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Racial residential segregation in Dallas public housing projects is analyzed before and after the implementation of the "central tenant assignment plan," adopted in May of 1975. Among the socioeconomically segregated population served by public housing, the effects of race and the nondiscrimination policy are investigated using project occupancy data. Indexes of dissimilarity are used to measure racial segregation, and the racial compositions of the communities in which the projects are located are described using 1970 U.S. census and 1976 Dallas City Profile Survey data.

The findings indicate that the nondiscrimination policy was not effective in reducing the high levels of racial segregation. A small decline in segregation was noted after a change in project administrative personnel late in 1974.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introductory Statements

One result of the processes of urbanization in American society has been the evolution of patterns of residential segregation. People live together in the city, but at the same time they are divided by racial and socioeconomic differences (6, p. 56). Since the Twenties, one of the tasks of the social sciences has been to define and distinguish between racial and socioeconomic segregation (8, p. 94). This is difficult, for the two types of segregation are not independent; American blacks are segregated both by race and by social class.

Patterns of residential segregation may be observed in the slums of the city. Low incomes and ethnic solidarity brought the poor together; discriminatory housing practices serve to keep them apart from the rest of society (2, pp. 109, 123). Blacks and whites may choose to live apart, or separation may be enforced by whites (5, p. 619). The extent of racial discrimination in housing is a major factor in the analysis of residential segregation. Piven and Cloward wrote:
Restricted housing is regarded by reformers as the key factor in creating and maintaining racial barriers, and in turn racial barriers are said to force Negroes into the deteriorated slum; therefore, it is felt that desegregation should be a central objective of housing and re-development for the poor (7, p. 17).

The goal of racial desegregation has been the Achilles' heel of housing programs. Public housing opportunities, were opened for blacks by antidiscrimination laws during the Sixties, but separatist tendencies among low income whites allow only token efforts toward desegregation to be made. As blacks move into a project, whites move out or are reluctant to apply for housing assistance (7, pp. 20-21). In addition, whites may hesitate to live in projects that were constructed in neighborhoods that are predominantly black; the institutionalized goal of racial desegregation must be implemented in the city before it can succeed in the projects. Public housing remains racially segregated. "There is a curious tendency for critics of housing operations to attack local authorities for failing to prevent what society as a whole has been unable to prevent" (4, p. 455).

The Problem

Several studies of residential segregation on a national basis have been completed, comparing the levels of segregation among central cities and Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. The results indicated high
levels of segregation throughout the United States, but the factors of race and social class were usually not considered separately (1, p. 498). The effects of nondiscrimination laws on racial segregation were not analyzed by these studies.

Desegregation has become a major issue in the housing field since the advent of nondiscrimination laws, but the impact of these policies has not been adequately measured. The extent of racial segregation among the low income population served by public housing and the effects of open-housing policies on segregation levels may be measured through an analysis of public housing occupancy data. Residents of public housing are socioeconomically segregated. Using this population, the factors of race and discrimination may be examined as the general causes of residential segregation (3, p. 608).

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze the levels of racial residential segregation in Dallas public housing projects before and after the implementation of an open-housing policy which was designed to assure nondiscrimination in tenant selection and assignment. The study attempts to answer the following questions:
What were the levels of racial residential segregation in Dallas public housing projects from 1970 to 1976?

Did the racial compositions of the projects change between 1970 and 1976?

Was the nondiscrimination policy effective in reducing the levels of racial segregation in the projects?

The Significance of the Study

Racial segregation is a major issue in the housing field, and many efforts have been made to desegregate America's housing. This study attempts to measure the levels of segregation in Dallas public housing in order to evaluate the effectiveness of a nondiscrimination policy. The results help to answer this question: can racial segregation be reduced through federal legislation?

If social class was the primary factor in residential segregation, then areas where persons were of the same socioeconomic status would not be racially segregated (1, p. 514). This study observes one level of America's class structure—the poor—and measures the levels of racial segregation within this category. The extent of racial segregation and the effects of a nondiscrimination policy are examined while the factor of socioeconomic segregation is controlled.

