UNDERSTANDING INEQUALITY IN THE LATE TWENTIETH-CENTURY METROPOLIS: NEW PERSPECTIVES ON THE ENDURING RACIAL DIVIDE

Alice O'Connor

THE UNITED States enters the new millennium amidst widespread celebration of its vast prosperity. That prosperity is marred, however, by the same great problems with which the twentieth century began: growing inequality in the distribution of wealth, income, and opportunity; a rapidly restructuring "new economy" that is destabilizing older patterns of work and community; ethnic tensions sparked by the steady arrival of "new," racially "other" immigrants; and the endurance of what W. E. B. DuBois prophetically described one hundred years ago when he wrote that "the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line; the relation of the darker to the lighter races of men in Asia and Africa, in America and the islands of the sea" (DuBois 1901, 354).

Nowhere are these intertwined problems more vividly captured than in the complex economic, gender-based, and racial and ethnic divisions of contemporary urban America. In major cities nationwide, overall economic growth is accompanied by higher than average rates of unemployment and poverty, concentrated especially in low-income, working-class minority neighborhoods that have only recently begun to show signs of recovery following decades of steady decline (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development 1999). Still, the low-skilled urban workforce, greatly expanded by the "end of welfare," has little access to local jobs that provide living wages, employment security, and adequate benefits. For the past several years job creation has been faster in the suburbs, where minority workers encounter greater racial discrimination in hiring (Holzer 1996). Meanwhile, despite gradually rising

rates of nonwhite suburbanization, racial residential segregation remains the norm—laying the basis for racial and class segregation in education, transportation systems, access to public services, and political representation. Yet, the commitment to deliberate policies of integration, on the metropolitan as well as the national level, is in open retreat.

Explaining these economic, spatial, and racial divisions is the central purpose of the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality, a unique inquiry launched in the early 1990s by an interdisciplinary team of social scientists with sponsorship from the Russell Sage and Ford foundations. Based on surveys of households and employers in the metropolitan areas of Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, and Los Angeles, the study affords a comprehensive and systematic look at the roots of inequality in labor markets, residential segregation, and racial attitudes.

Three long-range and far-reaching transformations in the post-World War II and especially the post-1970s urban landscape set the larger context for the Multi-City Study. One is the transformation of the urban economy, which for the past fifty years and with greater speed in the past two decades has become more decentralized, global, and heavily reliant on finance, services, and technology than on its once-larger and more powerful manufacturing base. Until recently, urban economies also manifested two deeply troubling and interrelated long-term trends in the broader U.S. economy. The first, the two-decade-long stagnation and decline in real wages for American workers, has only recently been reversed, thanks largely to the high-employment economy. The second, a trend toward growing inequality in the distribution of income, has not been significantly altered, while wealth inequality has continued to gain momentum during the current economic boom. Although cities have historically been associated with the extremes of concentrated wealth and concentrated poverty, the postindustrial urban economy has left a large segment of working- and middle-class families struggling to keep up as well (Danziger and Gottschalk 1995; Levy 1998; Mishel, Bernstein, and Schmitt 1999). Moreover, the consequences of economic restructuring and polarization have played out differently across racial lines. Nonwhites, historically disadvantaged in access to educational opportunity, have suffered disproportionately from the decline of high-wage, unionized manufacturing jobs for non-college educated workers. And although nonwhite college graduates have indeed benefited from the "premium" to education, far fewer minority households have been in a position to share in the gains that wealth generates in the "new economy" (Wilson 1987, 1996; Oliver and Shapiro 1995).

Accompanying economic restructuring and rising inequality has been a second, equally consequential transformation in the urban landscape, brought about by the metropolitanization of residential and industrial space. Spurred on by post–World War II public policies and gov-

2

ernment-subsidized infrastructure building, the long-term trend toward residential suburbanization and industrial deconcentration has profoundly altered the geographic map of opportunity, shifting jobs toward what for many remains an elusive periphery and away from the central cities and "inner-ring" suburbs that are often home to minority workers. While spatial restructuring varies physically across metropolitan areas, its racial significance does not: shaped by a long history of segregationist policies, institutional practices, and social attitudes, the metropolitanization of population and employment has meant diminished work opportunities and neighborhood decline for poor and working-class minorities, who remain barred by race as well as income from following the trajectory of metropolitan sprawl (Jackson 1985; Kasarda 1989; Massey and Denton 1993; Sugrue 1996).

The third transformation, and the most recent in origin, is the vast demographic change brought about by the post-1965 growth and changing nature of immigration to the United States. In contrast to the principally European origin of nineteenth and early twentieth-century migration, today's "new immigrants" have come from Asia, Latin America, and Africa, adding visibly to the racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity of their predominantly urban destinations (Portes and Rumbaut 1990). Especially in high-immigrant cities such as Los Angeles, New York, and Miami, this changing demographic profile has affected intraminority relations in complicated ways. On the one hand, groups once reviled as "newcomers" to the cities—African Americans, native-born Latinos, and other, more established ethnic communities—now picture themselves as threatened old-timers, vying with a new wave of immigrants for residential space, labor market position, and cultural recognition. Further heightened by years of urban deindustralization, physical deterioration, and political neglect, the resulting tensions set the stage for daily conflict as well as "multiethnic rebellion" during the 1980s and 90s in America's major immigrant destination points (Oliver, Johnson, and Farrell 1993; Waldinger and Bozorgmehr 1996; Mohl 1997 [1995]). On the other hand, in recent years these same transformations and interethnic conflicts have also fostered growing awareness of the need for cross-ethnic coalition building within and between urban neighborhoods, particularly around issues of economic, environmental, and racial justice, education and social services, and governing institutions that are more adequately representative of the multiethnic urban core.

Connected though they may be to economic and social forces that are taking place on a global level, these changes in urban America have been shaped by policy choices made within a political environment that over the past quarter-century has grown increasingly hostile to government activism in the areas of poverty and race, and that has looked more and more to individualized, free market forces as explanations for

and solutions to social problems. This shift in public philosophy, reflected most dramatically in manifestos such as the Republicans' 1994 Contract with America and the "end of welfare" in 1996, is part of a broader ideological and political transformation that has challenged the very underpinnings of the New Deal and post–World War II welfare state—and has had important consequences for urban minority and working-class communities. One is a retreat from public investment in physical and social infrastructure in central cities, even in the face of the industrial decentralization and metropolitan sprawl that have been encouraged by government policies (Caraley 1992; O'Connor 1999). A second is the erosion of the political coalitions that have given voice to urban interests in national and regional politics (Dreier 1995, 2000; Wolman and Marckini 1998). Third has been a withdrawal from race-targeted policies such as affirmative action and aggressive civil rights enforcement (Days 1984; Williams 1998).

How, the Multi-City research team set out to ask in the early 1990s, are contemporary patterns of inequality related to the transformations that have made late twentieth-century cities at once more multiracial, more metropolitan in orientation, and less traditionally industrial than they have been since the century's start? How and why does the postindustrial metropolitan economy distribute opportunity unequally across the overlapping lines of class, gender, and race? Do patterns of inequality differ significantly across metropolitan areas, and if so, why? To answer these and a host of related questions, the Multi-City Study team collaborated on a series of linked household and employer surveys in the Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, and Los Angeles metropolitan areas. These surveys were designed to dig beneath the broad patterns discernible in census statistics, to provide comprehensive and in-depth information on local labor markets, residential segregation, and racial attitudes. The breadth of the issues surveyed, the multi-city scope of the project, and the pairing of household and employer interviews combine to give a uniquely comprehensive and detailed look at urban America at the turn of the millennium.

This volume of essays represents one of several products of the Multi-City Study research, which include separate volumes on each of the four metropolitan areas under study, plus two volumes based on employer telephone and face-to-face (listed at the end of this volume) interviews. In this book, researchers present results from *cross-city* analyses, selected to highlight both the special strengths of the surveys and the complex and interrelated factors contributing to urban inequality. While the city-specific volumes draw out the unique historical, structural, and political conditions that differentiate these metropolitan areas from one another, the focus in this volume is on identifying more broadly prevailing patterns.

These analyses tell us that ongoing economic, spatial, and demo-

graphic restructuring has heightened the advantages of education, technological skill, and suburban residence in the metropolitan opportunity structure, while deepening the disadvantages of less-educated and inner city residents. They also tell us that, while a visible part of the ethnic "niche" economy, recent immigrants constitute a growing segment of the broader low-wage labor pool, earning lower wages—and, frequently, higher praise—than their native-born counterparts from employers eager to maintain a cheap, cooperative workforce. And our analyses tell us that metropolitan job opportunities are segmented by gender, especially within industries and firms, leaving women at a disadvantage that is further compounded by the greater burden of child care and household responsibility they carry. But the disadvantages generated by changing skill demands, spatial "mismatch," immigration, gender, and family responsibility cannot fully account for the substantial and enduring racial disparities that mark social and economic outcomes in the contemporary American metropolis. Those disparities cannot be understood without confronting the complex, and cross-cutting, significance of race. A central theme in this book is that racial barriers, having in some ways diminished since the landmark civil rights legislation of the 1960s, remain a powerful, albeit not always readily visible, social and structural dimension of contemporary inequality.

