

Editorial

Landscapes of Inequality: Spatial Segregation, Economic Isolation, and Contingent Residential Locations

Amy K. Glasmeier

*Department of Geography, The Pennsylvania State University,
308 Walker Building, University Park, PA 16802
akg1@ems.psu.edu*

Tracey L. Farrigan

*Geographer, Farm and Rural Household Well-Being Branch,
Resource and Rural Economics Division, Economic Research Service,
USDA, 1800 M Street NW, Room N4088,
Washington, D.C. 20036
tfarrigan@ers.usda.gov*

Cities contain clusters of jobs and people. These clusters or groups lead to the formation of districts. In the case of firms, transactions costs and networks facilitate spatial concentration; in the case of people, chain migration and social networks reinforce group propinquity. Together, these clusters come to form the socioeconomic fabric of metropolitan areas. The end result is a city made up of labor markets and residential enclaves. This simplistic representation of urban form is at the heart of many efforts to model the residential or place-of-work location decision. Reflective of this verbal schematic of a city, the articles in this issue ask, each in their own way, two questions: do industrial and social groups overlap; and what factors, market and nonmarket, structure residential location options and therefore either facilitate or retard access to jobs by social groups? In these articles, immigrants and underrepresented minorities are the objects of investigation, and the metropolitan region, captured in multiple spatial scales, is the geographic unit of observation. The literature on immigrants' propensity for employment suggests that the demand for low-wage labor, on the one hand, and ethnic networks, on the other hand, together help to explain the spatial location of ethnic employment concentrations. Similarly, a

prominent explanation of the underemployment of underrepresented minorities emphasizes the discrepancy between residential location and the suburban location of work. At work are markets for housing and labor. At the scale of the city, this description of cause and effect is attractive and even compelling. But it ignores preexisting spatial segregation and residential discrimination that fix in space and reinforce patterns of spatial inequality that shape and reshape the location of residents and their access to work. At work is the unfolding process of uneven development, a persistent quality of capitalism that plays out across multiple spatial scales and effects differences in levels and rates of economic development across time among places, people, and broader economic activity.

The articles in this issue consider, in different and novel ways, the residential-location decision of social groups and the corresponding links between the site of residence and the site of work, overlaid on long-abiding problems of social and economic inequality that are defined by race, income, and uneven development (Fox Gotham 2002; Orfield and Lee 2005; Watson 2006). These location decisions are encumbered geographically by a segregated landscape that, once acknowledged, stands as a testa-

ment to the spatial disparities in levels of living and poverty that persist in America today and through different mechanisms in many industrial societies (e.g., Glasmeier 2005). Recognition of and interest in these issues among geographers and other social scientists began in the 1930s, motivated by the social and economic imbalances of the Great Depression and carried through to the 1960s with the civil rights movement and the War on Poverty. Within this context, it is clear that segregation by race, income, and uneven development is the norm and that spatial economic processes need to be analyzed as such to reflect a complete geography that is informed by this inequality. Segregation based on these factors has attracted considerable research attention, but our understanding of the interrelatedness of these factors is still limited, given the extent to which the factors represent both cause (determinants) and effect (outcomes).

The most comprehensive area of study on segregation has been on trends in racial and ethnic residential location (e.g., Farley and Frey 1994; Glaeser and Vigdor 2001; Iceland 2004; Taeuber and Taeuber 1965). Those works have established the existence of distinctive patterns of racial and ethnic residential partitioning in U.S. metropolitan areas. Among the most cited is the abundance of research by Massey and Denton (e.g., 1987, 1989, 1993a, 1993b). In one of their earliest works, Massey and Denton (1988) used the dissimilarity index as a measure of separation to examine segregation between whites and blacks, Hispanics, and Asians for 1970 and 1980 in 60 metropolitan areas and found that blacks were the most highly segregated of the three groups in both time periods. The experience for Hispanics was a little more than half that for blacks, while Asians were shown to be the least segregated from whites. Massey and Denton also suggested that dissimilarity from whites declined for all three groups during the 1970s, which some have attributed largely to the enforcement of 1960s fair housing legislation (e.g., Frey and Farley 1996). Suburbanization of the middle class must also be considered as a probable

association with the decline of dissimilarity from whites over the same period. Subsequent research has shown that the trend toward decreasing segregation has persisted for blacks, while Hispanic and Asian segregation in reference to whites has increased in most metropolitan areas (Cutler, Glaeser, and Vigdor 1999; Frey 2002; Myers 1999). This latter trend owes its development to the role of migration during the same period.

