THE NEGRO AS AN IMMIGRANT GROUP:

RECENT TRENDS IN RACE AND ETHNIC SEGREGATION IN CHICAGO*

Karl E. Taeuber and Alma F. Taeuber

Population Research and Training Center, University of Chicago

The processes by which various immigrant groups have been absorbed into American society are complex, and have been studied from a variety of viewpoints. A distinctively sociological approach to the topic views assimilation as a process of dispersion of the members of the group throughout the social structure, and not solely as a psychological and cultural process. In the conventional account, the immigrants have initially settled in ethnic colonies in deteriorated central sections of large cities, and have found low-paid unskilled jobs. Assimilation consists in part of a process of social and economic advancement on the part of the immigrant group and their descendants, along with a decreasing residential concentration in ethnic colonies.

The large-scale migration of Negroes to Northern cities began during the first World War. In a very real sense Negroes served as a native-born substitute to fill in the labor gap created by the cessation of large-scale immigration from abroad, at first due to the war, and then as a result of newly imposed restrictions on immigration. Like the immigrants from abroad, the Negro migrants from the South moved to urban industrial centers where they filled the lowest occupational niches and rapidly developed a highly segregated pattern of residence.

Viewing the obvious analogies between the Northern urban Negro population and the European immigrant populations which preceded it, some sociologists have concluded that the Negroes will undergo a similar process of "assimilation," and that it is only a matter of time until social and economic progress is translated into their residential dispersion.[1] Other sociologists believe that the Negroes in Northern cities are not following the immigrant pattern of socio-economic advancement and residential dispersion, but rather that the second-generation urban Negroes are occupying the same relative position in the society as did their parents.[2]

The question of whether or not a Northern urban Negro population can fruitfully be viewed as an immigrant population, comparable to the immigrant populations of earlier decades with respect to the nature and speed of assimilation, is the underlying theme in our consideration of recent trends in race and ethnic segregation in Chicago.

One type of data indicative of the intergenerational assimilation of the immigrant groups is presented in the first six columns of Table 1. For each of the larger ethnic groups, data for 1950 are presented showing the average standing on three measures of socio-economic status, standardized for age, of the first generation (the foreign born white, FBW) and the second generation (native white of foreign or mixed parentage, NFMP). The nationality groups are split into "old," "new" and "newer" groups in an extension of the traditional system. On the average, comparing within the first or within the second generation, the "old" immigrant groups are the best off on these measures, the "new" groups are intermediate, and the "newer" groups are the worst off. It cannot be determined from these data to what extent the old immigrants are better off by virtue of their longer average period of residence in the U.S., and to what extent they may have been better off at their time of immigration than the newer immigrants were at the time of their move.

Comparisons between the first generation (FBW) and second generation (NFMP) are a more direct means for determining the extent of assimilation. Although it is not always specified carefully in the literature, most discussions of assimilation view it as an inter-generational process, rather than simply a process of upward adjustment through time in the status of the original immigrants. Emphasis is usually placed on the higher status and lesser residential segregation of the children relative to their parents. Comparisons of corresponding status measures for the first and second generations in Table 1 reveal the expected pattern of intergenerational advance. Although data of the type shown in Table 1 cannot be interpreted unambiguously, and do not suffice for specific measures of the degree or pace of inter-generational change, they are probably adequate indicators of the general direction of change.

Measures of the changing residential patterns of the immigrant groups are given in columns 7 - 9 of Table 1. The measure is an index of residential segregation between the total foreign stock (FBW + NFMP) of each nationality and the total native whites of native parentage (NWNP). The indexes were computed from the distribution of each group among the 75 Community Areas of the city of Chicago, for 1930 (the last previous census year which included information on the total foreign stock) and 1960.[3] The degree of residential segregation from the native population is highest for the "newer" immigrants, and lowest for the "old" immigrants. Between 1930 and 1960, most of the ethnic groups became less segregated from the native population. Only for England, Ireland, and Sweden did the indexes fail to

decline, and these were already at relatively low levels.[4]