The significance of race in urban inequality is to be found not in any single place but in various aspects, and at multiple levels, of social experience: in discriminatory behavior, policies, and institutional practices; in the structural segmentation of labor markets and residential space; and in the attitudes, stereotypes, and ideological belief systems through which people make sense of broader social conditions and determine their own policy preferences. Race has a deep and enduring historical significance as well, still visible in residential color lines constructed by years of racial exclusion, violence, and overtly discriminatory policies; in the persistent racial gaps in education, skills, and capital that stem from opportunity denied; and in the mistrust between minorities and local law-enforcement agencies that has once again erupted around the issue of racial profiling. And race has significance as the basis of a color-coded sense of social hierarchy that affects individual attitudes and behavior, and that is embedded in social structure as well as in shared cultural norms.

The significance of race as a factor in urban inequality, then, cannot fully be captured in a single social scientific variable or by considering social and economic outcomes in isolation from one another. Nor can its effects easily be separated out from those associated with economic restructuring and metropolitanization, which are often treated as nonracial, or race-neutral forces in the literature (Wilson 1999). Race, of course, is by no means the only fault line in urban America; it does,

however, enter into, complicate, and form a context for understanding the divisions of class, gender, and space.

In light of their varied disciplinary backgrounds, it should come as no surprise that the authors contributing to this volume do not take a uniform approach to measuring and disentangling the significance of race. For some, indeed, the significance of race lies precisely in the entanglements—in the extent to which race relations and racialized perceptions shape market dynamics, residential settlement patterns, and a whole host of economic, social, and cultural processes that affect the distribution of opportunity and outcome. Analyses that purport to "explain" racial disparities in terms of human capital or other non-racial gaps miss an important aspect of how race affects social and economic outcomes: they do not adequately acknowledge the racial context within which these disparities are generated, judged, and maintained. Others, however, argue that it is not only possible but imperative to pinpoint race effects categorically, by first taking the full measure of disparities in education, skill, socioeconomic status, and other nonracial variables that can account for racial disparities in social and economic outcomes. In one view, the significance of race is pervasive and built into the social environment; in the other view, it is contained within what, after accounting for a host of other variables, can be attributed to racial discrimination. By either measure, according to Multi-City Study findings, race is a major force in generating economic and social inequality.

In what follows, I offer an overview of the Multi-City Study and its findings that seeks not so much to resolve as to recognize these differences of approach—acknowledging, at the outset, two things we continually encountered in the course of our collaboration. First, the complexities of measuring race are compounded not just by discipline and methodology but by the enduring political as well as fundamentally moral significance of race as America's central unresolved dilemma. Encountering that dilemma with the tools of social science does not, as Gunnar Myrdal long ago recognized, make it a "value-free" exercise. That, indeed, is why race remains such a deeply conflicted issue, in social science as in society at large. Second, while it did not produce universal consensus, this collaborative research did give us the common ground upon which we could come to important points of agreement, while continuing to air our differences of interpretation.

Project Origins

The Multi-City Study was motivated by a confluence of institutional as well as intellectual and policy concerns, all of which are important for understanding its scope and theoretical framework, as well as its unique contribution to the ongoing social scientific study of inequality. Indeed,

the "story" of constructing the Multi-City Study necessarily brings together several sometimes divergent strands—and unresolved tensions—within the social science of race and inequality more generally. As such, it offers insights into the challenges as well as the importance of conducting this kind of collaborative multidisciplinary research.

The idea for the Multi-City Study was itself the product of a period of renewed intellectual vitality in urban studies, as foundations and social scientists in the late 1980s and early 1990s took stock of the vast structural changes affecting worldwide urban centers while lamenting the consequences of urban policy neglect. That vitality was evident in research that moved toward reconceptualizing urban prospects and urban problems by pointing to the rise of postindustrial "global" cities, as well as to the emergence of a postindustrial urban underclass (Sassen 1991; Wilson 1987). It was evident, as well, in an emerging network of institutions devoted to new urban research. Foundations played an important role in fostering this network, not only by providing direct funding for research and training, but also by creating intermediaries, such as the Social Science Research Council's Program for Research on the Urban Underclass, to steer research agendas toward problems of persistent, concentrated poverty (Gephart and Pearson 1988; Jencks and Peterson 1991). What was most important about these foundation-sponsored initiatives, however, was that they were committed to providing a venue for younger, and particularly for minority scholars, to get access to research and training opportunities and, ultimately, to forge new directions in urban research. Such was the case with University of California at Los Angeles's Center for the Study of Urban Poverty, established by a group of young minority scholars as an interdisciplinary research institute with strong ties to the local community at a time when many Los Angeles neighborhoods were reeling with the combined forces of demographic restructuring, political disfranchisement, and economic decline (Oliver and Johnson 1984; Johnson and Oliver 1989). By 1991, these intellectual and institutional resources had started to come together in the extended process of conceptualizing and planning the Multi-City Study.

The project originated when the social scientists at UCLA's Center for the Study of Urban Poverty joined forces with their counterparts at the University of Michigan, who since the late 1980s had been engaged in a parallel research and graduate training program funded as part of foundation efforts to reinvigorate the study of race and urban poverty. Their initial plan was to use an already-scheduled replication of the 1976 Detroit Area Survey of racial attitudes and residential segregation as an opportunity to conduct a much-expanded and comparative survey in Detroit and Los Angeles. The new survey would build on the well-established, albeit contested, sociological and social psychological literature linking segregation to race relations, and specifically to the strong

degree of white resistance to residential integration with blacks (Farley et al. 1978). It would also look more closely and extensively at inter-racial attitudes, in the interest of incorporating more recent work documenting the enduring power of racial stereotypes (Bobo and Kluegel 1997). And by fielding the survey in Detroit's predominantly black-white as well as in Los Angeles's more multi-racial and ethnic setting, the collaborative project would provide insight into how racial attitudes and relations were affected by localized demographic trends.

Equally important, the contemplated Los Angeles-Detroit survey would broaden the scope of the inquiry even further, by surveying households about their employment and labor market as well as their residential experiences. In this way, it would take advantage of the revival of interest in research on urban labor markets, stimulated in part by William Julius Wilson's widely influential concept of the underclass, and subsequently cultivated in the fellowships and research planning networks sponsored by the SSRC Committee for Research on the Urban Underclass. That work had brought renewed prominence to a variety of structural explanations for persistent urban poverty, particularly to the idea that urban deindustrialization had devastated employment opportunities for the inner-city poor through a combination of skill and spatial mismatches between less educated workers and secure, decent-paying jobs.

More immediately relevant to the original survey planners, interest in the underclass had also generated a series of small but revealing employer surveys showing, among other things, employer prejudice and discriminatory practices toward the minority workforce (Kirschenman and Neckerman 1991; Fix and Struyk 1993). This research helped to stimulate wider attention to what was happening on the "demand" side of the labor market for low-skilled and minority workers, and became the basis of a series of meetings on employer surveys sponsored by the Russell Sage Foundation.

Finally, the Los Angeles-Detroit survey planners were also influenced by a then-burgeoning literature documenting the dramatic rise of inequality since the 1970s, evidenced for some in the polarization of income and wages (Levy and Murnane 1992) and for others in the emergence of a decidedly two-tiered economy, heralded by the decline of once-powerful unionized labor and divided between high-wage opportunities requiring education and credentials, and permanently low-wage, low-skilled, mostly service-sector jobs (Harrison and Bluestone 1988; Sassen 1990).

In hopes of drawing from each of these still-disparate strands in the literature, the UCLA-Michigan team secured funding from the SSRC Committee for Research on the Urban Underclass to sponsor a planning

conference early in the summer of 1991. At that conference, the seeds were planted for what became the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality, expanded from the originally contemplated two-city household survey to an even more ambitious series of linked household and employer surveys fielded in four widely divergent metropolitan areas. Discussions at the conference generated interest among researchers and funders alike, leading both groups to begin discussing, and then actively planning, a broader study.

The four cities incorporated in the final study represent a cross-section of the varied circumstances and fortunes of urban America. Detroit is the quintessential rust belt city, hit hard by decentralization and loss of heavy manufacturing and sharply divided between its heavily black urban core and the surrounding white suburban periphery. Atlanta combines a "new South," heavily service-based economy with persistent black-white segregation despite the presence of a substantial African American middle class. Boston stands at the hub of a declining New England manufacturing economy that in the 1980s began to transform itself into a rising high-technology center, with a history of majority white-minority black tension recently complicated by the arrival of substantial numbers of Asian and Latino immigrants. And Los Angeles is by far the most multiracial, economically diversified, and geographically sprawled of the study sites, with its recent emergence as a major destination point for a diverse array of Latin American and Asian immigrants and its now reduced manufacturing economy offset by the growth in high-tech, services, finance, and the long-present entertainment and tourist industries. In addition, the Multi-City Study added two major new components, designed to gather firsthand information on the structure of metropolitan job opportunities: a telephone survey of employers, focusing on jobs, skill requirements, and hiring and related practices; and a series of face-to-face interviews with a subset of these employers to explore their attitudes, perceptions, and employment policies in more depth.