The public housing program has been criticized because its projects were constructed in segregated areas,
for it was assumed that the racial composition of a community determined the racial composition of its project. Public housing projects are observed as integral parts of the communities in which they are located. The assumption of racial homogeneity is tested by comparing the racial compositions of the areas and the projects.

Racial segregation is one of the processes of urbanization. National studies typically use census data to measure segregation at one point in time. Does a static view of segregation present a valid picture of the process? Are levels of segregation increasing, decreasing, or remaining constant? This study observes the levels of racial segregation in Dallas public housing from 1970 to 1976. A contribution to the methodology of housing studies is made; the extent and the process of residential segregation are analyzed.

Major Divisions of the Research Report

This report is divided into five chapters. An introduction to the problem of residential segregation is presented in the first chapter. The purpose of the study is given, and the significance of the research is set forth.

The theoretical focus of the study is presented in Chapter II. The socioeconomic status model of residential
segregation is reviewed, and a summary of studies of racial segregation in American cities is presented. The historical development of open-housing policies which were designed to desegregate public housing is traced. This is followed by discussions of the changing characteristics of public housing residents and project site selection policies.

The methodology of the study is delineated in Chapter II. Data sources and the treatment of the data are described, and the index of dissimilarity is discussed.

The results of the study are presented in Chapter IV. The racial compositions of the projects and the statistical communities in which they were constructed are described. Indexes of dissimilarity are used as measures of racial segregation in the projects from 1970 to 1976.

The conclusions and implications of the study are presented in the final chapter. The impact of open-housing policies on segregation levels is discussed. Also described are problems faced by local housing authorities which hinder their efforts to desegregate public housing projects.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The theoretical focus of this paper and the historical development of open-housing policies are presented in this chapter. The socioeconomic status model of residential segregation is discussed, and this is followed by a review of major studies of racial segregation. The evolution of the central tenant assignment plan is presented. Discussions of the changing characteristics of public housing residents and site selection policies for the construction of public housing are included.

Residential Segregation

Socioeconomic Segregation

The socioeconomic status model of residential segregation and succession was developed by the Chicago school of human ecology. The central thesis of this approach was stated by Park in 1925: "Changes in economic and social status . . . tend to be registered in changes in location" (15, p. 61). As part of their general ecological theory of the development of the city, the Chicago
school traced the sequence of the residential locations of immigrant ethnic populations. Older, often unattractive housing in certain areas near the center of the city is the temporary residence of new arrivals to the city (24, pp. 4-5). As the immigrants or their offspring achieve the same levels of income, education, and occupational prestige as native American whites, they are able to disperse into the surrounding community. Through the processes of invasion and succession, the segregated neighborhoods are then occupied by new immigrant populations which undergo the same inevitable process of assimilation into American culture (9, pp. 1088-1089). The residential segregation of each ethnic population weakens with advancements in the socioeconomic status of its members.

The socioeconomic status model is primarily concerned with the residential segregation of white ethnic populations in Northern cities. It was evident to the early ecologists that social mechanisms were evolving which would effectively control the residential dispersion of blacks. Park cited a 1908 address by Charles Francis Adams: "We are confronted by the obvious fact, as undesirable as it is hard, that the African will only partially assimilate and that he cannot be absorbed" (15, p. 118). The intergenerational process of increased social mobility following gains in socioeconomic status
does not adequately explain the residential segregation of American blacks (23, p. 374).

Implicit in the socioeconomic status model is "the basic assumption that a group's status determines its ability to compete for housing sites in the open market" (17, p. 60). In the absence of racial discrimination, the open market is available only to those who can afford to participate in it. Negroes have lower incomes than whites, and this fact alone acts to restrict the housing opportunities of blacks (24, p. 78). Whites share the economic segregation faced by blacks, since the majority of poor households in America are white. However, a pattern of dual housing markets exists, caused in part by long-established practices of racial segregation in housing. Certain areas of the city are occupied by whites; blacks compete for housing within their own neighborhoods (16, p. 72).