The residential segregation between Negroes and NWNP was much greater than that between any of the ethnic groups and the NWNP. Furthermore, the small decline from 84 in 1930 to 82 in 1960 was less than for most of the ethnic groups. In every case, the residential segregation of the ethnic group from the Negro population is much greater than its segregation from the white population (NWNP). The lowest indexes for immigrant groups in comparison with Negroes occur for the two "newer" groups, Mexicans and Puerto Ricans. The high magnitude even of these two indexes indicates that these recent inmigrants to the city are not joining or replacing Negroes in the existing Negro areas, but are moving into separate ethnic colonies of their own. Lieberson has demonstrated that although prior to the great Negro migrations of World War I there were instances of ethnic groups being more segregated from native whites than were Negroes, since 1920 the general pattern has been for Negro residential segregation to be the highest.[5]

Data similar to those presented for the various ethnic groups are presented for whites and nonwhites in Table 2. For each of 4 measures reflecting socio-economic status, there was improvement in the status of the nonwhite (predominantly Negro) population between 1940 and 1960. For two of these measures, there was a definite narrowing of the differentials between whites and nonwhites. The indexes of residential segregation between whites and Negroes, in the top panel of the table, show minor fluctuations around an extremely high level, and give no indication of the decline anticipated on the basis of the socio-economic advancement of the Negro population. That this is not an atypical finding can be indicated by reference to other data showing a long term historical trend toward increasing residential segregation between whites and nonwhites. Increasing racial residential segregation was evident in most large cities of the United States between 1940 and 1950, while during the 1950's, Southern cities continued to increase in segregation and Northern cities generally registered modest declines.[6] In broad perspective, then, it appears that the historical trend toward improving socio-economic status of immigrant groups has gone hand in hand with decreasing residential segregation. In contrast, Negro residential segregation from whites has increased steadily over past decades until it has reached universally high levels in cities throughout the United States, despite significant advances in the socio-economic status of Negroes.

The pattern of decreasing residential concentration of immigrant groups and increasing residential concentration of Negroes is not what would have been expected from the fact that many nationality groups worked hard at maintaining the ethnic colonies, whereas most of the major Negro organizations strive for residential dispersal. Furthermore, there were declines in the residential concentration of the immigrant groups almost from the initial formation of the ethnic colonies, and this dispersion was going on during the periods of rapid increase in immigrant populations.[7] These observations tend to discredit the argument that a major barrier to residential dispersion of the Negro population in Chicago is its continuing rapid increase. However, the size of the Negro population and the magnitude of its annual increase are larger than for any single ethnic group in the past, and comparisons with smaller groups are not completely convincing. That rapid increase of Negro population does not necessarily lead to increasing residential segregation was demonstrated directly in the inter-city comparative study previously cited. There was no definite relationship between increase in Negro population and change in the value of the segregation index. Indeed, during the 1950-60 decade, there appeared to be some relationship in the opposite direction.[8]

More significant in accounting for the divergent trends in residential segregation may be the different urban contexts in which the immigrant and Negro populations found themselves. Comparing the residential locations of Italian-born and Polish-born in Chicago in 1899 and in 1920, Wallace observed:

> "...it can be seen that the areas of greatest dispersion, low proportion, and presumably of 'second' settlement for many immigrants were those which were not settled at all in 1899.
>
> "The implication of this fact is that the so-called 'assimilation' process was not reflected by the geographic dispersion of the immigrant populations into 'cosmopolitan American areas.' The dispersal was more directly related to an increase in housing alternatives as the city grew at the periphery."[9]

By the time the Negro concentrations were forming near the central areas of Chicago, the city was built up, and the urbanized area extended well beyond the present boundaries. Residential alternatives at a price Negroes could afford and in a sufficiently close-in location to permit inexpensive commuting were no longer available.