Some differences in patterns of racial/ethnic segregation have been documented when the geographic scale of analysis and measure of segregation has been changed (e.g., Iceland, Weinberg, and Steinmetz 2002). For instance, having looked at segregation from 1960 to 2000 along several dimensions and geographic levels using Theil's H as their measure of segregation, C. Fischer, Stockmayer, Stiles, and Hout (2003) found that a significant decrease in the segregation of blacks occurred after 1960 as neighborhoods became more integrated, while the segregation of immigrants increased owing to the concentration of immigrants in particular metropolitan areas. They also found that income-class segregation increased between 1970 and 1990 because of the clustering of the affluent not only in specific metropolitan areas, but also within specific neighborhoods in those areas. Of the more than 3,000 counties in the United States, the wealthy concentrate in less than 10 percent of them (Shaw 1997; Glasmeier 2005). Frey and Myers (2005) produced similar results upon examining neighborhood dissimilarity indices for 318 metropolitan areas and 1,220 places in 2000, but they found that the majority of the declines and gains between 1990 and 2000 were to be relatively small for all three minority groups. They attributed their findings to a number of factors, including mixed patterns of dispersion and immigration of the Hispanic population, growth in the number of multiminority areas, recent housing construction, and higher and increasing incomes for the black population.

The literature has shown an increase in income segregation between 1970 and 2000

(M. Fischer 2003). For instance, Massey and Eggers (1993) found increases in segregation and isolation between the affluent and poor from 1970 to 1980. Likewise, upon examining the residential concentration of poverty in 100 metropolitan areas in the United States from 1970 to 1990, Abramson, Tobin, and VanderGoot (1995) found that the poor had become more segregated. Furthermore, using a correlation-based sorting index to measure segregation, rather than the more traditional dissimilarity index, Jargowsky (1996a, 990) reported a “pronounced trend toward increasing economic segregation” for whites, blacks, and Hispanics from 1970 to 1990. Considering only these general trends, however, disguises the significant differences in income segregation both between and within racial/ethnic groups.

Empirical research has shown considerable variation in intergroup residential patterns on the basis of income class. For example, Jargowsky (1996b) and others (e.g., Massey and Eggers 1990) reported that poor blacks and Hispanics are disproportionately more likely to live in high-poverty neighborhoods than are whites and that those groups endured particularly large increases in economic segregation during the 1970s and 1980s. Therefore, the life chances of the poor among minority groups, given limited access to individual and place-based resources, tend to be more adversely affected than are those for poor whites (Massey, Gross, and Eggers 1991; Massey and Shibuya 1995; Sampson and Wilson 1995).

Studies on income segregation within racial groups have found similar patterns. Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians of higher-income classes tend to isolate themselves from those of lower-income classes less often than do whites, but blacks are the least likely to experience intragroup income segregation (Erbe 1975; Kantrowitz 1973; Pattillo-McCoy 2000; Sims 1999). This work suggests that rising incomes for minority groups, particularly blacks, have not resulted in substantial spatial mobility away from poor neighborhoods or a higher degree of sharing

of neighborhoods with whites (Darden 1987; Farley 1977; Massey and Fischer 1999; South and Crowder 1998). Thus, as Iceland, Sharpe, and Steinmetz (2003, 5) noted, “the general consensus is that racial and ethnic rather than class status remains the most salient factor in explaining residential location for blacks and Hispanics.”

The emphasis in the studies described here is on group outcomes with lesser regard for elements of a causal chain leading to the spatial segregation of groups by income, class, and race. Fischer (2003) argued, for example, that income segregation is gaining in importance relative to race/ethnicity and that there is a need for a better understanding of the changing dynamics of residential spatial distribution and the forces that are behind them. In making this argument, she cited Jargowsky (1996a, 1996b), who found economic segregation to be on the rise and similarly stated that changes in social distance and socioeconomic transformations (e.g., race and income segregation) are not enough to explain the increase—that there is much that still needs to be explained and that doing so will be no easy task. That difficulty lies in the fact that research has offered numerous explanatory factors behind the continuing spatial segregation of the poor by race/ethnicity, both contradictory and complementary (Quillian 1999). For instance, Wilson (1987) emphasized the significance of economic restructuring and migration patterns to the concentration of poor blacks in the inner city; Massey, Gross, and Shibuya (1994) focused on the significance of race in the residential separation of the poor from the nonpoor; Jargowsky (1996a) stressed the significance of economic diversity among racial groups; and M. Fischer (2003) demonstrated the relationship between income inequality and metropolitan growth and its effect on residential segregation.

