

THE RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION OF OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS IN CENTRAL CITIES AND SUBURBS

John Fine

Department of Sociology, California State College at San Bernardino 92407

Norval D. Glenn

J. Kenneth Monts

Department of Sociology, The University of Texas at Austin 78712

Abstract—The impression of journalists and social critics in the 1950's that post-war suburbia was uniformly middle-class has been generally rejected by social scientists, but there is a persisting belief in a high degree of residential segregation by social level in suburbia and in a high degree of socio-economic homogeneity within suburban neighborhoods. A comparison of eight central cities with their suburban zones in 1950 and in 1960 revealed, for both dates, (a) small differences in occupational distributions between the central cities and the suburban zones and (b) generally higher Index of Residential Dissimilarity values for pairs of occupational groups in the central cities. These findings indicate that suburban neighborhoods, at least in the eight suburban zones studied, were little, if any, more occupationally homogeneous than the central city neighborhoods. This suggests that the belief in homogeneous suburban neighborhoods should be added to the growing list of discredited "myths of suburbia."

The early literature on the post-World-War-II suburbs in the United States was concerned especially with what the authors perceived to be the homogeneity of the populations of specific suburbs or of suburbia as a whole (e.g., Whyte, 1956). By the late 1950's and early 1960's, social scientists had come to recognize that suburbia as a whole is quite heterogeneous occupationally and economically rather than being populated very largely by middle-class "organization men" and prosperous manual workers who have adopted middle-class life styles and values (e.g., Berger, 1960, 1961; Dobriner, 1963). However, most of the social scientific as well as journalistic observers of suburbia have persisted in assuming that people at the various social levels are highly segregated from one another in suburbia and

that most suburbs or suburban neighborhoods contain primarily people within a rather narrow range of income, education, and occupational prestige (Wrong, 1967; Wood, 1959; Dobriner, 1963; Lee, 1963; Boskoff, 1970; Broom and Selznick, 1968; Coleman, 1966; Beshers, 1962; Fava, 1956; Packard, 1959; Bernard, 1962; Martin, 1956). If the contention is simply that each suburb tends to contain a more homogeneous population than the central city, then its validity is hardly in doubt. However, most of the authors imply, and some explicitly state, that suburban neighborhoods are typically more homogeneous than central city neighborhoods. References to "one-class" suburbs and suburban neighborhoods are legion, and usually it is implied that one-class neighborhoods are more characteristic of the suburbs

than of the central cities. Some authors believe that suburban neighborhoods had become less homogeneous, less "monolithic," by the early 1960's (Dobriner, 1963; Wrong, 1967), but they do not challenge the impression that most of the mass produced post-war suburbs initially contained inhabitants highly uniform in their status characteristics.

Since a number of consequences (mainly detrimental) have been attributed to living and growing up in homogeneous suburban neighborhoods (e.g., Whyte, 1956; Lee, 1963; Riesman, 1957), it is important to know whether or not there is, or has been, as much segregation by social level in the suburbs as alleged and whether or not suburban neighborhoods have really become more heterogeneous. So far, there has been no adequate empirical investigation of these questions. The existing evidence pertains to specific suburbs; there is not even an adequate treatment of all of the suburbs around a single central city.

In this paper we report a study designed to provide some of the needed evidence pertaining to these and related questions. Our concern with the alleged homogeneity of suburban neighborhoods leads us to consider each of the two determinants of degree of homogeneity, namely, (1) degree of residential segregation by social level and (2) degree of representation of all social levels in suburbia. Our primary focus is on the former factor, but the latter cannot be neglected. Even if suburban residents in the higher and the lower social levels are not highly segregated from one another, the neighborhoods will tend to be homogeneous if few lower-stratum people live in the suburbs.

METHODS

The study covers two dates, 1950, when the mass produced post-war suburbs were new and were just beginning to attract the attention of social commentators, and 1960, when, according to

some social scientists, the trend toward greater heterogeneity of the mass produced suburbs was well under way. Data were analyzed for each date for eight Urbanized Areas of considerably varying population size and economic base and in several regions of the country. Two, Boston and Philadelphia, are old, large eastern cities which tend to conform roughly to the Burgess concentric scheme (Schnore, 1963), at least in that people in the suburbs tend to be of higher status than people in the central cities (Table 2). Others (especially Los Angeles and San Diego) are newer and have no apparent tendency to conform to the Burgess scheme.

In spite of their diversity, the eight Urbanized Areas are not a random sample of all Urbanized Areas and are not necessarily representative of the universe. Rather, for a study broader in scope than this one, we drew a random sample of 15 from all Urbanized Areas for which the central cities were census tracted in 1950. When we moved from that study to this one, we could use only eight of the original 15 Urbanized Areas, because large portions of the suburbs of the other seven were not tracted in 1950. Therefore, generalization from this study to all Urbanized Areas must be very tentative.