It has been suggested that considerable time is required for Negroes to make the transition from a "primitive folk culture" to "urbanism as a way of life."[10] Several types of data indicate that large and increasing proportions of the Negro urban population are city-born and raised. For instance, there is a rapidly decreasing color differential in the percentage of the Chicago population born in the state of Illinois. In 1960, 44 per cent of the native-born nonwhite residents of Chicago were born in Illinois, as contrasted to 66 per cent of the white population.[11] National estimates for 1958 showed that of all males aged 45-64 living in metropolitan places of 500,000 or more population, 65 per cent of the nonwhites as compared to 77 per cent of the whites had lived in this size of city for 20 years or longer.[12] Estimates of the components of growth of the nonwhite population

of Chicago indicate that between 1950 and 1960 natural increase was as important as net in-migration, and that natural increase will in the future account for rapidly increasing proportions of the growth of nonwhite population.[13]

Unfortunately there is inadequate knowledge of the specific length of time under specified conditions for the required cultural transformation to occur. Wallace's quoted observations indicate a significant degree of dispersal over time among the first generation immigrants. More usually, such processes are conceived as primarily inter-generational. That many of the "first generation" Negro migrants to Northern cities have lived there for 20 years and more and that in the younger adult ages there are sizable numbers of "second generation" urban Negroes suggests to us that there has been ample time for adjustment to urban living, at least for large proportions of the Negro population. It is also clear that if Northern Negroes remain inadequately educated for urban living and fail to participate fully in the urban economy, the "primitive folk culture" of the South can less and less be assigned responsibility, and Northern cities will be suffering from the neglect of their own human resources.

The "visibility" of Negroes due to skin color and other features which make the large majority of 2nd, 3rd, and later generation descendants readily identifiable as Negroes is often cited as a basic factor in explaining the distinctive position of Negroes in our society. It is exceedingly difficult to assess the significance of visibility. For instance, there is no other group which is strictly comparable to Negroes regarding every factor except visibility. It is not completely irrelevant, however, to note that nonwhite skin color, by itself, is not an insurmountable handicap in our society. The socio-economic status of the Japanese population of Chicago in 1950 substantially exceeded that of the Negro population, and their residential segregation from whites, although high, was considerably lower than that between Negroes and whites.[14] Unfortunately there are no trend data available on the characteristics of the Japanese in Chicago. A more appropriate Japanese population for comparison, however, is the much larger one in the San Francisco area. A recent study there affirmed that "ethnic colonies of Japanese are gone or rapidly going," and documented their rapid socio-economic advance.[15]

In the traditional immigrant pattern, the more recent immigrants displaced the older groups at the bottom socio-economic levels. How do the Negroes compare with the other "newer" immigrant groups, the Mexicans and the Puerto Ricans? The limited data now available suggest that the Negroes may soon be left alone at the bottom of the social and economic scale. We have already noted (from data in Table 1) that the "newer" groups were in 1950 of very low status compared to the other immigrant groups, and that their residential segregation from the native whites of native parentage was the highest of all the immigrant groups. For 1960, the distribution within Chicago of persons born in Puerto Rico is available separately from those born in the U.S. of Puerto Rican parentage. Thus it is possible to compute indexes of residential segregation for first and second generation Puerto Ricans. For Chicago in 1960, these index values were 68.4 for the first generation and 64.9 for the second generation, indicating that residential dispersion has already begun for the Puerto Ricans. This difference actually understates the amount of dispersion, since the second generation consists in large proportion of children still living with their first generation parents.

Selected socio-economic measures for the Puerto Rican and the nonwhite populations of the city of Chicago in 1960 are shown in Table 3. On every measure, the Puerto Rican population is less well off -- it is less educated, of lower income, more crowded, less likely to be home-owners, less well-housed, and lives in older buildings. Yet the index of residential segregation (computed with respect to NWNP) for Puerto Ricans is 67 as compared to 82 for Negroes.

Thus far we have been making comparisons between Negroes and immigrant groups. With respect to the relationship between socio-economic status and residential segregation, it is appropriate to pursue a more direct approach. Since Negroes are disproportionately represented in low status groups, it might be argued that on this basis alone we would expect some segregation between whites and Negroes.[16] To the extent that this is the case, future economic advances on the part of the Negro population should be translated into lowered residential segregation. Before presenting our approach to this problem, let us emphasize that the task of partialling out a component of racial segregation due to economic factors involves some difficult methodological problems, and no method is entirely satisfactory.[17] In an effort to make a rough assessment of the relative impact of patterns of economic segregation on patterns of racial residential segregation, we will consider a simplified model.