The result, following several months of intensive planning, was a project that was at once larger and more interdisciplinary than even the original collaborators had envisioned, now constituting an extensive nationwide network of investigators that included economists, political scientists, and historians, as well as the geographers, sociologists, and social psychologists who had launched the initial planning effort. Indeed, in scope and interdisciplinarity it was reminiscent of the historic urban social surveys of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: aiming, like DuBois's *The Philadelphia Negro* (1996 [1899]), to investigate the social structural underpinnings of racial inequality, while mapping labor market conditions with the comprehensiveness of the first

major research undertaking of the newly founded Russell Sage Foundation, the 1909 Pittsburgh Survey. Over thirty academics took part in some stage of the design and execution of the Multi-City Study, along with a similar number of graduate students. The multiracial team, which encompassed African Americans, Latinos, Asians, and whites, roughly evenly split between men and women, mirrored the diversity of the urban areas under study.

As the project grew, it became far more complicated logistically, requiring the creation of a central research coordinating committee with representatives from each survey component and each metropolitan area research team. This committee was designated to make key, sometimes contested, decisions about the study design, in particular to determine the content of the core survey to be fielded in all locations while still allowing room for a battery of city-specific questions. The Social Science Research Council took on the role of helping coordinate and guide the planning effort, establishing an interdisciplinary committee of outside advisers who would review draft surveys, offer comments, and, on occasion, arbitrate among the various research interests, specializations, and disciplinary perspectives the Multi-City Study embraced—inevitably an issue in crafting a broad-gauged survey that could be conducted within reasonable time limits.[1]

The main work of planning, however, fell to the investigators, who, in sustaining their commitment to the multidisciplinary collaborative, opened themselves up to an intensive process of learning across disciplines as well as areas of specialization. As a result of this collaboration, analysts of spatial mismatch moved beyond measures of commuting time and physical distance to grapple with the social and symbolic meaning of place (Sjoquist 1996; Tilly et al., this volume). Students of social attitudes, in turn, grappled with the tensions between labor market theory and sociological theories of racial stratification in their investigations of the patterning of racial attitudes (Bobo, Johnson, and Suh 2000).

For all their diversity in terms of discipline and perspective, however, the multi-city investigators were in agreement about designing a study that would extend the boundaries of previous research in several specific ways. First, the planners sought to move beyond the predominant black-white biracial race relations paradigm by refining their surveys to accommodate an increasingly multiracial reality, in which relations among different racial and ethnic minorities could prove as consequential as those between white and nonwhite. Second, they sought to move beyond the standard national-sample survey by gathering original data at the metropolitan level, allowing for a more detailed picture of variation in local race relations, labor market, and residential processes, as well as an opportunity to conduct comparative research.

Third, the planners wanted to construct a more realistic and complete picture of labor market dynamics by gathering information from the demand as well as the supply side of the employment and earnings structure, adding the characteristics of jobs, employer practices, and attitudes to an inquiry hitherto focused on individual human capital traits. At the same time, they worked to overcome the relative absence of gender analysis in labor market research, by incorporating measures of gendered stereotypes, hiring and promotion practices, and family and child care responsibilities into the surveys. Fourth, they sought to overcome the bias toward single-variable explanations by exploring employment, residence, and attitudes as interacting processes in generating and shaping the class, gender, and racial dimensions of inequality. Finally, the planners sought to broaden a social scientific discourse that had thus far focused heavily on concentrated poverty, by exploring the forces driving the larger distribution of advantage as well as disadvantage for people of all income levels within metropolitan areas.

Of course, planning for the Multi-City Study did not take place in a vacuum. In important ways the project was influenced by, and certainly it drew a sense of purpose from, the visible deterioration of urban conditions and the absence of an affirmative policy response. At the same time, investigators took pains to look beyond the most immediate or extreme expressions of dislocation to answer questions that would be of long-range relevance to our understanding of urban inequality. Thus, while designed to uncover the roots of poverty and joblessness, which by the early 1990s had reached new heights, the multi-city surveys were also designed to situate those problems within an understanding of the changing conditions of work, neighborhood, and family, in particular for the low-wage, low-skilled workforce. Meanwhile, shortly after the first household surveys had been fielded in Detroit, the Multi-City Study was given new urgency by the 1992 uprising in South Central Los Angeles following the acquittal of four white police officers for the widely broadcast beating of African American motorist Rodney King. Still several months away from fielding their own survey, the Los Angeles-based investigators were in a position to assess the impact of the uprising in subsequent focus groups and in a series of questions included on the household survey (Bobo et al. 1994). Most important, however, with a large sample of white, black, Latino, and Asian respondents and an extensive set of questions ranging from residential and labor market experience to attitudes, they were in a position to explore the deeper and complex currents of interracial and ethnic tension that helped give shape to the uprising itself.

Planning for the Multi-City Study can also be seen as part of two related developments in the politics and in the ongoing public discourse about race and inequality, which played a role in shaping the project's

research agenda and figured prominently in our own internal deliberations and debates.

One was an intensification of debate about the state of black-white relations in the United States, captured in a number of prominent books published throughout the 1990s as well as in sustained political controversy over affirmative action and other race-based anti-discrimination policies.[2] In some ways this heightened racial discourse was a continuation of older debates about the nature and degree of racism in American society, centered principally on the question of whether African American disadvantage should be traced to racial prejudice and discrimination or to some combination of class status, family structure, and culture (O'Connor 2001). But it was also grounded in more recent disputes about the changing nature of "the race problem" in post-civil rights America, and especially those over the question of whether race was declining as a source of disadvantage for the black working and "under" class (Wilson 1980; Willie 1979). Feeding into this debate was a growing emphasis on economic restructuring, human capital, limited access to jobs, family structure and other nonracial explanations for black-white inequality in wages, income, and employment (Kasarda 1989; O'Neill 1990; Holzer 1991). Equally important was a turn, especially within liberal and "new Democrat" circles, to a putatively race-neutral policy framework for addressing racial inequality (Wilson 1990; Williams 1998).

Originating, as it did, during a period when the emphasis on race had been muted in social science and social policy, the Multi-City Study helps to mark a new stage in the debate over race and its significance, when scholars, concerned that problems of racial discrimination, prejudice, and segregation were being neglected or marginalized in the literature, sought not just to put race back on the agenda but to understand it as a structurally-rooted phenomenon (Massey and Denton 1993). Thus, in bringing race to the forefront of measurement and analysis, the multi-city researchers sought not simply to substitute one kind of explanation for another, but to transcend the limitations of the either/or debate. At the same time, they sought to recognize the complexity of race as a social scientific variable, looking not only to measures of discriminatory behavior but to its structural and institutional expression in labor and residential markets, and in the patterning of racial stereotypes. Here the Multi-City Study joined with what has emerged as an ongoing rethinking of the measure and meaning of race as a sociological category, spurred not just by the fact of increasing racial and ethnic diversity but also by frustration with analyses that treat racial disadvantage as stemming from a collection of individual-level attributes, as opposed to institutional and structural processes (Bonilla-Silva 1996; Winant 2000). Notably, this effort to recognize the complexity of race also took multi-city investigators back to themes sounded in such pioneering sociological

classics as DuBois's *The Philadelphia Negro* and St. Clair Drake and Horace Cayton's *Black Metropolis*, which long ago rejected the either/or framework by mapping the interlocking contours of the color line in employment, housing, social relations, and racial beliefs (DuBois 1996 [1899], Drake and Cayton 1993 [1945]). The issue then, as it became for the investigators, was not *whether* but *how* "race matters"—and on a more fundamental level, whether, in the highly racialized context of urban America, it makes sense to think about a racially progressive policy agenda in race-neutral terms.

That the investigators continue to differ in the way they answer these questions is itself testament to the complexity of race as a social and social scientific category. But the nature of their differences is also an indication of the complication and insights the Multi-City Study brings to the debate. Thus, analyses of the household and employer data confirm that there are considerable skill differences between white and nonwhite workers, and that nonwhites suffer in the labor market as a result (Holzer 1998). By some measures, including several reported in this volume, this skills gap can be said to explain most of the racial disparity in employment and wages. By other measures, also included in this volume, the meaning of the skills gap cannot be considered apart from the racial context within which skills acquisition and labor markets are formed and operate. Skills, that is, are not race-neutral variables—not only because they originate in racially unequal educational opportunities but because they are embedded in social structures and processes that the Multi-City Study investigates in some depth: the racially segregated networks that provide access to both jobs and skill acquisition, and the racialized perceptions through which employers filter workforce decisions.

A second political development also figured in deliberations about the study, and that was the successful effort—launched while the surveys were getting started and culminating not long after the final component of field research had been completed—to bring "welfare as we know it" to an end. The issue of welfare, like the continuing debate over affirmative action, does not at all capture the full policy or intellectual significance of the project. Nevertheless, their prominence has had an important impact, in creating a context of welfare-state retrenchment and polarized racial discourse to which this research can be addressed. Thus, the devolution and "work-first" emphasis of post-welfare policy has redoubled the need for the kind of analysis of local labor market opportunities available to disadvantaged workers that the Multi-City Study can provide (O'Connor 2000; Holzer and Danziger, this volume). Similarly, the intensified debate over affirmative action and other racially targeted policies calls more than ever for direct evidence and nuanced analysis of the extent and nature of racial disadvantage.