For each Urbanized Area, we compared measures of segregation for the central city (or central cities) with measures for the suburban zone. We used the Index of Residential Dissimilarity, with census tracts the areal units, to measure the segregation between each pair of occupational groups (Duncan and Duncan, 1955). The central city values were computed from data on the census tracts predominantly (in terms of area) in the central city (or cities), and the suburban values were computed from data on census tracts predominantly in the Urbanized Area but outside the central city or cities. Location of the census tracts was determined by

comparing census tract maps with maps of the Urbanized Areas. We used only eight occupational groups (28 pairs), because separate data for the two agricultural groups are not given in the census tract reports, and there were too few private household workers to use as a separate group. The mean of the index values for the 28 pairs of occupational groups is termed the Summary Segregation Index (SSI).

For Minneapolis-St. Paul, we pooled the census tracts in the two central cities to arrive at the central city index values. The Bureau of the Census also designates two central cities for the Los Angeles-Long Beach Urbanized Area, but the cities are not contiguous and one is much larger than the other. Therefore, we used only the census tracts primarily in Los Angeles for the central city data and included the Long Beach tracts with the suburban tracts.

We used census tracts as approximations of neighborhoods only because there is no practical alternative; we do not claim that the tracts are, in any sociologically meaningful sense, usually coincident with neighborhoods. However, people within a census tract do often share such neighborhood facilities and institutions as schools, churches, retail outlets, service establishments, and the like. Census tracts are more or less "neighborhood sized" units in terms of number of inhabitants; therefore, a high degree of segregation by occupational group among neighborhoods would almost always entail a high degree of segregation among census tracts, and vice versa.

Nor is segregation by occupational group a totally adequate measure of segregation by social level. The people in an occupational group do not constitute a social stratum, because the groups overlap considerably in the status characteristics of the detailed occupations they contain, and the people in each detailed occupation vary a great deal on

the various dimensions of stratification aside from occupational prestige. However, the use of occupational groups to gauge segregation by social level is preferable to the available alternatives, namely, use of amount of formal education or income. In the adult population, amount of education is related in a negative and approximately linear fashion to age, and there is considerable residential segregation of persons at different stages of the life cycle. Therefore, segregation by amount of education is in part a reflection of segregation by age and thus is not an adequate indicator of segregation by social level. The incomes of adult males are also related to age, although in a nonlinear fashion, so that segregation by income also reflects in part segregation by age and stage of the life cycle.

In order to relate the data on segregation to the issue of the homogeneity of neighborhoods, we compared the occupational distribution of employed central city males with that of suburban males, for both 1950 and 1960. We made this comparison for each Urbanized Area and with the pooled data from all eight Urbanized Areas.

FINDINGS

In Table 1 we present the pooled occupational distributions of employed males in the central cities and in the suburban zones of the eight Urbanized Areas in 1950 and 1960. Obviously, all of the occupational groups well represented in the central cities were also well represented in their suburbs. Overall, the differences between the central city and the suburban distributions were very small at both dates; there was especially little difference in the proportions in the nonmanual, or "middle-class," occupations. Lower-manual workers were less well represented in the suburbs than in the central cities, but the difference was not great.

Although these eight Urbanized Areas

TABLE 1.—Percentage Distribution of Employed Males in Central Cities and Suburbs of Eight Urbanized Areas, 1950 and 1960

Occupational group	1950			1960		
	Central cities	Sub-urbs	Diff. CC-S	Central cities	Sub-urbs	Diff. CC-S
Total	100.0	100.0	...	100.0	100.0	...
1) Professional, technical, and kindred workers	10.0	11.7	-1.7	13.6	12.8	0.8
2) Farmers and farm managers	0.2	0.4	-0.2	0.4	0.4	0.0
3) Managers, officials, and proprietors, exc. farm	12.8	14.7	-1.9	10.9	13.8	-2.9
4) Clerical and kindred workers	9.5	8.0	1.5	10.3	8.5	1.8
5) Sales workers	9.2	9.2	0.0	8.6	9.5	-0.9
6) Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	21.0	23.9	-2.9	19.8	23.8	-4.0
7) Operatives and kindred workers	19.7	19.1	0.6	19.9	19.2	0.7
8) Private household workers	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1
9) Service workers, exc. private household	9.3	5.9	3.4	9.3	5.9	3.4
10) Farm laborers and foremen	0.3	0.5	-0.2	0.2	0.5	-0.3
11) Laborers, exc. farm and mine	7.8	6.3	1.5	6.8	5.2	1.6
Nonmanual [sum of (1) and (3)-(5)]	41.5	43.6	-2.1	43.4	44.6	-1.2
Lower manual [sum of (7)-(11)]	37.3	32.0	5.3	36.4	30.9	5.5

Note: Persons for whom no occupation was reported are excluded.

are not necessarily representative of all cities and their suburbs, other authors have observed similar small differences in occupational distributions between central cities and suburbs (Lazerwitz, 1960; Schnore, 1963; Farley, 1964). Undoubtedly, suburbia in the United States was never so uniformly "middle-class" as the journalists portrayed it to be in the early 1950's.