Together, these studies have added the critical perspective of uneven development to the underlying causes of the spatial segregation of the poor (Fong 1997; Fong and Shibuya 2000), whereby a combination of private prejudices (e.g., discrimination and

personal choice) and public policies have contributed to the patterns of segregation that exist today (Massey and Denton 1993a; Sawyer and Tatian 2003). Yet, uneven development, in and of itself, is a far less advanced area of research on segregation than that of race or income (Feagin 1998), largely because of the difficulty of defining and isolating the determinants of urban form, which Harvey (1988) thought is dependent on various modes of production and the manner in which economic surplus is circulated in the social context of places. Darden (1987; see also Darden, Child Hill, Thomas, and Thomas 1987; Darden and Kamel 2000) similarly argues that extraordinary poverty and racial segregation in Detroit and Chicago are the result of economic decentralization, chronic racial and class discrimination, and regional political fragmentation. In other words, no single factor explains uneven development, and identified factors are known to vary in intensity over time. The work of Gotham (2002) further advanced this discussion by demonstrating that a long history of uneven development, defined by the coupling of urban decline and suburban growth, has been and continues to be a primary contributor to racial residential discrimination in Kansas City, Missouri. More generally, others have argued that a multiplicity of interests that reward land developers through sometimes permissive, sometimes exclusionary, land-use policies to the detriment of poor racial minorities help functionally to maintain such segregation of the poor in U.S. metropolitan areas (Fox Gotham 2002; Seitles 1998).

Clearly, the spatial segregation of the poor is not and never has been just a black-white phenomenon. It is systematically linked to other dimensions of economic isolation and residential separation, including socioeconomic status and urban form. Its study thereby requires a multidimensional approach that links race/ethnicity and income with conditions that reflect the profound impacts of uneven development and resultant distress.

Empirical work on economic segregation in the United States suggests that the spatial segregation of the poor by racial/ethnic group reflects both between- and within-group economic differentiation (Glaeser and Vigdor 2001; Logan and Stults 2001). That is, residential location is taken to be a function of the socioeconomic resources that are available to a household that allow the household to move to a neighborhood with the desired physical, political, and social conditions or restrict it from doing so (Tiebout 1956). In the past, the residential sorting of the nonpoor to the poor was understood to be a discriminatory social process that was based mainly on race, whereby whites sought to avoid black neighbors and had the economic resources, institutional recognition, and market access to do so (Alba and Logan 1991; Farley 1977; Farley and Frey 1994; Farley et al. 1993). Yet, since the ability of blacks to move into more affluent neighborhoods has continuously increased since the 1970s, interclass segregation of blacks has emerged as a relevant factor underlying economic segregation (Logan and Alba 1993; Massey and Eggers 1990; Wilson 1987).

Thus, the desire of the nonpoor to avoid the poor and of whites to avoid blacks, in addition to an appetite for other perceived locational amenities, has motivated moves by both the black and white middle class, on the one hand, and by whites, on the other hand (Quillian 1999). Therefore, patterns of racial segregation between blacks and whites have continued, while within-group patterns of economic segregation have increased (between poor and nonpoor blacks), but the latter is not as pronounced as it would be if it were not for the former. That is, it has been suggested that whites' demand for housing declines as blacks transition to previously all-white neighborhoods, thereby reproducing black-white racial segregation while introducing black economic segregation (Cutler, Glaeser, and Vigdor 1999; Kain 1985, 2000). This is an oversimplification of the process, but it suggests that the segregation of the poor strictly adheres not to socioeconomic status, but to patterns of

social relations that are based on a combination of factors, including income, class, and race/ethnicity (Bobo and Zubrinsky 1996; Massey 1985). Discriminatory residential practices provide a context that further reinforces the segregation of the poor from the nonpoor, particularly along racial/ethnic lines (Cutler and Glaeser 1995). Poor minority racial/ethnic groups, limited in their choices of residential locations, tend to aggregate in the least desirable metropolitan environments where little new investment takes place (Jargowsky and Bane 1991; Massey, Gross, and Shibuya 1994; Taeuber and Taeuber 1965). In other words, capital accumulates where there is the greatest return; therefore, those with financial and social resources are attracted to newly developed, developing, or redeveloped areas, leaving poor areas behind to suffer greater deterioration and abandonment (Harvey 1983, 1988). This uneven development is considered a major cause of the social stratification and group differentiation of urban spaces and is thus a fundamental contributor to the spatial segregation of the poor (Hill 1977; Kain 1968; Smith 1984).