The Surveys

The single largest component of the Multi-City Study is the comprehensive Household Survey, administered to a total of 8,916 non-Hispanic white, African American, Hispanic and Asian adults (twenty-one years or older) across the four metropolitan areas.[3] Samples were drawn separately in each metropolitan area, and weighted to yield respondents representative of the prevailing local racial and ethnic mix (white-black in Atlanta and Detroit; white-black-Hispanic in Boston; white-black-Hispanic-Asian in Los Angeles). The sample was constructed to include equal numbers of each racial-ethnic group and a sizable number of low-income and below poverty-level households, to allow a detailed analysis of these groups; weighted results are representative of each metropolitan area as a whole. Interviews were conducted in person, generally lasting from ninety to a hundred minutes, in the respondent's native language (requiring English, Spanish, Mandarin, Cantonese, and Korean versions in Los Angeles), and in the majority of cases interviewers and respondents were of the same race, to assure candor and minimize tension or bias when covering questions about race and ethnicity (Johnson, Oliver, and Bobo 1994, 80). The Household Surveys took place over several months in each metropolitan area, starting in Detroit in the spring of 1992 and reaching completion with Boston and Los Angeles in the fall of 1994.[4]

Employer telephone surveys (numbering 3,510) were timed to coordinate with the household surveys in each area and were administered between 1992 and 1994, with a supplemental sample of about 300 firms added in 1995.[5] The Face-to-Face Employer Surveys, interviewing in greater depth 365 managers at 174 firms already contacted by the Telephone Survey, were conducted between the summers of 1994 and 1996.[6] In both employer surveys, cases were roughly equally divided across the four metropolitan areas. Of the Telephone Survey employers, almost 1,200 were the current or last employer identified by the household respondents. The remainder were drawn from business directories.

The household survey provides rich and unusually detailed data on intergroup attitudes, residential segregation, and labor market experience, offering a uniquely comprehensive look at processes that are often considered separately, while also allowing scholars to explore a wide range of more narrowly framed questions about specific dimensions of inequality. In the area of intergroup attitudes the survey documents several aspects of race and gender relations, including the strength and pervasiveness of stereotypes, the sense of competition or threat between groups, and the pattern of beliefs about the existence and nature of discrimination in local housing and labor markets. Moreover, taking advantage of its multiracial sample, the survey explores relations among dif-

ferent minority groups, while also recognizing gender as part of the configuration of attitudes and stereotypes. Data from the survey also offer insight into the social and ideological roots of racial and gender belief systems, how they relate to patterns of support for social policies, and how they affect various aspects of the urban opportunity structure.

One link between attitude and opportunity, extensively explored in the Multi-City Household Survey, is through the degree of preference and/or tolerance for racial residential integration and its impact on the range of residential choices available to different race and ethnic groups. Expanding on a series of show cards first developed in the 1976 Detroit Area Study, the Household Survey explores how respondents react to the prospect of living with varying proportions of groups other than their own, including the prospect of being racial "pioneers"—or distinct minorities in their own neighborhoods. The survey also gauges how metropolitan-area residents perceive the affordability and racial openness of actual neighborhoods, as well as the quality and desirability of their own residential communities. Here again the Multi-City Study goes beyond the black-white dichotomy characteristic of previous residential segregation research by exploring tolerance for a variety of racial and ethnic mixes. It also offers rare insight into the broader social meaning of racial and ethnic "succession" in urban neighborhoods, by probing how people think and talk about the appearance of "others" in their midst—and why, in some instances, it might lead to flight from the neighborhood (Farley et al. 1994). In another important experimental innovation, the survey asks respondents to construct their own ideal neighborhoods, allowing for a more finely grained picture of tolerance for integration and proximity to other racial groups.

Labor market questions gather extensive information on job search, including the use of networks, requirements regarding wage levels and commute times, and access to knowledge about job opportunities. The survey also draws out information about what previous research has found or hypothesized to be serious barriers to gainful employment, including education and skill levels, the availability of transportation, child care or related family obligations, and the actual experience or perception of employer bias. Parallel to questions asked about the housing market, the survey addresses how respondents vary in their cognitive "maps" of the metropolitan labor market—allowing researchers to explore how the perception of racial hostility in certain areas acts as a strong deterrent to minority job applicants (Sjoquist 1996). Equally important, the survey taps into such key but often unexamined aspects of actual labor market experience as the race and gender composition of the workplace and its supervisory structure, as well as the experience or perception of discrimination at the workplace.

What is perhaps most distinctive about the Multi-City Study labor market data is that it is linked to a set of surveys on employer demands, practices, attitudes, and perceptions with regard to the metropolitan labor force. The larger of these is the Employer Telephone Survey, administered to approximately eight hundred establishments in each metropolitan area. In order to yield as much information as possible on the prospects for disadvantaged workers, the sample was weighted toward larger firms (reflecting the greater numbers of jobs in those businesses), and designed with an emphasis on jobs that do not require a college degree (Holzer 1996). The telephone survey itself gathers information on a range of demand-side factors shaping local labor market opportunities, including the skill requirements, wage and benefit levels, location and related characteristics of available jobs; the demographic composition and degree of union representation within the firm; employer recruitment, screening, training, promotion, and affirmative action practices; and employer preferences with regard to race, gender, and other characteristics of employees. (See Holzer 1996 for a more complete description of the Employer Telephone Survey.)

Supplementing the statistical data generated by the Employer Telephone Survey is a more in-depth survey, based on longer, face-to-face interviews with 175 of the originally surveyed employers. Focusing again on the job characteristics, employer practices, and attitudes that shape opportunities for lower-wage workers, these open-ended interviews were structured to draw out the intentions, preferences, labor market perceptions, and attitudes behind the broader patterns indicated in the Telephone Surveys. What determines employer skill demands and preferences for certain categories of workers? Why do employers rely on certain kinds of recruitment and hiring methods, and with what effect? How do employers decide where to locate, and relocate, and why? What are their perceptions of the local workforce, and how do they affect hiring and recruitment practices? These interviews provided investigators with an opportunity to probe all these issues at greater length and in more depth than in the Telephone Survey. (See Moss and Tilly 2001 for a more complete description of the in-depth Employer Survey.)

Whether considered as part of a whole or separately, these interrelated components of the Multi-City Study provide a unique source of empirical data for enhancing and testing some of the principal findings and explanations that have emerged in recent literature on inequality. Thus, it brings new evidence, from both supply and demand sides of the labor market, to test hypotheses about skills and spatial mismatches, about the role of social networks, and about the impact of job search mechanisms on employment and wages. To the literature on discrimination, which has focused primarily on the experience of African Ameri-

cans, the Multi-City Study adds an expanded set of questions as well as information for whites, Hispanics, and Asians across class and gender lines (Bobo and Suh 2000). It similarly expands on existing residential segregation literature, not only by exploring factors—racial prejudice, in-group preferences, class background, affordability—that have been offered as competing explanations but also by incorporating data from multiethnic settings, and by exploring the consequences of residential segregation.

Additional features of the Multi-City Study create an opportunity to complicate and move beyond the existing range of hypotheses as well. First is that the surveys were conducted at the metropolitan rather than the national level, allowing for a more detailed picture of the local dynamics of inequality in each metropolis, as well as analyses of how and why patterns may vary—or hold steady—in different social, economic, and political settings. Among the most important advantages of metropolitan-level analysis is that it allows investigators to refer to specific residential or employment areas by name, affording an opportunity to explore the social meaning of space and how it affects decisions about housing, job search, hiring, and firm location. It also allows for a more detailed picture of the institutional and compositional dimensions of the local labor market, revealing important features—such as the degree of occupational segregation and the immediate context of job opportunities for workers—that cannot be determined through relying on national-level data alone. By exploring these issues through a blend of qualitative and quantitative data, the Multi-City Study allows us to capture the racialization of key aspects of the metropolitan opportunity structure—in social perception as well as in social fact.

Second is the unusual breadth of issues covered in the linked surveys, which allows researchers to look at different places and mechanisms within the broader metropolitan context where inequality is generated, as well as their interactive effects. Indeed, the Multi-City Study was specifically designed not only with the understanding that no single-variable explanations would—or necessarily should—emerge but also as a way of appreciating how those variables intersect. And third, by paying attention to the institutions, practices, and attitudes that mediate the distribution of opportunity, the Multi-City Study expands the focus of analysis beyond individual-level variables and toward an appreciation of the structural underpinnings of inequality. Finally, the study is unusual in the extent and variety of measures it incorporates on race and gender attitudes, stereotypes, biases, and discrimination, allowing researchers to assess these sources of inequality in greater depth and more directly than in most social or labor market surveys.