As we point out above, some authors have asserted that suburbia has become less uniform, meaning in most instances,

less uniformly middle-class (Dobriner, 1963; Wrong, 1967; Goldstein and Mayer, 1964). If such a change were to occur, it would lead to a narrowing of occupational differences between the central cities and the suburbs. However, no such decline was evident in the eight Urbanized Areas we studied. The Index of Occupational Dissimilarity between the central cities and the suburbs computed from the pooled data in Table 1 is 7.0 for 1950 and 8.3 for 1960. The data for individual Urbanized Areas in Table

TABLE 2.—Percentage of Employed Males in Nonmanual Occupations and Percentage in Lower Manual Occupations in the Central City and the Suburbs of Each of Eight Urbanized Areas, 1950 and 1960

Urbanized area	Nonmanual						Lower manual					
	1950			1960			1950			1960		
	CC	S	Diff.	CC	S	Diff.	CC	S	Diff.	CC	S	Diff.
Boston	38.2	44.4	-6.2	38.7	48.6	-9.9	41.6	33.2	8.4	41.7	29.3	12.4
Kansas City	44.3	38.2	6.1	43.6	46.4	-2.8	36.6	39.3	-2.7	37.8	30.8	7.0
Los Angeles	45.7	42.5	3.2	48.4	43.3	5.1	33.7	32.1	1.6	32.0	32.7	-0.7
Miami	42.9	48.3	-5.4	38.7	50.6	-11.9	36.5	27.2	9.3	41.9	25.7	16.2
Minneapolis												
-St. Paul	44.6	47.7	-3.1	44.4	53.0	-8.6	34.0	29.0	5.0	35.1	25.5	9.6
Phila.	36.1	45.8	-9.7	37.5	47.5	-10.0	41.6	29.8	11.8	41.9	29.4	12.5
San Diego	42.6	38.8	3.8	46.6	41.2	5.4	32.8	30.8	2.0	29.7	28.8	0.9
Syracuse	42.3	36.7	5.6	44.6	51.1	-6.5	36.1	35.3	0.8	35.3	24.5	10.8
Mean diff.	-0.7	-4.9	4.5	8.6

Note: Persons for whom no occupation was reported are excluded.

2 indicate even more distinctly a general increase in the central city-suburban differences. Furthermore, a study by Farley (1964) of 17 Urbanized Areas shows a general trend toward greater central city-suburban occupational differences from 1950 to 1960.

A trend away from "middle-classness" may have occurred in some of the mass produced tract developments, but no such trend occurred in the total suburban zone in any of the Urbanized Areas we studied (Table 2). In each of them, the percentage of suburban workers in nonmanual occupations increased from 1950 to 1960, and the percentage in lower-manual occupations decreased in all except Los Angeles, where it remained virtually the same. It seems that the alleged movement of suburbs away from "middle-classness" may be as illusory as the myth that a high degree of middle-class homogeneity ever existed.

The most important revelation of the data in Tables 1 and 2 for our purposes is that people at all broad occupational levels were well enough represented in the suburbs so that the occupational homogeneity of the suburbs we studied depended, in both 1950 and 1960, primarily upon degree of residential segregation by occupational level. To be sure, the very poor may not have been well represented in the suburbs, but employed male workers in lower-status occupations were. Therefore, we turn now to the data on residential segregation.

The literature would lead one to expect greater segregation by occupational level in the suburban zones than in the central cities, but our data bear out this expectation only in the case of Miami (Tables 3 and 4). For 1960, the Summary Segregation Index is greater for the central city (or cities) except for the Miami Urbanized Area. For 1950, the SSI is identical for the central city and the suburban zone of Philadelphia and is greater for the central city (or cities) for all other Urbanized Areas except Miami. There

was apparently no appreciable change in the central city-suburban difference in degree of segregation from 1950 to 1960; at both dates, the mean SSI was three points greater for the central cities than for the suburbs.