**Racial Segregation**

Several studies of racial residential segregation have been conducted on national, regional, and local bases. Although caution should be exercised when the effects of socioeconomic and racial segregation are not separated (4, p. 498), these studies confirmed that residential segregation by race is much greater than segregation by socioeconomic status in American cities.
A classic example was the study of residential segregation in Chicago by Taeuber and Taeuber. They concluded that, in 1950, income differences among the seventy-five community areas accounted for only fourteen per cent of the observed racial segregation. In 1960, only twelve per cent of the racial segregation could be attributed to income differences (23, p. 374).

Residential segregation in the New York metropolis was examined by Kantrowitz and by Rosenberg and Lake. Using 1960 census data, Kantrowitz (11, p. 4) found high levels of ethnic residential segregation years after the waves of European migration ended. Rosenberg and Lake (18, p. 1143) concluded that the Puerto Rican population remained segregated in the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Manhattan during the Sixties.

Guest and Weed studied segregation in Cleveland from 1930 to 1970 and in Boston and Seattle from 1960 to 1970. They confirmed that ethnic populations are segregated by socioeconomic status, but "ethnic segregation would continue to exist even if social status differences among ethnic groups disappeared" (9, p. 1088). Hermalin and Farley reached a similar conclusion in their study of residential segregation in the twenty-nine largest urbanized areas in the United States from 1960 to 1970: "We believe that economic factors continue to account for
little of the racial segregation of neighborhoods in central cities" (10, p. 608).

Farley extended the analysis to consider the separate effects of racial and socioeconomic segregation. Using 1970 census tract data, Farley measured the residential segregation of blacks and whites while controlling for social class. High levels of racial segregation were found in all twenty-nine urbanized areas among blacks and whites who were of the same socioeconomic status (4, p. 514). Farley wrote:

Racial residential segregation is much more extensive than social class residential segregation. Whites in any social class category are more highly segregated from blacks in that same social class than they are from whites in different social class categories (4, p. 515).

Socioeconomic segregation was also measured within each racial category. Blacks in a particular social class were moderately segregated from blacks in other social classes; whites faced a similar situation. The implication of these findings was that, while high levels of racial segregation exist in American cities, there is "a great deal of within-tract heterogeneity of social class groups" (4, p. 505).

Public housing projects may be viewed as testing grounds for racial desegregation in residential areas. The projects are integral parts of the neighborhoods in which they were constructed, and they are subject to the
process of residential segregation. Public housing represents a form of socioeconomic segregation, for the poor are clustered together in apartment complexes. The residents of the majority of the projects are also racially segregated (8, p. 216). Policies designed to encourage desegregation have been initiated by the federal government and local housing authorities. The historical development of these policies is presented below, and the effectiveness of the "central tenant assignment plan" is analyzed in following sections.

Desegregation Policies

In 1896, the United States Supreme Court, in the case of Plessy v. Ferguson, established the "separate but equal" doctrine. Racial segregation was allowed in every form of public facility. "It was within this legal and political framework that federally-assisted public housing was initiated" during the Thirties (20, p. 608).

The failure of the mortgage market during the Depression brought foreclosure to thousands of homeowners. To counter this trend, the National Housing Act of 1934 created the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Federal National Mortgage Association (12, pp. 5-6). The Federal Housing Administration developed policies of racial segregation which remained in effect until 1950.
In its Underwriting Manual, the FHA declared racial homogeneity to be essential for the financial stability of a neighborhood. An area which had been infiltrated by "inharmonious racial or nationality groups" was an unlikely candidate for housing assistance (2, pp. 523-524). The FHA was primarily involved in housing for the working and middle classes, but its policies were indicative of official attitudes towards segregation.