Perspectives from Multi-City Analysis

In companion volumes published in the multi-city series, investigators from the city-based research teams trace the complex dynamics of inequality in each of the four metropolitan areas, drawing attention to what is historically distinctive about local patterns of segregation, labor market restructuring, and racial attitudes even as they parallel similar dynamics in other metropolitan areas. Thus, Detroit stands out as the most racially polarized of the four cities in terms of central city-suburban residential segregation, income inequality, and employment outcomes, a pattern that must be understood as part of a long history of racial conflict as well as the severe impact of industrial decline and deconcentration on the job prospects for African Americans (Farley, Danziger, and Holzer 2000).

In Atlanta, racial segregation and income disparities have persisted despite a greater degree of African American suburbanization and a rapidly growing economy, a situation described by the Atlanta-based investigators as the "Atlanta paradox" (Sjoquist 2000). The greater Boston metropolitan area, in contrast, witnessed income growth across racial lines after recovering from the decline of its manufacturing sector in the 1970s and restructuring its economic base toward finance, technology, and services. Still, amid the rapid demographic diversification that has accompanied the recent arrival of immigrants from Latin America, the Caribbean, Asia, and Africa, segregation and an ongoing history of interracial antagonism continue to sustain racialized patterns of inequality (Bluestone and Stevenson 2000). It is in Los Angeles, however, that the combination of industrial and demographic diversification has been largest, most visible, and spatially dispersed, dividing what the Los Angeles research team calls a "prismatic metropolis" along complex lines of class, race, ethnicity, immigration status, and geography (Bobo et al. 2000).

The chapters in this volume are based on cross-city analysis, and highlight not so much the distinctiveness as the common patterns shaping metropolitan inequality. At the same time, they draw attention to the unique strengths of the Multi-City Study as an opening toward a fuller and more integrated understanding of how race shapes and limits opportunity.

In chapter 1, Reynolds Farley uses census data to provide an overview of the four metropolitan areas, sketching the statistical outlines of a marked, if complicated, racial divide in residence, income, education, employment, and other key markers of socioeconomic status. Despite significant and important variations, all the metropolitan areas displayed broadly similar patterns on several indicators. First, Farley re-

ports high rates of black-white residential segregation, despite slight improvements over time, and lower but still significant Latino-non-Latino segregation in Boston and Los Angeles. Second, there are large disparities in the racial distribution of income, with blacks and Latinos disproportionately represented among the poor and near-poor and underrepresented at the upper end of the income distribution. Third, despite gains among all nonwhite minorities, especially among blacks and minority women, the racial gap in educational attainment persists, and in some places has actually grown wider at the postsecondary level, which economists point to as especially important for achieving success in the changing labor market. Fourth, there are persistent racial disparities in the distribution of employment and occupation, clustering minorities in low-wage menial jobs and leaving white men and women more likely to be employed and in higher-prestige positions than their nonwhite counterparts.

As Farley's analysis points out, the patterns displayed in census statistics are highly complicated, differing by gender, city, and immigration status. In some instances, historical trend lines provide a measure of progress toward racial parity; in others, they show stagnation or decline. Certainly there is also inequality within racial categories, across class as well as gender lines. Nevertheless, in the four socially and economically diverse metropolitan areas, racial segregation and inequality stand out as persistent and serious problems that can be understood as part of broader national patterns.

The remaining chapters in this volume use data from the Multi-City Study to examine the interlocking factors that sustain the racial divide, focusing on the structural and institutional as well as the individual-level processes that generate inequality.

Racial Attitudes

We begin by considering the substance and determinants of racial attitudes and beliefs, and the extent to which they operate as important sources of meaning and behavior for household survey respondents. The chapters by Lawrence D. Bobo and Michael P. Massagli and by James R. Kluegel and Lawrence D. Bobo map out the ideas and perceptions through which people make judgments about one another, make sense of racial and economic disparities, and form preferences about policies to promote racial equity. Together, these two chapters make a compelling case for reintegrating attitudes and beliefs into social scientific accounts of racial inequality. Though less likely to appear as overt expressions of racial prejudice, the authors show, racial attitudes and beliefs continue to operate in prejudicial ways: by forming the basis of negative stereo-

types that "color" social behavior and practices; by justifying existing racial inequities as a reflection of group characteristics; and by limiting the possibilities for cross-racial cooperation in matters of policy.

Chapter 2 focuses on one of the most widely recognized mechanisms of social prejudice by examining the composition, foundations, and extent of racial stereotyping. Racial stereotypes are widespread, the authors find, and arranged in a hierarchical order that makes distinctions among minorities as well as between minorities and whites, and that cuts across local context. While ranking whites and Asians highly on key traits related to socioeconomic status, achievement, and socially approved behavior, that hierarchy in turn places African Americans and Hispanics at the bottom, with the most stigmatized social attributes. As we shall see, the sense of racial hierarchy expressed in these rankings is replicated at several points within the urban opportunity structure.

In an especially effective use of the survey's multiracial sample and comparative framework, Bobo and Massagli also come to important conclusions about the nature of stereotypes. One is that they are drawn from a generalized, widely shared cultural repertoire of images and social perceptions rather than from the local specifics of race relations. Reflective though they may be of individual beliefs and attitudes, stereotypes operate more broadly in society as a common language and a cultural belief system that in turn shapes, gives order to, and to some degree operates independently of individual attitudes. Second is that this hierarchical system of stereotypes is at least partly grounded in the reality of racial stratification; this is not merely ethnocentrism at work. Thus, positive and negative stereotypes are influenced by who's on top and who's at the bottom of the earnings structure, even as they play a role in shaping, justifying, and perpetuating that status quo through their influence on housing and labor market practices. Nor are they simply imposed by dominant whites on racial "others"; stereotypes influence the way minorities view one another, and in some instances the way they view themselves. Clearly, these conclusions tell us, the importance of stereotypes is not merely incidental. They warrant further attention as one of the structural underpinnings of inequality.

In chapter 3, Kluegel and Bobo examine another aspect of how racial beliefs and attitudes act as a lens for interpreting social conditions, this time with important consequences for social policy. Here the central focus is on how the climate of racialized perception discussed in the previous chapter applies to the question of job discrimination. Taking advantage of the richness of the multi-city data, Kluegel and Bobo provide an unusually in-depth analysis of racial gaps in perceptions of the extent and seriousness of job discrimination, asking not only about underlying determinants but also about how this translates into racially divergent policy preferences.

20

While previous analyses have described a large white-black difference in perceived discrimination, Kluegel and Bobo are able to explore patterns for Hispanics and Asians as well, and to examine whether there is a comparable gap in perceptions of gender discrimination between women and men. Moreover, to a far greater degree than previous studies, they are able to explore what shapes these divergent perceptions of an issue that has taken center stage in recent policy debate. Reporting similar patterns across all four metropolitan areas, Kluegel and Bobo conclude that perceptions of discrimination are more heavily racialized than gendered: the gap between whites and both blacks and Hispanics with regard to racial discrimination is significantly larger than the male-female gap in perceived gender discrimination. Indeed, while white men and women both tend to diminish the extent of gender discrimination, black men and women are consistently more likely to see it as a serious problem.

Equally significant, perceptions of discrimination are racialized in other ways as well. First, Kluegel and Bobo report a racial gap in what *determines* perceptions of discrimination, with whites influenced chiefly by the abstractions of ideology and nonwhites by concrete experience. The most effective way of eliminating the gap in perception, they conclude, is to eliminate the discrimination itself. Second, however, Kluegel and Bobo show how these differences in perception complicate that task, linking them to a substantial racial division in support for anti-discrimination policy. Nevertheless, they express some hope for a more informed public discourse, based on the fact that most whites do acknowledge the existence of at least some racial discrimination.

Residence, Employment, and the Significance of Space

In turning to the racialized dimensions of metropolitan social geography, the volume begins to consider how racial beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions are implicated in and are in turn replicated by the urban infrastructure. Chapters 4 and 5 reveal how patterns of racialization are structured into urban housing markets, by examining the causes and the consequences of racial residential segregation. Chapter 6 investigates space as a component of the labor market that is similarly infused with perceptions and assumptions about race.

In chapter 4, Camille Zubrinsky Charles brings multi-city evidence to bear on what has long been a matter of contention in segregation research, by assessing the importance of race in sustaining residential segregation. Zubrinsky Charles takes several factors into consideration as possible explanations, including racial gaps in socioeconomic status, disparate knowledge or perceptions of the housing market, and racial

attitudes, preferences, and prejudices. She also draws on a novel measure of racial residential preferences, known as the Ideal Neighborhood Experiment, which allows respondents to configure their own preferred living environment and to consider integration with several different out-groups. The evidence, she concludes, reveals a complex array of factors, all of which point to the central importance of race: racial discrimination, stereotypes, and economic disparities that originated in racial restrictions all contribute to maintaining segregation. In a pattern that varies across cities in specifics but not in its broad contours, Zubrinsky Charles finds a powerful connection between racial stereotypes and a widely shared hierarchical rank-ordering that rates whites, Asians, Hispanics, and blacks, in descending order, as preferred out-group neighbors. Thus, while blacks express the strongest preference for integrated neighborhoods, they are most likely to meet with resistance.