One might guess that the central city-suburban difference in SSI values results from a systematic difference in the size of census tracts in the two zones. The Index of Residential Dissimilarity is sensitive to the number and kind of areal units used in its computation, and its values can be lowered by combining units so that each contains a larger and more heterogeneous population. Therefore, if the suburban zones were typically divided into fewer census tracts, relative to population size, than the central cities, then this difference alone might account for the lower SSI values for the suburbs. In fact, the mean number of employed males was greater in the suburban than in the central city tracts in both 1950 and 1960. In 1960, the mean was 1,179 for the suburban tracts and 996 for the central city tracts; in 1950, the means were 1,411 and 1,240. (See Table 5.) However, when we consider only those Urbanized Areas in which the mean number of male workers in the central city tracts was greater than or about the same as the mean in the suburban tracts, the mean SSI values are still greater for the central cities, by three points for 1950 and by two points for 1960. Therefore, it seems unlikely that the suburban SSI values would exceed the central city values if the suburban and central city tracts had averaged the same number of people.

One might also guess that the small number of census tracts in some of the suburban zones depresses their SSI values. Beyond a certain number, the number of census tracts should have no effect on the SSI, but below a certain number it may. In order for the SSI to reach its theoretical upper limit of 100, which would mean no intermixture of occupa-

TABLE 3.—Index of Residential Dissimilarity for Paired Occupational Groups, for Central Cities and for Suburban Zones, Eight Urbanized Areas, 1950

Paired occupational groups	Boston			Kansas City			Los Angeles			Miami			Minneapolis-St. Paul			Philadelphia			San Diego			Syracuse			Mean score		
	CC	S	D	CC	S	D	CC	S	D	CC	S	D	CC	S	D	CC	S	D	CC	S	D	CC	S	D	CC	S	
																									CC	S	D
Prof.-Mgr.	17	13	4	10	9	1	15	13	2	10	23	-13	12	10	2	17	12	5	14	10	4	15	10	5	14	13	1
Prof.-Sales	19	14	5	10	7	3	15	13	2	12	17	-5	13	7	6	16	11	5	16	11	5	14	8	6	14	11	3
Prof.-Cler.	25	27	-2	23	30	-7	27	22	5	16	24	-8	23	24	-1	26	23	3	20	14	6	30	18	12	24	23	1
Prof.-Craft.	29	34	-5	33	44	-11	35	32	3	34	44	-20	33	26	7	32	34	-2	28	20	8	34	22	12	31	32	-1
Prof.-Oper.	36	43	-7	43	59	-16	42	40	2	34	44	-10	40	38	2	40	44	-4	35	28	7	43	32	11	39	41	-2
Prof.-Serv.	36	36	0	49	46	3	44	31	13	42	35	7	38	37	1	39	40	-1	35	25	10	36	23	13	40	34	6
Prof.-Lbr.	48	40	8	57	63	-6	56	44	12	68	60	8	46	42	4	55	53	2	43	33	10	49	43	6	53	47	6
Mgr.-Sales	10	10	0	14	12	2	11	11	0	8	16	-8	11	11	0	11	10	1	12	12	0	12	9	3	11	12	-1
Mgr.-Cler.	26	24	2	25	28	-3	24	18	6	13	28	-15	22	20	2	25	23	2	18	15	3	23	12	11	22	21	1
Mgr.-Craft.	28	29	-1	34	41	-7	30	26	4	22	48	-26	30	24	6	29	32	-3	25	20	5	27	14	13	28	29	-1
Mgr.-Oper.	35	38	-3	43	55	-12	37	33	4	32	46	-14	38	33	5	36	41	-5	32	27	5	35	23	12	36	37	-1
Mgr.-Serv.	37	33	4	49	43	6	40	27	13	43	29	14	38	34	4	36	36	0	34	23	11	32	19	13	39	30	9
Mgr.-Lbr.	47	37	10	57	59	-2	51	38	13	68	61	7	44	37	7	50	50	0	42	28	14	43	34	9	50	43	7
Sales-Cler.	26	20	6	18	25	-7	19	15	4	9	17	-8	19	24	-5	25	18	7	11	10	1	18	14	4	18	18	0
Sales-Craft.	28	25	3	30	39	-9	29	24	5	20	37	-17	29	25	4	30	30	0	19	13	6	23	20	3	26	27	-1
Sales-Oper.	34	35	-1	40	54	-14	35	32	3	30	38	-8	34	37	-3	37	40	-3	27	22	5	33	29	4	34	36	-2
Sales-Serv.	36	30	6	46	42	4	37	24	13	41	26	15	33	37	-4	38	35	3	30	21	9	29	20	9	36	29	7
Sales-Lbr.	47	34	13	54	58	-4	51	38	13	68	56	12	41	41	0	52	51	1	41	29	12	42	40	2	50	43	7
Cler.-Craft.	10	13	-3	15	15	0	19	15	4	15	24	-9	13	14	-1	11	15	-4	12	13	-1	10	9	1	13	15	-2
Cler.-Oper.	19	23	-4	26	30	-4	23	23	0	24	26	-2	20	18	2	19	27	-8	20	18	2	18	17	1	21	23	-2
Cler.-Serv.	22	16	6	37	20	17	25	18	7	38	24	14	24	17	7	22	26	-4	25	20	5	20	14	6	27	19	8
Cler.-Lbr.	30	23	7	44	34	10	42	32	10	68	50	18	29	23	6	40	44	-4	37	30	7	31	28	3	40	33	7
Craft.-Oper.	13	17	-4	16	15	1	16	12	4	20	13	7	13	15	-2	14	15	-1	11	13	-2	13	10	3	15	14	1
Craft.-Serv.	13	16	-3	34	11	23	29	19	10	38	31	7	22	20	2	24	23	1	23	18	5	19	14	5	27	19	8
Craft.-Lbr.	27	19	8	38	20	18	37	25	12	64	34	30	24	22	2	40	37	3	34	22	12	28	24	5	36	25	11
Oper.-Serv.	22	16	6	24	13	11	22	22	0	21	24	-3	18	10	8	21	17	4	19	20	-1	16	14	2	20	17	3
Oper.-Lbr.	17	16	1	26	8	19	28	21	7	48	27	21	14	10	4	32	30	2	27	21	6	17	16	1	26	19	7
Serv.-Lbr.	24	17	7	17	17	0	29	23	6	38	38	0	17	13	4	23	24	-1	24	27	-3	18	20	-2	24	22	2
SSI ^a	28	25	3	33	32	1	31	25	6	33	34	-1	26	24	2	30	30	0	26	20	6	26	20	6	29	26	3