The Housing Act of 1937 was sponsored by Senator Robert Wagner of New York. Its purposes were to expand slum clearance efforts initiated during the Depression, to provide employment, and to create the conventional public housing program. Local authorities developed and managed low-income housing. The federal government financed the program by authorizing "annual federal contributions to amortize the capital costs... The federal contribution allowed rents to be reduced so that families otherwise unable to afford adequate shelter could be properly housed" (25, p. 12). No provision was made for families who were too poor to afford even the reduced rentals of subsidized housing. In effect, recipients of relief funds were excluded from public housing. The projects were designed for "deserving but underpaid workers--innocent victims of economic reverses, who
needed a 'break' to tide them over the lean years" (6, p. 109).

Construction of public housing projects did not begin on a national basis until the onset of World War II. In support of the defense mobilization effort, Public Law 171 was passed in June of 1940. This bill waived the low income eligibility standards for admission to the projects, allowing defense workers to live in public housing. At the end of the war, approximately 100,000 units were occupied and hundreds of local housing authorities were fully staffed. A Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development decided in August of 1945 to continue the public housing program (21, pp. 111-112). They wrote:

The local authorities had substantial vested institutional interests not only in continuing to handle the projects already in being, but in resuming the program for which they had been created, and which had been preempted by the war (21, p. 112).

Racial desegregation was not a policy of the local authorities. The United States Commission on Civil Rights, in its 1963 report to the President, stated that "at the end of World War II, virtually all public housing in America was segregated" (20, p. 608).

Political sanctions concerning racial segregation were debated during the years following World War II. A Supreme Court decision in 1948 ruled against racial
covenants in property transfers (22, p. 438). Congressmen from Southern states, including Mississippi, South Carolina, Virginia, and Texas, were actively opposed to desegregation and were able to delete an antidiscrimination clause from the Housing Act of 1949 (5, p. 138), which promised "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family" (26, pp. 10-11). In 1950, the Federal Housing Administration deleted its requirement that a neighborhood be racially homogenous (22, p. 438). Following the case of Brown v. Board of Education in 1954, "two circuit courts of appeal ruled that government-enforced segregation in public housing denied citizens the equal protection of the law and was, therefore, in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment" (20, p. 608). By 1960, public housing projects in thirty-two states were operating on an open-occupancy basis. The following cities had anti-segregation policies: New York, Los Angeles, Cleveland, Pittsburg, Seattle, Boston, and Newark (5, p. 138).

The executive branch of the federal government first attempted to assure nondiscrimination in public housing when John F. Kennedy issued Executive Order 11063, entitled "Equal Opportunity in Housing," on November 20, 1962. This order had little impact on housing
segregation, for it applied only to newly constructed projects and lacked enforcement regulations (19, p. 187).

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 codified the federal government's policy on nondiscrimination. Title VI stated:

No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance (19, p. 188).

Federal enforcement regulations under Title VI became effective on January 1, 1965. These laws applied to all federally-assisted housing projects and urban renewal agencies. For public housing, Title VI required "the elimination of discrimination not only in the selection and assignment of tenants but also in the selection of sites for projects and in the provision of services" (20, p. 608).

In August of 1965, local housing authorities were given federally-approved plans to end discrimination in tenant selection and assignment. Local officials were allowed to choose between or to combine "first come first served" and "freedom of choice" plans. Many chose the latter method, which, in retrospect, did not guarantee freedom of choice in housing (20, p. 609). In 1967, the following statement was issued by the general counsel of
the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which was created by the Housing Act of 1965:

Under these plans, the entire burden for expressing a choice of project or location was upon the individual applicants, who were to make this choice in many communities in which segregated housing patterns [had] been traditional. In such situations, for various reasons, such as the mores of the community, fear of reprisals, types of neighborhoods, inducement by local authorities—whether by subtle suggestion, manipulation, persuasion, or otherwise—or other factors or combinations, such 'freedom of choice' plans, in their operation, did not provide applicants with actual freedom of access to, or full availability of, housing in all projects and locations. The existence of a segregated pattern of occupancy was in itself a major obstacle to true freedom of choice, since few applicants [had] the courage to make a choice by which they would be the first to change the pattern. Even without inducement of local authority staff, the plans tended to perpetuate patterns of social segregation and consequently separate treatment (20, p. 609).