That these preferences can have far-reaching consequences is confirmed by the analysis in chapter 5, where Franklin Wilson and Roger Hammer focus on how ethnic homogeneity affects neighborhood quality. While most people express a preference for at least some degree of residential integration, Wilson and Hammer find that, for a small but statistically significant number of respondents, living in an ethnically homogeneous neighborhood can be attributed to a stated preference for living among co-ethnics. A more important factor for blacks (though not for Hispanics), however, is that the expectation of meeting with discriminatory barriers steers them toward more homogeneous neighborhoods. Taking advantage of the breadth of the Multi-City Study household data, Wilson and Hammer find that residence in homogeneous neighborhoods carries stark and racially disparate consequences in all four metropolitan areas—whether respondents "choose" homogeneity or not. For minorities, it means low neighborhood socioeconomic status, housing quality, and access to services, and, for blacks, more limited proximity to jobs. For whites, neighborhood ethnic homogeneity brings the opposite: higher status, better housing and services, and fewer reported neighborhood problems. Like Zubrinsky Charles, these authors conclude that racial restrictions, over and above other factors, play a powerful role in limiting residential opportunities for blacks and Hispanics, with implications that go beyond the immediate neighborhood environment.

Chapter 6, by Chris Tilly and others, provides a bridge to part III of the volume, by focusing on the significance of neighborhoods in metropolitan labor markets. It also features a distinctive component of the Multi-City Study, drawing on the Face-to-Face Employer Survey to explore how employers think about urban space, and in particular how race figures into the map of desirable locations for doing business and recruiting employees. Using the literature on spatial mismatch as their point of departure, the authors find evidence to support a conclusion

reported in a substantial body of quantitative research that minority workers are disadvantaged by the physical distance between their neighborhoods of residence and the increasingly suburban location of jobs.

But the main thrust of their analysis is to emphasize how race and space are intertwined in employers' minds: certain neighborhoods, that is, act as racially charged "signals" that in turn affect employer decisions with regard to location, recruitment, and hiring. As the authors demonstrate in their richly textured discussion of the interview findings, employer perceptions are closely attuned to the local particularities of social geography and race relations: Detroit's starkly segregated city-suburban dividing line cannot be taken as the urban norm, particularly in a city like Los Angeles, where the urban "core" is itself diffuse. Moreover, in Boston and Los Angeles, the growth of "new immigrant" populations has complicated the racial significance of space, bringing greater diversity to still heavily minority neighborhoods and also, for some employers, a welcome source of low-wage labor. Nevertheless, and despite important geographic and demographic differences, the authors find that space acts as a racial signal in similar ways across all four metropolitan areas, "coloring" how employers view prospective location and the quality of the metropolitan workforce. "Inner city" emerges from these interviews as a highly pejorative blanket term, one uniformly associated not only with blacks and Latinos but with a cluster of attributes—high crime, low-quality workforce, family breakdown, welfare dependence—that parallels the racial stereotyping reported in the Multi-City Study Household Surveys. While acknowledging that employer concerns about inner-city crime and workforce skills do have basis in reality, the authors draw on the in-depth interviews to point out how these concerns are filtered and magnified through a racial lens that stigmatizes black neighborhoods and workers in particular.

Inequality and the Structure of Labor Market Opportunity

Chapters 7 through 9 begin to illuminate what the Multi-City Study can tell us about how metropolitan labor markets work, focusing particular attention on the variegated mechanisms through which minority and female workers are channeled into often segregated, lower-wage positions with limited opportunities for advance.

In chapter 7, Luis M. Falcón and Edwin Melendez delve into the extensive data on job search and social networks to look at a relatively unexamined aspect of labor market experience. How, they ask, do processes of labor market incorporation differ by race and ethnicity, and with what consequence? What they find points to three key dimensions of racial and ethnic segmentation in the labor market. First, across the

metropolitan areas, job search methods are "bundled" differently by race and ethnicity. While all groups rely on a combination of networks, formal intermediaries (for example, agencies or unions), and open market techniques, whites have far greater access to a broader range of contacts and are more often in a position to use strategies leading to the credentialed sector of the labor force. Second, Falcón and Melendez report racial and ethnic differences in the way different groups of workers actually find jobs. Latinos and Asians, especially, connect to jobs through relatives and close friends, while whites are more likely to find work through distant contacts. Moreover, the social networks that produce jobs are themselves highly segregated; contacts for all groups remain substantially confined to co-ethnics. Third, the reliance on these segregated networks has strikingly disparate consequences for different groups, leading nonwhites to lower-status, lower-wage, racially segregated jobs, while showing no negative consequences for whites. Falcón and Melendez conclude by pointing to the need for job search mechanisms that help minorities connect to more stable opportunities. Ultimately, however, they view the racial segmentation of job search as more symptom than cause: a reflection of segregated neighborhoods and, as revealed in this and the next chapter, highly segregated workplaces as well.

While Falcón and Melendez use the Multi-City Household Survey to explore job search processes in depth, in chapter 8 Irene Browne, Leann Tigges, and Julie Press exploit its capacity to illuminate different dimensions of labor market experience to investigate the structural, institutional, and individual-level sources of racial and gender earnings inequality. Invoking the concept of "double" or what they term "multiple" jeopardy, they focus on how race and gender act as intersecting sources of labor market disadvantage for African American women and Latinas. They also examine how disadvantage is generated at multiple points within the labor market—through overall occupational segregation, within-firm segregation in jobs and authority hierarchies, and a variety of family arrangements, including single parenthood and/or a gendered division of household and child care responsibility—that have been linked to lower earnings among women. Their findings, which control for human capital characteristics, strongly parallel patterns reported elsewhere in this volume. There is a high degree of racial and ethnic segregation within the workplace, the authors report, reflected to some degree in metropolitan-wide occupational distribution but more prominently at the firm level, in the degree of segregation within jobs. This extends to supervision: workers are most often supervised by someone of the same race and gender. Like segregated neighborhoods and job search networks, working in a job dominated and supervised by

co-ethnics carries a high price: lower earnings and more limited advancement opportunities for black women and Latinas—more so for minority women than minority men. Meanwhile, women of all racial and ethnic backgrounds suffer the consequences of lower earnings when they encounter child care constraints, although men do not. The authors conclude that it is the institutional factors of racial segmentation within firms and gender divisions within the family that create multiple jeopardy, operating together to push black women and Latinas to the bottom of the wage distribution.

Tom Hertz, Chris Tilly, and Michael P. Massagli continue the institutional focus in chapter 9, here taking advantage of the unique link between household and employer data in the Multi-City Study to examine the nature and extent of race and gender discrimination in the labor market. To a far greater degree than in most studies of labor market discrimination, they are able to take institutional context into account, drawing on household survey information about workplace composition as well as on employer descriptions of job requirements, hiring, and wage-setting practices. Equally important, they are able to compare employer reports of job qualifications and starting wages with the actual skills and wages of job holders, to see what factors beyond human capital attributes influence who gets hired and at what wage. Their findings point to the importance of persistent occupational segregation by race and gender, but also to the differences in pay rates for the same occupation *between* different firms. Higher-paying firms, they conclude, are least likely to hire women and minorities—adding to such firm-specific institutional features as suburban location and customer demographics that other literature has identified as sources of gender and racial wage disparities. In their consideration of employment outcomes, they also find that extending the analysis to include involuntary *under*employment as well as unemployment significantly widens the race and gender gaps.

The two remaining chapters offer a comprehensive overview of the structure of opportunity from the standpoint of what workers bring to the labor market as well as what barriers they face.

In chapter 10, Philip Moss and Chris Tilly build on the link between the qualitative and the Telephone Employer Surveys to provide an analysis of what they call the "jobscape" for low-skilled urban minority workers. Shifting the focus that prevails in labor market research, their objective in this chapter is to look at what disadvantages minority workers from the demand rather than the supply side. By drawing on both the Telephone and the In-Depth Employer Surveys, they also begin to elaborate some of the trends reported by Harry J. Holzer (1996) in his analysis of the Employer Telephone Survey, adding evidence from more

detailed, Face-to-Face Interviews to help explain what lies behind the persistent, and for many years worsening, racial gap in earnings and employment. Keying their analysis to several factors identified in the literature, they find strong evidence to support the notion that changing skill demands, spatial mismatch, employer attitudes toward minority workers, and hiring-recruitment methods create disadvantages for minority workers. But they also bring important new insights to these findings. Thus, employer reports of changing skill demands emphasize the growing importance of "soft" (behavioral and interactive) skills as well as "hard" skills that require at least a high school education—both of which weigh especially heavily against minority males. Moreover, like the employer maps of desirable location and recruitment areas, qualitative evidence shows perceptions of skill to be highly racialized and riddled with stereotypes. Policies to assist minority workers, Moss and Tilly conclude, need to recognize that the effects of skill and spatial mismatches cannot easily be separated from the barriers of race, by investing in strong antidiscrimination enforcement as well as in programs to improve skills and access to jobs.