a-Summary segregation index: mean of index values for 28 pairs of occupational groups.

TABLE 4.—Index of Residential Dissimilarity for Paired Occupational Groups, for Central Cities and for Suburban Zones, Eight Urbanized Areas, 1960

Paired occupational groups	Boston			Kansas City			Los Angeles			Miami			Minneapolis-St. Paul			Philadelphia			San Diego			Syracuse			Mean score			White workers only		
	CC	S	D	CC	S	D	CC	S	D	CC	S	D	CC	S	D	CC	S	D	CC	S	D	CC	S	D	CC	S	D	CC	S	D
Prof.-Craft.	18	14	4	15	14	1	17	15	2	14	16	-2	17	15	2	17	14	3	19	12	7	20	8	12	17	14	3	17	13	4
Prof.-Sales	21	15	6	15	14	1	19	15	4	17	21	-4	17	15	2	20	13	7	18	16	2	19	12	7	18	15	3	18	15	3
Prof.-Cler.	26	28	-2	27	31	-4	33	25	8	21	29	-8	25	23	2	27	27	0	24	23	1	29	16	13	27	25	2	26	25	1
Prof.-Craft.	31	31	0	33	37	-4	33	31	2	28	41	-13	33	24	7	32	34	-2	29	27	2	36	22	14	32	31	1	32	31	1
Prof.-Oper.	38	39	-1	43	46	-3	44	40	4	40	47	-7	41	32	9	41	43	-2	38	31	7	45	29	16	41	38	3	39	37	2
Prof.-Serv.	32	32	0	46	46	0	44	31	13	43	40	-7	33	28	5	39	37	2	38	28	10	36	28	8	39	34	5	34	32	2
Prof.-Lbr.	42	37	5	54	53	1	55	44	11	60	58	2	43	31	12	55	44	11	43	35	8	51	31	20	50	42	8	45	39	6
Mgr.-Sales	16	13	3	15	13	2	16	14	2	12	12	0	15	12	3	13	15	-2	14	17	-3	14	11	3	14	13	1	14	13	1
Mgr.-Cler.	27	30	-3	32	33	-1	33	25	8	16	29	-13	28	29	-1	31	31	0	22	21	1	25	15	10	27	27	0	26	26	0
Mgr.-Craft.	30	33	-3	36	38	-2	34	31	3	26	42	-16	33	30	3	34	37	-3	26	26	0	29	19	10	31	32	-1	31	32	-1
Mgr.-Oper.	37	41	4	46	47	-1	43	38	5	38	47	-9	41	37	4	43	45	-2	34	30	4	40	28	12	40	39	1	38	38	0
Mgr.-Serv.	33	35	-2	48	47	1	43	31	12	41	35	6	38	33	5	41	39	2	33	27	6	36	26	10	39	33	6	35	33	2
Mgr.-Lbr.	44	38	6	56	53	3	53	41	12	59	59	0	44	34	10	56	45	11	38	34	4	48	30	18	50	42	8	44	39	5
Sales-Cler.	26	24	2	25	31	-6	30	21	9	14	26	-12	23	26	-3	28	24	4	18	18	0	20	17	3	23	23	0	22	23	-1
Sales-Craft.	28	26	2	33	37	-4	33	26	7	27	41	-14	30	27	3	32	32	0	23	20	3	26	22	4	29	29	0	29	29	0
Sales-Oper.	34	35	-1	41	45	-4	42	35	7	38	45	-7	37	35	2	40	41	-1	31	26	5	36	29	7	37	36	1	35	35	0
Sales-Serv.	33	29	4	44	45	-1	42	27	15	40	33	7	33	31	2	40	36	4	31	23	8	34	26	8	37	31	6	32	30	2
Sales-Lbr.	41	32	9	52	51	1	53	39	14	61	58	3	40	33	7	55	43	12	38	30	8	47	30	17	48	40	8	42	37	5
Cler.-Craft.	15	14	1	19	14	5	23	16	7	18	20	-2	15	13	2	13	16	-3	15	18	3	13	11	2	16	15	1	16	15	1
Cler.-Oper.	21	18	3	23	19	4	25	22	3	32	28	4	21	18	3	20	24	-4	22	22	0	22	16	6	23	21	2	16	15	1
Cler.-Serv.	21	15	6	30	25	5	23	19	4	34	26	-2	20	20	0	22	24	-2	22	20	2	25	16	9	25	21	4	22	20	2
Cler.-Lbr.	26	19	7	36	31	5	38	31	7	57	50	7	26	21	5	38	34	4	32	26	6	35	19	16	36	29	7	21	19	2
Craft.-Oper.	16	15	1	16	16	0	20	14	6	25	21	4	15	12	3	16	15	1	15	13	2	16	10	6	17	16	1	15	14	1
Craft.-Serv.	21	17	4	32	27	5	29	19	10	34	31	3	22	20	2	25	24	1	20	17	3	23	15	8	26	21	5	21	20	1
Craft.-Lbr.	22	17	5	35	29	6	36	27	9	53	47	6	23	18	5	40	31	9	30	20	10	29	19	10	33	26	7	26	22	4
Oper.-Serv.	22	17	5	24	22	2	22	22	0	16	20	-4	21	21	0	18	21	-3	18	20	-2	21	10	11	20	19	1	20	19	1
Oper.-Lbr.	15	14	1	23	20	3	23	22	1	33	34	-1	16	17	-1	29	26	3	23	19	4	18	14	4	23	21	2	19	19	0
Serv.-Lbr.	24	16	8	19	19	0	28	26	2	31	36	-5	22	22	0	23	24	-1	21	23	-2	23	12	11	24	22	2	24	21	3
SSI ^a	27	25	2	33	32	1	33	27	6	33	36	-3	28	24	4	32	30	2	26	23	3	29	19	10	30	27	3	28	26	2
White workers only	27	25	2	30	31	-1	31	26	5	23	30	-7	28	24	4	29	29	0	25	23	2	28	19	9	-	-	-	-	-	-