In short, the 1965 tenant assignment plans did not assure nondiscrimination in housing. In many cases, they contributed to the continuation of segregated housing patterns.

In 1967, HUD administratively developed a modification of the 1965 tenant assignment procedures in order to elicit compliance of public housing management with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This was done at the request of Lyndon B. Johnson, who had not been able to get Congress to enact a comprehensive fair housing law during the 1966 and 1967 sessions (20, p. 609).
The "central tenant assignment" or "limited freedom of choice" plan was officially adopted by HUD on October 28, 1967. Applicants for public housing were placed, without regard for their race, on a "first come first served" basis in projects having the highest vacancy rates. Three consecutive project locations were offered to each applicant; refusal to accept housing in one of the three locations, with certain exceptions, caused the applicant's name to be placed at the bottom of a community-wide eligibility list. This procedure was intended to end segregation in public housing, but it was not immediately utilized by local housing authorities. After a change in personnel at the executive level late in 1974, the Dallas Housing Authority implemented the plan on May 20, 1975 (3).

Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 prohibited discrimination in the "financing, advertising, brokerage, sale, and rental of housing." It required that affirmative fair housing plans be developed for all federally-subsidized housing programs. The role of HUD was limited to the recording and investigating of complaints from the public. Essentially, Title VIII was a restatement of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, but the 1968 Act delegated the responsibility of
enforcing nondiscrimination in housing to the Justice Department (19, p. 188).

Before 1969, federal public housing subsidies consisted of annual contributions to amortize capital costs and direct subsidies for units occupied by elderly or handicapped tenants, which were authorized by the Housing Act of 1961. Section 213(a) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969, known as the Brooke Amendment, lowered the amount of rent charged for a public housing unit to twenty-five per cent of a tenant's income. Congress then authorized an increase in public housing subsidies to cover the difference between project operating expenses and the amount of rental income received under the new procedure (26, p. 20). This change insured that families with extremely low incomes could live in public housing (25, p. 15). The Brooke Amendment contributed to the rising costs of the programs to subsidize project operating expenses, which increased from $33 million in 1969 to $280 million in 1973. On January 5, 1973, Richard Nixon cited this increase as a major justification for suspending a great majority of new applications to HUD for the construction of federally-subsidized low and moderate income housing projects. This "freeze" signaled the end of construction
of conventional public housing projects (14, pp. 30263-30264).

The Residents of Public Housing

"The public housing program has historically served several distinct population groups. Before and during World War II, public housing is claimed to have represented a clearly desirable sign of middle-class mobility" (27, p. 867). The program was designed to assist the unfortunate victims of the Depression. Low income eligibility standards were waived during World War II, allowing defense workers to live in the projects. In the Fifties, public housing was occupied by the working poor. The Sixties and Seventies saw proportional increases of the dependent poor, partly as a consequence of the Brooke Amendment in 1969 (6, pp. 20-21, 109). In 1960, thirty-five per cent of the applicants for public housing received welfare assistance. By 1972, seventy-one per cent were receiving benefits. Racial and ethnic minority families occupied sixty per cent of America's public housing in 1972; projects in several cities were 100 per cent black. "The combination of poverty linked with minority group status has served to stigmatize public housing in many cases as a kind of undesirable 'housing of last resort'" (26, p. 154).
An important factor in the changing status of public housing residents was the general decline in the quality of life of the central city. According to the socio-economic status model of residential segregation and succession, the central city was once the home of the upwardly mobile poor. Public housing was designed to clear the slums and to provide adequate housing for this population (27, p. 867). After World War II, middle- and working-class families moved out of the city and into the suburbs. This trend, coupled with a general lack of employment for young persons and black in-migrants, resulted in an increase in the numbers of the dependent poor in central city neighborhoods (13, p. 443). The residents of public housing mirrored this trend. Since many of the dependent poor were black, the problems of racial segregation in public housing were intimately tied to the decline of the urban economy (1, p. 125).