The three articles in this issue each explore an aspect of the landscape of inequality, making additions to received wisdom along the way. In a novel attempt to incorporate housing markets of “gateway cities” and their effect on the location of immigrants and native residents, David Ley, in “Countervailing Immigration and Domestic Migration in Gateway Cities: Australian and Canadian Variations on an American Theme,” suggests that a rapidly inflating housing market fosters flows of native populations and immigrant populations, often in opposite directions. Responding to conventional hypotheses about the locational propensities of immigrant population groups who are attracted to gateway cities, using the cases of Sydney and Toronto, Ley argues that to understand migration patterns into and out of gateway cities, it is necessary to go beyond explanations that emphasize hypotheses of cultural avoidance or labor market effects to consider how housing markets respond to flows of

new immigrants and simultaneously affect old migrants in these national ports of immigrant entry. Using a range of studies, he first explores how and to what extent research supports the hypothesis that cultural groups form enclaves. Finding evidence that conforms to this proposition, he questions the blanket proposition that segregation causes cultural clumping. To this process of forced geographic grouping he adds the possibility that immigrants settle near one another to maintain cultural practices and norms. In a second step, Ley explores the literature that suggests that domestic migration responds positively to labor market stimulation and finds, contrary to expectations, that tight labor markets lead to the outmigration of residents of gateway cities. One explanation for this unexpected pattern is that tight labor markets force individuals with fewer resources to the edge of high-cost metropolitan areas. This explanation sets up his analysis of the effect of immigration on housing markets in gateway cities. The upshot of this analysis suggests two countervailing patterns of expression behind his empirical findings—the intense demand for housing by new immigrants leads to a rise in the value of housing. The increased value of housing, in turn, allows domestic residents to “cash out” of the high-cost urban housing market and move to the suburbs. This, his central empirical contribution, raises interesting questions about the interaction of old and new migrants, long-time residents, and inflationary pressures that are associated with the exogenously derived demand for housing in gateway cities. In this way, Ley offers one explanation for why wealthy immigrants end up appearing isolated from other members of the same social group despite their status as new residents. The spatial isolation of immigrants of financial means despite their immigrant status coincides with the growing recognition of the changing nature of segregation and the role of wealth in further stratifying housing markets and the location of groups in society.

In another approach to the issue of immigrants’ locations in major cities, Mark Ellis,

Richard Wright, and Virginia Parks explore, in "Geography and the Immigrant Division of Labor," the extent to which immigrants' locational choice of residence constrains the location of work. Sociologists explain immigrants' employment enclaves as a response to social networks that fix in space residential concentrations of ethnic population groups. Employers are then drawn to these reservoirs of low-wage workers, which, in turn, form an economic enclave of certain types of work. Verification of this tendency toward the niching of immigrants has been the subject of considerable sociological research. In this body of work, the labor market for immigrants is specified at the scale of metropolitan area, and thus spatial scale is given. Ellis, Wright, and Parks emphasize that conventional practice imposes a fixed immigrant division of labor throughout metropolitan space, obscuring intraurban variation in the sectors in which immigrants niche. Relaxing the assumption of metropolitan scale as the relevant spatial unit of analysis, Ellis, Wright, and Parks demonstrate at the tract level that considerable variation exists across social groups in terms of spatial niching; gender, ethnicity, and sector all intersect with and possibly condition the effect of residential location on the location of work. Using Los Angeles as the case study and employing a one-in-six-person sample from the 1990 census long form, which allows observation of the individual both at the location of residence and place of work, they ask three questions: to what extent does industrial niching by select groups of immigrants decline as the distance increases between the location of work and home; alternatively, do networks and employers' preferences for certain groups diminish the effects of distance between home and work; and to what extent does niching vary by immigrant group, and do employers switch groups based on their proximity to them? According to their analysis, locations of residence and work within a metropolitan area vary across groups and raise a host of questions about the importance of the initial location decision of immigrants that leads to the formation of

population clusters. Furthermore, how can and does this decision intersect with the locational strategies and serendipitous "location-making events" of the location of firms that form the locus of jobs? Instead of cultural factors prescribing locational choice, Ellis, Wright, and Parks explore the role of residential segregation as a key factor in explaining the pattern of labor market outcomes.