a-Summary segregation index: mean of index values for 28 pairs of occupational groups.
 b-Mean of indexes calculated over tracts in which more than 50 percent of residents were white.

TABLE 5.—Number of Census Tracts and Mean Number of Employed Males per Census Tract in the Central City and the Suburbs of Each of Eight Urbanized Areas, 1950 and 1960

Urban- ized area	Number of census tracts				Mean emp. /Ct, 00's			
	1950		1960		1950		1960	
	CC	S	CC	S	CC	S	CC	S
Boston. . .	158	248	164	276	13	15	9	16
KC.	100	10	122	102	13	15	9	10
LA.	364	340	636	874	14	15	9	11
Miami . . .	46	40	58	124	16	15	13	10
Minneap.- St. Paul	198	16	204	120	12	24	9	12
Phila. . .	408	180	378	360	14	13	13	12
San Diego	92	32	138	86	8	8	9	6
Syracuse.	62	12	62	14	10	16	9	19

tional groups in any census tract, there must be at least eight census tracts (one for each occupational group). All of the central cities and suburban zones contained more than eight tracts, but two of the suburban zones in 1950 (Kansas City and Syracuse) and one in 1960 (Syracuse) contained so few tracts in excess of eight that the number of tracts may have tended to keep the SSI relatively low (Table 5). To the extent that there is any such effect on the SSI, the index may be regarded as unreliable, although it seems more realistic to consider a small number of census tracts a limitation on the kind of segregation measured by the index. In any event, it is important to know whether or not the small number of suburban tracts in some of the Urbanized Areas accounts for the generally lower suburban SSI values.

In excluding the Urbanized Areas in which the suburban tracts had a considerably larger mean number of employed males, we have already excluded Syracuse for both 1950 and 1960, and for 1960 the mean SSI is two points greater for the central cities than for the suburbs for the remaining Urbanized Areas. When we exclude Kansas City, in addition to those we have already excluded, from the 1950 data, the mean SSI is four points greater for the central cities than for the suburbs. Clearly, the

overall central city-suburban difference in the SSI is not totally an artifact of differences in the size and number of census tracts.