Site Selection Policies

During the Sixties, there was increasing criticism of the site selection policies of local housing authorities. Public housing construction was tied to slum clearance by the Housing Acts of 1937 and 1949. Over eighty per cent of the projects were located in run-down central city neighborhoods which were already inhabited by low-status racial and ethnic groups (7, p. 124).
Although support for public housing may have brought votes from the low income population, few city officials found it politically wise to locate projects in their home districts (5, pp. 112-115). There was a similar consensus among suburban city governments to exclude public housing developments, simply by not authorizing the construction of multi-family dwellings (8, pp. 272, 619). Public housing was kept out of the suburbs; in the central cities, it was located in undesirable neighborhoods.

One result of these site selection practices was racial segregation in public housing (5, p. 147). The Housing Act of 1968 did not specify guidelines to remedy this situation. Instead, Section 223(e) allowed the continuance of federal assistance for the construction of projects "located in older, declining urban areas" (26, p. 102). The dispersal of public housing tenants into residential neighborhoods under the leased housing program (currently known as Section Eight of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974) and the Turnkey method of project acquisition (where privately developed projects are purchased by local housing authorities) eliminated the site selection problems associated with the construction of conventional public housing (3).
These new methods did not counter the trend of racial segregation in the older projects.

Summary

Three factors involved in the study of residential segregation are social class, race, and the absence or presence of open-housing policies. The studies of socio-economic and racial segregation indicated the importance of the racial factor. Open housing was assured in Dallas public housing when the local authority adopted the "central tenant assignment plan" in May of 1975; any qualified household, regardless of race, could move into public housing. However, residents of public housing tend to be the dependent poor who live in central city neighborhoods. Since many of these people are black, racial segregation exists in public housing.


3. Darnell, William, personal interview, Executive Director, Dallas Housing Authority, Dallas, Texas, February 3, 1977.


CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter deals with the data and methods used to analyze the levels of racial residential segregation in Dallas public housing before and after the implementation of the "central tenant assignment plan." The projects and the statistical communities in which they are located are described. Data sources and the treatment of the data are presented, and the index of dissimilarity is discussed.

The Area of Analysis

The fifteen public housing projects are described in Table I, and their locations within nine statistical communities are shown in Figure 1. Eleven conventional projects were constructed under the Housing Acts of 1937 and 1949. Three of these projects--Cedar Springs Place, Frazier Court, and Washington Place--were enlarged by the addition of second phases, but each is considered to be one complex. The West Dallas Housing Park is treated as three separate projects: Edgar Ward, Elmer Scott
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Number on Figure 1</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Completion Date(s)</th>
<th>Statistical Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brackins Village</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Trinity--South Central Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Brooks Manor--elderly</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Jefferson--Cockrell Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cedar Springs Place</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1937, 1942</td>
<td>Love Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cliff Manor--elderly</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Jefferson--Cockrell Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Edgar Ward</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>West Dallas--Stemmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Elmer Scott Place</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>West Dallas--Stemmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Frazier Court</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>1943, 1952</td>
<td>South Dallas--Fair Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>George Loving Place</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>West Dallas--Stemmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Little Mexico</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Oak Lawn--Central Business District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Park Manor--elderly</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>South Dallas--Fair Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rhodes Terrace</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>W.R.C. Industrial--Jim Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Roseland Homes</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>East Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Turner Courts</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>W.R.C. Industrial--Jim Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Turnkey III</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Simpson Stuart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Washington Place</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>1943, 1945</td>
<td>East Dallas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1--Locations of Public Housing Projects in Dallas
Place, and George Loving Place. Without exception, these eleven conventional public housing projects are located in low-income, deteriorating communities surrounding the center of the city. The Turnkey III project was completed in 1970. It is located in the Simpson Stuart community, which is a low-income area south of the Central Business District. There are three high-rise apartment complexes designed for elderly households. Park Manor was built in the low income South Dallas community, and Brooks Manor and Cliff Manor were constructed in the Jefferson community, which may be classified as a middle-income area.