Coming at the problem of labor market outcomes from a different direction, Niki Dickerson examines, in "Black Employment, Segregation, and the Social Organization of Metropolitan Labor Markets," the extent to which high levels of racial residential segregation exact harmful influences on blacks' employment opportunities. Using a unique data set of the structural characteristics of the 95 largest U.S. cities drawn from the 1980, 1990, and 2000 decennial censuses' 1-percent Public Use Microdata Sample data, she expands the analysis of race, space, and work beyond an emphasis on the physical distance between minority communities, in this case, black communities and jobs, to a broader conceptualization of residential segregation as a structural feature of the entire metropolitan labor market. By implication, her work provides insights into the greater economic handicap experienced by blacks in accessing employment in highly segregated metropolitan areas that leads to greater economic isolation and higher rates of poverty. These findings, in conjunction with those of earlier studies (e.g., Abramson, Tobin, and VanderGoot 1995; Hughes 1989; Jargowsky 1994; Jargowsky and Bane 1991; Kasarda 1993; Weicher 1990), offer significant evidence of trends in the concentration and growth of poverty in the spatial separation of the poor from the nonpoor. Still, spatial segregation that is based on race and income has received far less attention than has segregation by race or income alone (Kain 2000).

The three articles in this issue add new insights to the vast literature on the spatial nature of labor markets, residential isolation, and gateway cities. At the same time, each in its own way goes deeper in exploring the

effect that institutions, such as class and racism, have on the formation of metropolitan areas. Each offers a novel approach to the empirical investigation of these issues, underscoring the value of approaching locational processes from multiple spatial scales. These articles are instructive in identifying the importance of time and processes that both fix in place and cause major ruptures in patterns of location. All underscore the variety of processes that contribute to the locational insecurity of vulnerable populations. Together, they remind us that contemporary circumstances reflect urban development that has been shaped by history and at the same time is context specific and therefore dependent upon larger social spatial processes that are themselves contingent and broadly similar at any particular moment.

References

- Abramson, A.; Tobin, M.; and VanderGoot, M. 1995. The changing geography of metropolitan opportunity: The segregation of the poor in U.S. metropolitan areas, 1970–1990. *Housing Policy Debate* 6:45–72.
- Alba, R., and Logan, J. 1991. Variations on two themes: Racial and ethnic patterns in the attainment of suburbanization. *Demography* 28:431–53.
- Bobo, L., and Zubrinsky, C. 1996. Attitudes toward residential integration: Perceived status: Differences, mere in-group preference, or racial prejudice? *Social Forces* 74:883–909.
- Cutler, D., and Glaeser, E. 1995. Are ghettos good or bad? *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 11(2–3):827–72.
- Cutler, D.; Glaeser, E.; and Vigdor, J. 1999. The rise and decline of the American ghetto. *Journal of Political Economy* 11(2–3):827–72.
- Darden, J. 1987. Socioeconomic status and racial residential segregation: Blacks and Hispanics in Chicago. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 28(2):1–13.
- Darden, J., and Kamel, S. 2000. Black residential segregation in the city and suburbs of Detroit: Does socioeconomic status matter? *Journal of Urban Affairs* 22(1):1–13.
- Darden, J.; Child Hill, R.; Thomas, J.; and Thomas, R. 1987. *Detroit, race and uneven development*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Dickerson, N. 2007. Black employment, segregation, and the social organization of metropolitan labor markets. *Economic Geography* 83:283–307.
- Ellis, M.; Wright, R.; and Parks, V. 2007. Geography and the immigrant division of labor. *Economic Geography* 83:255–281.
- Erbe, B. 1975. Race and socioeconomic segregation. *American Sociological Review* 40:801–12.
- Farley, R. 1977. Residential segregation in urban areas of the United States in 1970: An analysis of social class and racial differences. *Demography* 14:497–517.
- Farley, R.; and Frey, W. 1994. Changes in the segregation of whites from blacks during the 1980s: Small steps toward a more integrated society. *American Sociological Review* 59:23–45.
- Farley, R.; Steeh, C.; Jackson, T.; Krysan, M.; and Reeves, K. 1993. Chocolate racial residential segregation in Detroit: “Chocolate city, vanilla suburbs” revisited. *Journal of Housing Research* 7:319–44.
- Feagin, J. 1998. The new urban paradigm: Critical perspectives on the city. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Fischer, C.; Stockmayer, C.; Stiles, J.; and Hout, M. 2003. *Distinguishing the geographic levels and social dimensions of U.S. metropolitan segregation 1960–2000*. Century of Difference Project. Berkeley: Survey Research Center, University of California at Berkeley.
- Fischer, M. 2003. The relative importance of income and race in determining residential outcomes in U.S. urban areas, 1970–2000. *Urban Affairs Review* 38:669–96.
- Fong, E. 1997. A systematic approach to racial residential patterns. *Social Science Research* 26:465–86.
- Fong, E., and Shibuya, K. 2000. The spatial separation of the poor in Canadian cities. *Demography* 37:449–59.
- Fox Gotham, K. 2002. *Race, real estate, and uneven development: The Kansas City experience, 1900–2000*. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press.
- Frey, W. 2002. Three Americas: The rising significance of regions. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 68:349–56.
- Frey, W., and Farley, R. 1996. Latino, Asian and black segregation in U.S. metropolitan areas: Are multiethnic metros different? *Demography* 33:35–50.
- Frey, W., and Myers, D. 2005. *Racial segregation in U.S. metropolitan areas and cities, 1990–2000: Patterns, trends, and explanations*.