Basically, the approach involves an indirect standardization of the family income distributions for the 75 Community Areas of Chicago. The "rates" for the standardization were the percentage nonwhite in each income interval for the city of Chicago. For example, nonwhites constituted 44 per cent of all families in 1960 with an income below $1,000, 44 per cent of families with incomes of $1,000-1,999, 40 per cent for the interval $2,000-2,999, etc. This set of "rates" was then applied to the income distribution for each Community Area to obtain an "expected" number of nonwhite resident families on the basis of income. The total population of a Community Area minus the expected number of nonwhites is equal to the expected number of whites. Given this pair of expected numbers for each Community Area, we can compute an index of residential segregation between

expected nonwhites and expected whites. If income alone determined the residential locations of whites and nonwhites, this index is the expected amount of racial residential segregation. In 1950, the white-nonwhite residential segregation index expected on the basis of income was 11, compared to the actual segregation index of 79. Thus in 1950 income differentials can account for 11/79, or 14 per cent, of the observed racial segregation. In 1960, the expected segregation index was 10 and the actual 83, so that income differentials can account for only 12 per cent of the observed racial segregation. The slight decline from 14 to 12 per cent perhaps suggests that economic segregation is becoming a lesser component of total racial segregation.

Another investigator, studying ethnic groups as well as nonwhites, carried out a similar procedure, but used the rent and value distribution of occupied dwellings rather than the family income distribution to partial out economic factors in residential segregation. He also found that a negligible part of total residential segregation is accounted for by economic differentials. Furthermore, economic segregation was less a factor in the segregation of Negroes from whites than it was in the segregation of immigrant groups from native whites.[18]

The data just cited are one indication that it is not Negroes' inability to pay for housing that accounts for their residential segregation. In fact, in Chicago in 1960 Negroes paid as much as whites for housing, regardless of their lower incomes. Median rents for both groups were $88, but Negroes obtained much poorer housing for their money.[19] To a very real extent, there exists a separate housing market for Negroes in Chicago, so that their economic status cannot be used except in exceptional circumstances to obtain unsegregated housing. Regardless of their assimilation to urban living and their advancing economic position, therefore, Negroes have been unable to achieve the residential dispersion undergone by the second and third generation immigrant groups.

The judicious conclusion from our review of a variety of pieces of data is that we simply do not know enough about immigrant assimilation patterns and patterns of changing socio-economic status in the Negro population to be able to compare the two. With respect to immigrants, we are unable to find in the literature any satisfactory statistical specification of the processes involved. The available census data are of little use in this regard. For the Negro population, we have no data at all permitting inter-generational comparisons between migrants from the South and Negroes raised in Northern cities.[20] Thus any trends toward socio-economic advancement and residential dispersion on the part of "second generation" Negroes may be confounded in the data for the total Negro population.

If we can be allowed a brief moment of freedom from judicious interpretation of our data, we find ourselves in general agreement with the view that it is misleading to regard Negroes as another immigrant group. Even adopting a very simple formulation of assimilation as involving socio-economic advancement and residential dispersion, we do not think the data for Negroes can be interpreted as fitting the pattern. The second generation persons from several countries, in fact, are of higher socio-economic status than the total native whites of native parentage. Relatively few Negroes in Chicago have white collar jobs or have incomes above the median level for whites, and yet there are large numbers of adult Negroes who were born in the city. Basic differences between the Negroes and the immigrant groups seem to us implicit in the failure of residential desegregation to occur for Negroes, while it has continued to take place for the immigrant groups.

In view of the fundamental impact of residential segregation on extra-legal segregation of schools, hospitals, parks, stores, and numerous other facilities, the failure of residential dispersion to occur strikes us as an especially serious social problem. Although socio-economic advance and residential dispersion occurred simultaneously for the various immigrant groups, a causal relationship cannot be assigned. Nevertheless, it is apparent that the continued residential segregation of the Negro population will act as an impediment to the continued "assimilation" of Negroes into full and equal participation in the economy and the society at large.[21]

FOOTNOTES

*Paper No. 15 in the series, "Comparative Urban Research," issuing from the Population Research and Training Center, University of Chicago, under a grant from the Ford Foundation.