In chapter 11, Harry J. Holzer and Sheldon Danziger take a somewhat different angle on the question of job prospects for disadvantaged workers, providing estimates of the actual availability of jobs. In an innovative analysis using data from both the Household and the Employer Telephone Surveys, they link the supply with the demand side of the labor market by comparing what household respondents report about their own skill levels, residence, labor market experience, and other relevant characteristics to what employers report about the skill requirements, location, and racial composition of available jobs. Holzer and Danziger then conduct simulations that "match" workers to jobs based on both sets of reported characteristics, using the results to estimate the likelihood that disadvantaged workers will be able to find jobs. In findings that are of immediate relevance to the outcome of welfare reform, Holzer and Danziger report that a substantial number of job seekers— between 9 and 17 percent—will have difficulty finding work, even in a tight labor market. They also report that the rates of mismatch between jobs and job seekers are much higher for minorities, women, high school dropouts, and welfare recipients—principally, they argue, because these workers lack the skills that employers require for available jobs, but also due to spatial mismatch and racial discrimination. Even when successful in the job search, these workers face wages and benefit levels that are likely to leave large numbers in poverty. Clearly, these findings sound a strong note of caution amid the current celebration of declining welfare rolls. Holzer and Danziger conclude by emphasizing the ongoing importance of proactive public policies, including expanded investments in

education and training, transportation and job placement, government job creation, and stronger antidiscrimination enforcement.

Conclusion: Race and the Structure of Urban Opportunity

The essays in this volume do not tell a simple story. They point to intergroup attitudes, residential and industrial location, discriminatory practices, and the declining prospects for low-skilled workers as important, interlocking sources of inequality across metropolitan America. But they also point to several conclusions about race, both as a shaping force in the distribution of opportunity and as a variable in social scientific analysis. While not offered as a statement of consensus, they do advance the ongoing debate about race and inequality in important ways.

First, and indeed a point all agree on, is that race continues to play a powerful role in shaping life chances, and to a far greater degree than those who call ours a color-blind society would admit. Race matters palpably in the composition of social attitudes and stereotypes, and in the persistence of housing and labor market discrimination.

Second, and related, is that race operates within the urban infrastructure in complex and varied ways that go beyond individual attitudes or acts of discrimination, leading all of us to recognize that its effects cannot easily be separated from economic or other nonracial factors, and some among us to urge a rethinking of standard distinctions made between "race" and socioeconomic background effects. To be sure, the data provide evidence that racial disadvantage continues to take the form of individual discrimination and prejudice. But these analyses also reveal that race operates even more pervasively at the institutional and structural level—especially in the form of highly segregated housing and labor markets, along with the practices that keep them that way. Surveys also provide evidence of a widespread, stereotypically defined sense of racial hierarchy that finds structural expression in patterns of residential segregation and in employer hiring and locational preferences. It is a hierarchy, that, with striking consistency across metropolitan areas of varied demographic composition, puts black at the very bottom of a color-coded scheme that ranks Hispanic and Asian in ascending order toward white at the top.

A third insight from the Multi-City Study, albeit one explored more fully in the separate Los Angeles and Boston volumes, is that recent immigration complicates without necessarily dismantling the racial hierarchy, on the one hand placing recent Hispanic and Asian immigrants at the bottom of earnings measures, and on the other generating a

source of low-wage labor employers prefer over native-born blacks. A similar conclusion can be drawn with respect to gender, which does not operate separately so much as in conjunction with the racial hierarchy to put black and Hispanic women at the bottom of the wage structure even as employers express preferences for hiring minority women over minority men.

Fourth, by showing race to be both pervasive in influence and institutional and structural in nature, the Multi-City Study necessarily complicates and enhances social scientific understanding of skills and space as explanations for racial gaps in earnings and employment—without undermining the significance of either one. It provides powerful evidence that it is not only economics but racial attitudes and stratification that shape labor market relations and outcomes, much as race influences the configuration of residential and industrial space. It reminds us that policies to improve skills and access to jobs among minority workers are of great importance, but they must be part of a broader policy agenda that seeks direct and innovative ways to address the structural and institutional underpinnings of the racial divide.

A final insight from the analysis underscores the importance of making race a top and explicit policy priority, and that is the very high price of persistent racial segregation, whether in neighborhoods, social networks, or jobs—a price, as we have seen, that is borne most immediately by nonwhite minorities but that fundamentally undermines our capacity as a society to make genuine equality of opportunity a reality rather than a distant goal.

The message of this volume, then, is not simply that race continues to shape inequality in urban America. Race does indeed matter—as do gender, education and skill, and residential location. This research tells us more: that race and ethnicity matter in ways that are subtle and changing. Race is woven into the fabric of residential and industrial location choices, of hiring and wage determination, and of the human perceptions that underlie all these processes. It is critical to affirm the continuing import of race and ethnicity. But it is likewise critical to understand the ways—many newly emerging—in which racial divisions pervade, complement, and in some cases conflict with other dimensions of opportunity. Indeed, to ignore this dimension of urban inequality is to risk perpetuating the patterns that make race an enduring challenge as we enter the twenty-first century.

Notes

1. Members of the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality advisory committee were Robin Hollister (chair), Swarthmore College; Jorge Chapa, University of Texas, Austin; Mary Jackman, University of California, Davis; Arne Kalleberg, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Frank Levy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Seymour Sudman, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana; and Franklin Wilson, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

2. Among the most prominent of recent publications are Hacker (1992), West (1993), Cose (1993), Carnoy (1994), Steinberg (1995), Thernstrom and Thernstrom (1997), and Patterson (1997).

3. The actual number of households surveyed are as follows (unadjusted response rates for each metropolitan area are indicated in parentheses): Atlanta, 1528 (75 percent); Boston, 1820 (71 percent); Detroit, 1543 (78 percent); Los Angeles, 4025 (68 percent). The household surveys were face-to-face interviews, ranging from an average of fifty minutes in average interview length (Detroit) to ninety-five minutes (Boston). Detroit and Atlanta interviews were conducted in English; Boston in English and Spanish; Los Angeles in English, Spanish, Mandarin, Cantonese, and Korean. For non-English interviews, field materials were translated using independent forward-backward translation. The percentage of household respondents interviewed by someone of the same race or ethnicity are as follows: Atlanta: white 80 percent, black 94 percent; Boston: white 92 percent, black 49 percent, Hispanic 55 percent; Detroit: white 92.5 percent; black 89.6 percent; Los Angeles: white 53 percent, black 82 percent, Hispanic 74 percent, Asian 92 percent. Sample characteristics are described in more detail in the city volumes.

4. The combined four-city Household Survey file, along with data from the Employer Surveys described herein, is currently available through the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), located at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research in Ann Arbor.

5. The 297-Firm Supplemental Survey was drawn from the Household responses in Boston and Los Angeles. Due to the longer time frame for administering the Household Surveys in those metropolitan areas, the supplement was needed to raise the number of matched responses included in the Employer Telephone Survey.

6. Interviews were conducted at forty-five firms in Atlanta and Los Angeles, forty-six in Boston, and thirty-nine in Detroit. Up to three interviews were conducted per firm, depending upon size and firm structure, in an effort to incorporate perspectives at the level of CEO, personnel manager, and immediate supervisor. In a small number of firms with complex managerial structures (for example,

those using subcontractors), more than three interviews were conducted.

References

Bluestone, Barry, and Mary Stevenson. 2000. *Greater Boston in Transition: Race and Ethnicity in a Renaissance Region*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bobo, Lawrence D., Devon Johnson, and Susan A. Suh. 2000. "Racial Attitudes and Power in the Workplace: Do the Haves Differ from the Have-Nots?" In *Prismatic Metropolis: Race, Segregation, and Inequality in Los Angeles*, edited by Lawrence D. Bobo, Melvin L. Oliver, James H. Johnson Jr., and Abel Valenzuela Jr. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bobo, Lawrence D., and James R. Kluegel. 1997. "Status, Ideology, and Dimensions of Whites' Racial Beliefs and Attitudes: Progress and Stagnation." In *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change*, edited by Steven A. Tuch and Jack K. Martin. Westport, Conn.: Praeger.

Bobo, Lawrence D., Melvin L. Oliver, James H. Johnson Jr., and Abel Valenzuela Jr. 2000. *Prismatic Metropolis: Race, Segregation, and Inequality in Los Angeles*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bobo, Lawrence D., and Susan A. Suh. 2000. "Surveying Racial Discrimination: Analyses from a Multiethnic Labor Market." In *Prismatic Metropolis: Race, Segregation, and Inequality in Los Angeles*, edited by Lawrence D. Bobo, Melvin L. Oliver, James H. Johnson Jr., and Abel Valenzuela Jr. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bobo, Lawrence D., Camille L. Zubrinsky, James H. Johnson Jr., and Melvin L. Oliver. 1994. "Public Opinion Before and After a Spring of Discontent." In *The Los Angeles Riots: Lessons for the Urban Future*, edited by Mark Baldassare. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1996. "Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation." *American Sociological Review* 62(3): 465–80.

Caraley, Demetrios. 1992. "Washington Abandons the Cities." *Political Science Quarterly* 107(1): 1–27.