Although we cannot generalize with confidence from our data to all Urbanized Areas, it seems rather likely that greater residential segregation by occupational level in the central city is, or recently was, typical of Urbanized Areas in the United States. Miami's residential pattern is probably unusual and may be unique. Miami has a large and essentially nonindigenous wealthy population that is highly concentrated in a few of its several suburbs. Therefore, its suburban census tracts are highly varied in their socio-economic characteristics. The tentative conclusion that segregation is greater in the central cities than in the suburbs of most Urbanized Areas is further supported by the data from three other Urbanized Areas from our original sample of 15 for which the suburbs were completely or almost completely tracted in 1960. In each of these, the SSI for 1960 is greater for the central city than for the suburbs, by eleven points for Trenton, by nine points for Denver, and by one point for Rochester.

The sample of eleven formed by adding these three Urbanized Areas still is not a random sample and does not meet the strict requirements for use of tests of significance and generalization to the universe. However, there is little reason to believe that the sample is highly unrepresentative, and therefore we applied a Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test to the eleven pairs of central cities and suburbs in 1960. The results of a one-tailed test are significant at less than the .005 level. This reinforces our belief that probably segregation was generally greater in central cities than in suburbs throughout the country in 1960.

Although our sample is varied and contains large and smaller and old and newer cities, it does not contain enough of any type to serve as a basis for dis-

tinguishing among types of Urbanized Areas in terms of the central city-suburban difference in the residential segregation of occupational groups. The difference is not as great in the two old, eastern Urbanized Areas (Boston and Philadelphia) as in the two newer, western cities (Los Angeles and San Diego), but only the study of additional Urbanized Areas could determine whether or not this reflects a general difference between the older and the newer Urbanized Areas.

We point out above that the belief, expressed by Dobriner (1964) and others, that suburbs have become more heterogeneous through a loss of "middle-classness" is not supported by the data on central city and suburban occupational distributions in 1950 and 1960. However, in spite of those data, individual suburbs and suburban neighborhoods could have generally become more heterogeneous if segregation by social level had decreased. If this had occurred, Dobriner (1964: 27) could have been correct when he wrote in the early 1960's that "the 'middle class' suburb a decade ago is fast disappearing from the metropolitan scene. . . ." But again the data fail to support Dobriner's impression. In the eight suburban zones we studied, segregation apparently remained about the same or increased slightly; the mean suburban SSI is 26 for 1950 and 27 for 1960.

To explain completely why the suburban segregation index values are generally smaller than the central city values is beyond the scope of this paper. Indeed, most of the differences are so small that they hardly need explaining; we might merely conclude that there are no important differences between central cities and suburbs in residential segregation by social level. We might agree with Dobriner (1964: 27) that the suburban zone is not now sociologically distinctive, at least insofar as residential patterns are concerned, and

we might add that it probably never was.

However, redirecting attention from the SSI to the Index of Residential Dissimilarity values for pairs of occupational groups (Tables 3 and 4) leads to discovery of a greater amount of suburban distinctiveness than the SSI alone reveals. In the case of high-level groups paired with intermediate-level groups, there are no consistent and considerable differences between the central cities and the suburban zones. However, when the two lowest-ranking groups, laborers and service workers, are paired with any of the other groups, the index values are rather consistently, and sometimes very considerably, higher for the central cities. This is true even for Miami, for which most of the other index values and the SSI are higher for the suburbs.

One might suspect that the major reason for this, as well as for the higher SSI values for the central cities, is that the very high degree of Negro-white residential segregation in all Urbanized Areas contributed to segregation by social level (since Negroes are greatly overrepresented as laborers and service workers and whites are overrepresented in the higher levels), and this contribution was mainly in the central cities, where most Negroes lived. In order to determine whether or not Negro-white segregation largely accounts for the higher central city segregation index values, we recomputed all of the index values for 1960 using only those census tracts in which more than 50 percent of the residents were white. There were very few nonwhites in most of these tracts and very few whites in most of the excluded tracts, so the data for the predominantly white tracts are essentially data on the segregation by occupational group of white workers. These data are summarized in the last row and in the last columns of Table 4.

Virtually eliminating the effects of Negro-white residential segregation does

reduce the central city-suburban difference, but the difference in the mean SSI declines only from three points to two. The difference in index values with pairs of occupational groups including service workers is reduced considerably, in many cases by about two-thirds. However, the difference with pairs including laborers are generally not reduced more than about a fourth to a third; these remain the greatest differences, generally speaking, and many of them are rather substantial. Therefore, the contribution of Negro-white segregation cannot largely account for the overall greater segregation by occupational group in the central cities nor for the greater segregation there of laborers from higher-status workers.