- Research Report 05-573. Population Studies Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Glaeser, E., and Vigdor, J. 2001. *Racial segregation in the 2000 census: Promising news*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution. Available online: <http://www.brook.edu>
- Glasmeyer, A. 2005. *An atlas of poverty in America: One nation pulling apart, 1960–2003*. New York: Routledge.
- Harvey, D. 1983. Class-monopoly rent finance capital and the urban revolution. In *Readings in urban analysis*, ed. R. Lake, 197–227. New Brunswick, N.J.: New Brunswick Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University.
- . 1988. *Social justice and the city*. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell.
- Hill, R. 1977. Capital accumulation and urbanization in the United States. *Comparative Urban Research* 4:39–60.
- Hughes, M. 1989. Misspeaking truth to power: A geographical perspective on the “underclass”-fallacy. *Economic Geography* 65:187–94.
- Iceland, J. 2004. Beyond black and white metropolitan residential segregation in multi-ethnic America. *Social Science Research* 33:248–71.
- Iceland, J.; Sharpe, C.; and Steinmetz, E. 2003. *Class differences in African American residential patterns 1990–2000*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Iceland, J.; Weinberg, D.; and Steinmetz, E. 2002. *Racial and ethnic residential segregation in the United States, 1980–2000*. Census 2000 Special Reports. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Jargowsky, P. 1994. Ghetto poverty among blacks in the 1980s. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 13:288–310.
- . 1996a. *Poverty and place: Ghettos, barrios, and the American city*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- . 1996b. Take the money and run: Economic segregation in U.S. metropolitan areas. *American Sociological Review* 61:984–98.
- Jargowsky, P., and Bane, M. 1991. Ghetto poverty in the United States, 1970–1980. In *The urban underclass*, ed. C. Jencks and P. Peterson, 235–73. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Kain, J. 1968. Housing, segregation, Negro employment, and metropolitan decentralization. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 82:175–97.
- . 1985. Black suburbanization in the eighties: A new beginning or a false hope? In *American domestic priorities: An economical appraisal*, ed. J. Quigley and D. Rubinfeld, 253–99. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2000. Racial and economic segregation in U.S. metropolitan areas. In *The Oxford handbook of economic geography*, ed. G. Clark, M. Feldman, and M. Gertler, 518–37. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kantrowitz, N. 1973. *Ethnic and racial segregation in the New York metropolis*. New York: Praeger.
- Kasarda, J. 1993. Inner-city concentrated poverty and neighborhood distress 1970–1990. *Housing Policy Debate* 4:253–302.
- Ley, D. 2007. Countervailing immigration and domestic migration in gateway cities: Australian and Canadian variations on an American theme. *Economic Geography* 83:231–254.
- Logan, J., and Alba, R. 1993. Locational returns to human capital minority access to suburban community resources. *Demography* 30:243–68.
- Logan, J., and Stults, B. 2001. *Ethnic diversity grows, neighborhood integration lags*. Albany: Lewis Mumford Center, State University of New York at Albany. Available online: <http://mumford.albany.edu/census/WholePop/WPreport/page1.html>
- Massey, D. 1985. Ethnic residential segregation: A theoretical synthesis and empirical review. *Sociology and Social Research* 69(3):15–50.
- Massey, D., and Denton, N. 1987. Trends in the residential segregation of blacks, Hispanics, and Asians. *American Sociological Review* 52:802–25.
- . 1988. The dimensions of residential segregation. *Social Forces* 67:281–315.
- . 1989. Hypersegregation in U.S. metropolitan areas: Black and Hispanic segregation along five dimensions. *Demography* 26:373–91.
- . 1993a. *American apartheid segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- . 1993b. The spatial concentration of affluence and poverty during the 1970s. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 29:299–315.
- Massey, D., and Eggers, M. 1990. The ecology of inequality minorities and the concentration of poverty, 1970–1980. *American Journal of Sociology* 95:1153–88.
- . 1993. The spatial concentration of affluence and poverty during the 1970's. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 29:299–315.
- Massey, D., and Fischer, M. 1999. Does rising income bring integration? New results for