[1]Philip M. Hauser, "On the Impact of Urbanism on Social Organization, Human Nature and the Political Order," Confluence, VII (Spring, 1958), 65. Elsewhere Professor Hauser has expressed a more cautious view, emphasizing the lack of definitive knowledge; see his Population Perspectives (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1960), p. 129.

[2]Again we can cite a colleague, D.J. Bogue, "Chicago's Growing Population Problem," Commerce, 59 (July, 1962), 31.

[3]The index of residential segregation is an index of dissimilarity between the residential distributions of each group. It ranges from zero for an absence of segregation to 100 for complete residential segregation. For further discussion, see Otis Dudley Duncan and Beverly Duncan, "A Methodological Analysis of Segregation Indexes," American Sociological Review, 20 (April, 1955), 210-217.

[4]For a more detailed discussion of these patterns, using data for 1930 and 1950, see Otis Dudley Duncan and Stanley Lieberson, "Ethnic Segregation and Assimilation," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (January, 1959),

364-374.

[5]Stanley Lieberson, "Comparative Segregation and Assimilation of Ethnic Groups," unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago, 1960, p. 179.

[6]Karl E. Taeuber, "Negro Residential Segregation, 1940-1960: Changing Trends in the Large Cities of the United States," paper read at the Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, 1962.

[7]David A. Wallace, "Residential Concentration of Negroes in Chicago," unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1953.

[8]Taeuber, op.cit.

[9]Wallace, op.cit., p. 205.

[10]Philip M. Hauser, "The Challenge of Metropolitan Growth," Urban Land, XVII (Dec., 1958), 5.

[11]Data from the 1960 Census, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Illinois, Tables 72 and 77. Foreign born were included in the denominator for whites, but ignored for nonwhites on the assumption that they were primarily Orientals rather than Negroes.

[12]Karl E. Taeuber, "Duration-of-Residence Analysis of Internal Migration in the United States," Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, XXXIX (Jan., 1961), Table 3.

[13]D. J. Bogue and D. P. Dandekar, Population Trends and Prospects for the Chicago-Northwestern Indiana Consolidated Metropolitan Area: 1960 to 1990 (Chicago: Population Research and Training Center, University of Chicago, 1962).

[14]Although the maximum value of the residential segregation index is less than 100 for ethnic groups of small size, this is not sufficient to vitiate the Negro - Japanese comparison.

[15]Harry H. L. Kitano, "Housing of Japanese-Americans in the San Francisco Bay Area," p.184, in Nathan Glazer and Davis McEntire, eds., Studies in Housing and Minority Groups (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1960.)

[16]For a discussion of class residential segregation in Chicago, see Otis Dudley Duncan and Beverly Duncan, "Residential Distribution and Occupational Stratification," American Journal of Sociology, LX (March, 1955), 493-503.

[17]A general discussion of this problem can be found in the section on explanation of areal variation in Otis Dudley Duncan, Ray P. Cuzzort, and Beverly Duncan, Statistical Geography (Glencoe: Free Press, 1961).

[18]Lieberson, op.cit., p. 127.

[19]For a comprehensive analysis of white-nonwhite differentials in housing in Chicago as of 1956, see Beverly Duncan and Philip M.Hauser, Housing a Metropolis - Chicago (Glencoe: Free Press, 1960), Ch. 6.

[20]The only approach possible with census data is a comparison between recent migrants and the rest of the population, and then only the residential distributions are available, with no socio-economic characteristics. Using 1960 Community Area data for Chicago, we found the residential segregation index between nonwhites resident in the metropolitan area 5 years or more and NWNP to be 80.5; comparing nonwhites with less than 5 years in the metropolitan area and NWNP, the index was 81.0. Comparing the nonwhites who were in the metropolitan area 5 years before with those who were outside 5 years before, the index is 13. Thus the recent nonwhite in-migrants to Chicago are distributed somewhat differently from the rest of the nonwhite population, but are equally segregated from the native whites. It is not possible to interpret these results in terms of the general assimilation and dispersion processes under consideration.