What then does largely account for the generally greater segregation in the central cities? We can offer only a tentative explanation. Because of the greater population density and compactness and the better public transportation facilities of the typical central city, higher-status and lower-status workers can be highly segregated there without anyone living beyond easy commuting range of his place of work. In contrast, it is likely that a very high degree of segregation in the suburban zone would make the journey to work too expensive for many lower-income workers. Many retail and service establishments, schools, and other facilities are in or convenient to high-status neighborhoods, and a good many laborers, as well as service workers, are employed by these facilities. These workers, in turn, need to live as near as possible, because they, unlike upper-middle-class workers, cannot afford to commute long distances by automobile, and economical public transportation from one segment of the suburban zone to another is often not available. For instance, the janitor at a high-status suburban school may not be likely to live several census tracts away; rather, he may typically live in a lower-income

enclave in the same or an adjacent tract.

Of more importance than the reasons for the relatively low level of segregation by social level in suburbia are its probable consequences. The alleged detrimental consequences of living in homogeneous "one-class" neighborhoods (such as the inhibition of development of empathy for and understanding of people in other social strata) that the critics of suburbia have so loudly decried are probably not so great as the critics have believed. To the extent that they are real, they are not likely to be uniquely suburban nor much, if any, more characteristic of suburbs than of central cities. To be sure, people at the different social levels are typically separated by fewer miles and feet in the central cities, which may make some difference in the degree of contact and interaction among them. However, it seems unlikely that this greater physical proximity leads, in itself, to much primary and intimate interaction among the social levels or that it leads to greater sharing of neighborhood institutions and facilities than occurs in the suburbs.

We must stress, however, that we are concerned only with the alleged socio-economic homogeneity of suburban neighborhoods, and we have dealt only with occupational homogeneity. Many students of suburbia have been more concerned with homogeneity in terms of race, ethnicity, stage of the family life cycle, degree of family centeredness, and the like. Many suburban neighborhoods are highly homogeneous in terms of race and probably in terms of some of the other variables. The alleged consequences of these kinds of homogeneity may well be prevalent in suburbia.

One may wonder why the impression that suburban neighborhoods are unusually homogeneous in their socio-economic characteristics has become so prevalent in the absence of empirical support. This apparently incorrect impression may have grown out of the fact

that the suburban population is usually less dense, and therefore each cluster of relatively homogeneous residents covers more territory and may be more conspicuous. One large high-rise apartment building with rents within a narrow range may house as many people as a medium-sized tract development, but if it is near housing that is conspicuously more or less expensive, or just architecturally different, it may not give the same impression of a homogenized mass of people as a sprawling sea of tract houses. Central city slums often have considerable architectural variety and cover little territory, but the typical slum may contain a larger number of socio-economically similar people than the typical tract development.

REFERENCES

- Berger, B. M. 1960. *Working Class Suburb*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Berger, B. M. 1961. The myth of suburbia. *Journal of Social Issues* 27:38-49.
- Bernard, J. 1962. *American Community Behavior*. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Beshers, J. M. 1962. *Urban Social Structure*. New York: Free Press.
- Boskoff, A. 1970. *The Sociology of Urban Regions*. 2nd ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Broom, L. and P. Selznick. 1968. *Sociology*. 4th ed. New York: Harper and Row.
- Coleman, J. S. 1966. Community disorganization. In R. K. Merton and R. A. Nisbet (eds.), *Contemporary Social Problems*. 2nd ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.
- Dobriner, W. M. 1963. *Class in Suburbia*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Duncan, O. D. and B. Duncan. 1955. Residential distribution and occupational stratification. *American Journal of Sociology* 60:493-503.
- Farley, R. 1964. Suburban persistence. *American Sociological Review* 29:38-47.
- Fava, S. F. 1956. Suburbanism as a way of life. *American Sociological Review* 21:34-37.
- Goldstein, S. and K. Mayer. 1964. Population decline and the social and economic structure of the American city. *American Sociological Review* 29:48-54.
- Lazerwitz, B. 1960. Metropolitan residential belts, 1950 and 1956. *American Sociological Review* 25:245-252.
- Lee, D. 1963. Suburbia reconsidered: diversity and the creative life. In E. Green (ed.), *Man and the Modern City*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Martin, W. 1956. The structuring of social relationships engendered by suburban residence. *American Sociological Review* 21:446-453.
- Packard, V. 1959. *The Status Seekers*. New York: McKay.
- Riesman, D. 1957. The suburban dislocation. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 314:123-143.
- Schnore, L. 1963. The socio-economic status of cities and suburbs. *American Sociological Review* 28:76-85.
- Whyte, W. H. 1956. *The Organization Man*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Wood, R. C. 1959. *Suburbia: Its People and Their Politics*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Wrong, D. H. 1967. Suburbs and myths of suburbia. In D. H. Wrong and H. L. Gracey (eds.), *Readings in Introductory Sociology*. New York: Macmillan.