- blacks, Hispanics and Asians in 1990. *Social Science Research* 28:316–26.
- Massey, D.; Gross, A.; and Eggers, M. 1991. Segregation, the concentration of poverty, and the life chances of individuals. *Social Science Research* 20:397–420.
- Massey, D.; Gross, A. B.; and Shibuya, K. 1994. Migration, segregation, and the geographic concentration of poverty. *American Sociological Review* 59:425–45.
- Massey, D., and Shibuya, K. 1995. Unraveling the tangle of pathology: The effect of spatially concentrated joblessness on the well-being of African Americans. *Social Science Research* 24:352–66.
- Myers, D. 1999. Demographic dynamism and metropolitan change comparing Los Angeles, New York, Chicago and Washington, D.C. *Housing Policy Debate* 10:919–54.
- Orfield, G., and Lee, C. 2005. *Why segregation matters: Poverty and educational inequality*. Cambridge, Mass.: Civil Rights Project, Harvard University. Available online: http://www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu/research/deseg/Why_Segreg_Matters.pdf
- Pattillo-McCoy, M. 2000. The limits of out-migration for the black middle class. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 22:225–41.
- Quillian, L. 1999. Migration patterns and the growth of high-poverty neighborhoods 1970–1990. *American Journal of Sociology* 105:1–37.
- Sampson, R., and Wilson, W. 1995. Toward a theory of race crime and urban inequality. In *Crime and Inequality*, ed. J. Hagan and R. Peterson, 37–54. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Sawyer, N., and Tatian, P. 2003. *Segregation patterns in the District of Columbia, 1980 to 2000*. Discussion Brief No. 2. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.
- Seitles, M. 1998. The perpetuation of residential racial segregation in America: Historical discrimination, modern forms of exclusion, and inclusionary remedies. *Journal of Land Use and Environmental Law* 14(1). Available online: <http://www.law.fsu.edu/journals/landuse/vol141/seit.htm>
- Shaw, W. 1997. The spatial concentration of affluence in the United States. *Geographical Review* 87:546–53.
- Sims, M. 1999. High-status residential segregation among racial and ethnic groups in five metro areas, 1980–1990. *Social Science Quarterly* 80:556–73.
- Smith, N. 1984. *Uneven development: Nature, capital and the production of space*. Basil Blackwell.
- South, S. K., and Crowder, K. D. 1998. Leaving the 'hood: Residential mobility between black, white, and integrated neighborhoods. *American Sociological Review* 63:17–26.
- Taeuber, K., and Taeuber, A. 1965. *Negroes in cities: Residential segregation and neighborhood change*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Tiebout, C. 1956. A pure theory of local expenditures. *Journal of Political Economy* 64:416–424.
- Watson, T. 2006. *Metropolitan growth, inequality, and neighborhood segregation by income*. Available online: <http://www.econ.berkeley.edu>
- Weicher, J. 1990. How poverty neighborhoods are changing. In *Inner city poverty in the United States*, ed. L. Lynn and M. McGeary, 68–70. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Wilson, W. 1987. *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Conditions of use: This article may be downloaded from the *Economic Geography* website for personal research by members of subscribing organizations. This PDF may not be placed on any website without permission of the publisher, Clark University.