Carnoy, Martin. 1994. *Faded Dreams: The Politics and Economics of Race in America.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cose, Ellis. 1993. *The Rage of a Privileged Class*. New York: HarperCollins.

Danziger, Sheldon, and Peter Gottschalk. 1995. *America Unequal*. New York and Cambridge, Mass.: Russell Sage Foundation and Harvard University Press.

Days, Drew S. 1984. "Turning Back the Clock: The Reagan Administration and Civil Rights." *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review* 19(2): 309–47.

Drake, St. Clair, and Horace Cayton. 1993 [1945]. *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dreier, Peter. 1995. "Putting Cities on the National Agenda." *Urban Affairs Review* 30(5): 645–56.

———. 2000. "Labor's Love Lost? Rebuilding Unions' Involvement in Federal Housing Policy." *Housing Policy Debate* 11(2): 327–92.

DuBois, W.E.B. 1996 [1899]. *The Philadelphia Negro*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

———. 1901. "The Freedman's Bureau." *The Atlantic Monthly* 87(March): 354–65.

Farley, Reynolds, Sheldon D. Danziger, and Harry J. Holzer. 2000. *Detroit Divided: Racial and Spatial Inequalities in Employment and Housing*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Farley, Reynolds, Howard Schumann, Suzanne Bianchi, Diane Colasanto, and Shirley Hatchett. 1978. "'Chocolate City, Vanilla Suburb': Will the Trend Toward Racially Separate Communities Continue?" *Social Science Research* 7(4): 319–44.

Farley, Reynolds, Charlotte Steeh, Tara Jackson, and Keith Reeves. 1994. "Stereotypes and Segregation: Neighborhoods in the Detroit Area." *American Journal of Sociology* 100(3): 750–80.

Fix, Michael, and R. Struyk, eds. 1993. *Clear and Convincing Evidence: Measurement of Discrimination in America*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press.

Gephart, Martha A., and Robert W. Pearson. 1988. "Contemporary Research on the Urban Underclass." *Items* 42 (June): 1–10. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Hacker, Andrew. 1992. *Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal*. New York: Scribner's.

Harrison, Bennett, and Barry B. Bluestone. 1988. *The Great U-Turn: Corporate Restructuring and the Polarizing of America*. New York: Basic Books.

Holzer, Harry J. 1991. "The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis: What has the Evidence Shown?" *Urban Studies* 28(1): 105–22.

———. 1996. *What Employers Want: Job Prospects for Less-Educated Workers*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

———. 1998. "Employer Skill Demands and Labor Market Outcomes of Blacks and Women." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 52(1): 82–98.

Jackson, Kenneth T. 1985. *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jencks, Christopher, and Paul E. Peterson, eds. 1991. *The Urban Underclass*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Johnson, James H., Jr., and Melvin L. Oliver. 1989. "Interethnic Minority Conflict in Urban America: The Effects of Economic and Social Dislocations." *Urban Geography* 10(5): 542–62.

Johnson, James H., Jr., Melvin L. Oliver, and Lawrence D. Bobo. 1994. "Understanding the Contours of Deepening Urban Inequality: Theoretical Underpinnings and Research Design of a Multi-City Study." *Urban Geography* 15(1): 77–89.

Kasarda, John D. 1989. "Urban Industrial Transition and the Under-

class." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 501(January): 26–47.

Kirschenman Joleen, and Kathryn M. Neckerman. 1991. " 'We'd Love to Hire Them, But. . . ' : The Meaning of Race for Employers." In *The Urban Underclass*, edited by Christopher Jencks and Paul E. Peterson. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Levy, Frank. 1998. *The New Dollars and Dreams: American Incomes and Economic Change*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Levy, Frank, and Richard J. Murnane. 1992. "U.S. Earnings Levels and Earnings Inequality: A Review of Recent Trends and Proposed Explanations. *Journal of Economic Literature* 30: 1333–81.

Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Mishel, Lawrence, Jared Bernstein, and John Schmitt. 1999. *The State of Working America, 1998–99*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Mohl, Raymond. 1997 [1995]. "Blacks and Hispanics in Multicultural America: A Miami Case Study." Reprinted in *The Making of Urban America,* edited by Raymond Mohl, 2d ed. Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources.

Moss, Philip, and Chris Tilly. 2001. *Stories Employers Tell: Race, Skill, and Hiring in America.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

O'Connor, Alice. 1999. "Swimming Against the Tide: A Brief History of Federal Policy in Poor Communities." In *Urban Problems and Community Development*, edited by Ronald F. Ferguson and William T. Dickens. Washington, D.C.: Brookings.

———. 2000. "Poverty Research for a Post-Welfare Era." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 547–62.

———. 2001. *Poverty Knowledge: Social Science, Social Policy, and the Poor in Twentieth Century U.S. History*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Oliver, Melvin L., and James H. Johnson Jr. 1984. "Interethnic Conflict in an Urban Ghetto: The Case of Blacks and Latinos in Los Angeles." *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change* 6: 57–94.

Oliver, Melvin L., James H. Johnson Jr., and Walter C. Farrell Jr. 1993. "Anatomy of a Rebellion: A Political-Economic Analysis." In *Reading Rodney King/Reading Urban Uprising*, edited by Robert Gooding-Williams. New York: Routledge.

Oliver, Melvin L., and Thomas M. Shapiro. 1995. *Black Wealth/White Wealth*. New York: Routledge.

O'Neill, June. 1990. "The Role of Human Capital in Earnings Differences Between Black and White Men." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 4(Autumn): 25–45.

Patterson, Orlando. 1997. *The Ordeal of Integration: Progress and Resentment in America's "Racial" Crisis*. Washington, D.C.: Civitas Counterpoint.

Portes, Alejandro, and Ruben G. Rumbaut. 1990. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Sassen, Saskia. 1990. "Economic Restructuring and the American City." *Annual Review of Sociology* 16: 465–90.

———. 1991. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Sjoquist, David L. 1996. "Spatial Mismatch and Social Acceptability." Paper presented at the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality Conference, New York, April 1996.

Sjoquist, David L., ed. 2000. *The Atlanta Paradox.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Steinberg, Stephen. 1995. *Turning Back: The Retreat from Racial Justice in American Thought and Policy.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Sugrue, Thomas J. 1996. *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Thernstrom, Stephan, and Abigail Thernstrom. 1997. *America in Black and White: One Nation, Indivisible.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. 1999. *Now is the Time: Places Left Behind in the New Economy*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Waldinger, Roger, and Mehdi Bozorgmehr, eds., 1996. *Ethnic Los Angeles*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

West, Cornel. 1993. *Race Matters*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Williams, Linda Faye. 1998. "Race and the Politics of Social Policy." In *The Social Divide: Political Parties and the Future of Activist Government,* edited by Margaret Weir. New York/Washington, D.C.: Russell Sage/Brookings.

Willie, Charles V., ed. 1979. *The Caste and Class Controversy*. New York: General Hall, Inc.

Wilson, William J. 1980. *The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1990. "Race-Neutral Programs and the Democratic Coalition." *The American Prospect* 1(Spring): 82–89.

———. 1996. *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Knopf.

———. 1999. *The Bridge Over the Racial Divide: Rising Inequality and Coalition Politics.* Berkeley/New York: University of California/Russell Sage Foundation.

Winant, Howard. 2000. "Race and Race Theory." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 169–85.

Wolman, Harold, and Lisa Marckini. 1998. "Changes in Central City Representation and Influence in Congress Since the 1960s." *Urban Affairs Review* 34(2): 291–312.

Understanding inequality in the late twentieth-century metropolis: new perspectives on the enduring racial divide. Alice O'Connor. T. Â Nowhere are these intertwined problems more vividly captured than in the complex economic, gender-based, and racial and ethnic divi-sions of contemporary urban America. In major cities nationwide, over-all economic growth is accompanied by higher than average rates of unemployment and poverty, concentrated especially in low-income, working-class minority neighborhoods that have only recently begun to show signs of recovery following decades of steady decline (U.S. Depart-ment of Housing and Urban Development 1999). Introduction UNDERSTANDING INEQUALITY IN THE LATE TWENTIETH-CENTURY METROPOLIS: NEW PERSPECTIVES ON THE ENDURING RACIAL DIVIDE. (pp. 1-33). Alice O'Connor. The United States enters the new millennium amidst widespread celebration of its vast prosperity. Â Most social and economic inequality across racial groups in American society is rooted in disparities in their position in the labor market. Labor market inequality has been a core concern of a large body of literature in sociology and economics. A substantial literature documents differences in labor market performance and rewards across racial and ethnic groups. the nineteenth century, as the new interest in physics and mathematics is to the philosophy and history of the eighteenth; and the deflationary methods and ironical temper of the historians who wrote after the war of 1914-18 were conspicuously influenced by -- and accepted in terms of -- the new psychological and sociological techniques which had gained public confidence during. Â He understands neither that time nor his own if he does not perceive the contrast between Â And yet to a casual observer of the politics and the thought of the twentieth century it might at first seem that every idea and movement typical of our time is best understood as a natural development of tendencies already prominent in the nineteenth century.