[21]Amos H. Hawley, "Dispersion versus Segregation: Apropos of a Solution of Race Problems," Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters, XXX (1944), 667-674.

TABLE 1.--Selected Characteristics (age-standardized) of Foreign-born and Native-born Ethnic Populations in 1950 and Residential Segregation Indexes of Selected Groups of Foreign Stock from Native Whites of Native Parentage and Negroes in 1930 and 1960; Chicago[a]

	% high school graduates (male)		% income <$3,000		% white collar (male)		Residential segregation vs. NWNP			Residential segregation vs. Negro		
	FBW	NFMP	FBW	NFMP	FBW	NFMP	1930	1960	Change	1930	1960	Change
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
"Old" immigrant groups												
England and Wales	44	50	52	45	50	51	11	18	+7	84	83	-1
Ireland	24	47	57	48	22	47	23	31	+8	85	84	-1
Norway	31	47	50	46	24	50	44	37	-7	90	90	0
Sweden	25	48	46	44	23	50	26	30	+4	90	86	-4
Germany	37	34	51	49	35	42	22	19	-3	88	88	0
"New" immigrant groups												
Austria	29	40	51	46	34	44	30	16	-14	89	88	-1
Czechoslovakia	25	32	59	49	23	36	59	37	-22	93	89	-4
Italy	15	27	56	51	24	36	52	32	-20	79	81	+2
Poland	18	25	62	54	26	30	63	38	-25	94	93	-1
U.S.S.R.	35	60	47	37	60	74	51	44	-7	90	90	0
"Newer" immigrant groups												
Mexico	14	16	65	73	8	13	71	54	-17	77	73	-4
Puerto Rico[b]	13	29	86	72	22	36	NA	67	NA	NA	69	NA

[a]Foreign stock is the foreign-born (FBW) plus the native-born of foreign or mixed parentage (NFMP). NWNP is native white of native parentage. Characteristics refer to the Standard Metropolitan Area population, while segregation indexes refer to the city population. NA means not available.

[b]Socio-economic characteristics for Puerto Rican population refer to U.S. total. Puerto Rican population by Community Areas for Chicago available for 1960 only.

Sources: Characteristics from U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1950 Vol. IV, Special Reports, Part 3, Chapter A, Nativity and Parentage, and Chapter D, Puerto Ricans in Continental United States. Distributions of population by Community Area for 1960 from the 1960 census tract bulletin for Chicago, and for 1930 from Ernest W. Burgess and Charles Newcomb, eds., Census Data of the City of Chicago, 1930 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933).

TABLE 2.--Selected Socio-economic Characteristics (unstandardized) of White and Non-whites: City of Chicago, 1940, 1950, and 1960

Characteristic	Non-white	White
Residential segregation index, whites vs. Negroes		
1930		85
1940		85
1950		79
1960		83
% high school grad., ages 25+		
1940	16	25
1950	25	37
1960	29	37
% white collar, male		
1940	17	40
1950	17	41
1960	21	40
% home-owners		
1940	7	26
1950	12	33
1960	16	39
% of multiple-person households with 1.01 or more persons per room		
1940	41	17
1950	46	14
1960	34	10

Source: Data for 1940 from the 1940 census tract bulletin for Chicago; for 1950 from Philip M. Hauser and Evelyn M. Kitagawa, eds., Local Community Fact Book for Chicago, 1950 (Chicago: Chicago Community Inventory, 1953); and for 1960 from the 1960 census tract bulletin for Chicago.

TABLE 3.--Selected Socio-economic Characteristics (unstandardized) of Puerto Ricans and Non-whites: City of Chicago, 1960

Characteristic	Non-white	Puerto Rican
Residential segregation vs. whites	83	67
% high school grads., total	29	11
Median family income	$4,742	$4,161
% of families earning <$3,000	28	27
% of families earning >$10,000	9	4
% of home-owners	16	6
% substandard dwellings	26	33
% 1.01 or more persons per room	34	52
% h.u.'s built since 1940	12	6
Median gross rent	$88	$79
Median number of rooms	3.9	3.7
Median number of persons	3.0	4.0

Source: Data are from the 1960 census tract bulletin for Chicago.