The Data

Data Sources

The Dallas Housing Authority provided biannual occupancy reports on the racial compositions of its projects from 1970 to 1976. The racial compositions of low-income households in the nine statistical communities containing public housing were estimated from 1970 census tract records provided by the Department of Urban Planning in Dallas. Comparable data from the 1976 Dallas City Profile Survey were obtained from the city's Department of Housing and Urban Rehabilitation.
Public Housing Occupancy Reports

Processes of racial residential segregation were analyzed using data from 183 biannual occupancy reports issued by the Dallas Housing Authority from June, 1970, to June, 1976. Each occupancy report included data on the racial composition of a project. The level of racial residential segregation in Dallas public housing on a particular date was computed from these data. Each report also included the ethnicity of households which had moved into a project within the previous six months. These data were used to test the effectiveness of the "central tenant assignment plan" as an open-housing policy.

The ethnic categories used by the occupancy reports were black, white, Mexican-American, American Indian, and other races. Few American Indian, Cuban, and Oriental households were reported; their numbers were combined in this analysis with data on Mexican-Americans. Three categories--black, white, and Mexican-American--were used to describe the racial compositions of the projects. To compute the segregation indexes, discussed in a following section, the three categories were further collapsed by classifying Mexican-Americans as white. For example, Little Mexico was described as a Mexican-American project
but classified as white when the segregation indexes were computed.

Occupancy reports dated June 30, 1970, from the eleven conventional public housing projects were selected as the beginning point of the analysis. The Turnkey III project and the three high-rise complexes for the elderly were not completed on this date. The level of racial residential segregation could therefore be determined without the influence of these newer developments. Earlier reports categorized the ethnicity of households in terms of white and nonwhite, so the number of Mexican-American households could not be accurately estimated. In addition, it was assumed that 1970 data could be compared with the results of the 1970 census.

The final occupancy reports included in this analysis were dated June 30, 1976. These data were compared to the 1976 City Profile Survey of households in Dallas. An annual occupancy reporting system was implemented after this date, which categorized the ethnicity of project residents as black or white. The number of Mexican-American households could not be determined from the reports, and the continuity of the biannual reports was disrupted by the new procedure.
In the first stage of the analysis, racial segregation was examined using all of the projects. Data from the three high-rise projects for the elderly were omitted from the second stage, because the "central tenant assignment plan" could not be used to control their racial composition. The plan specified that each applicant for housing would choose an apartment from one of the three projects that had the highest vacancy rates. However, only three projects for the elderly existed in Dallas, and if an applicant did not approve of the racial composition of one complex, another project could be selected. In effect, an unrestricted freedom of choice procedure existed, leading to racial segregation among the high-rise projects (1).

**Statistical Communities**

In 1968 and 1969, the city of Dallas was divided into thirty-three geographical sub-areas in order to facilitate urban planning and citizen involvement in community affairs. The boundaries of these communities were drawn to include areas which were commonly known and recognizable to Dallas residents. After the 1970 census, these communities were redefined as aggregates of census tracts (5, pp. 1-3). In the 1976 Dallas City Profile Survey, the number of statistical communities was reduced from
thirty-three to twenty by aggregating data from certain contiguous communities. Nine of these twenty areas contained public housing projects.

Estimates of the number of low-income households, by race, which were eligible for public housing in 1970 and 1976 were made for each of the nine statistical communities containing projects. At the time of application for a public housing unit, each household provided adequate evidence that its income for the twelve-month period after admittance would not exceed the maximum allowable household income established for initial public housing occupancy (4, p. 28). The maximum allowable household incomes, by size of household, in 1970 and 1976 are presented in Table II. Using 1970 census and 1976 City Profile Survey data, the number of households by race, income, and number of persons was determined for each of the nine communities. The number of households by race that were eligible for public housing in each statistical community was obtained by including only those households whose incomes in 1970 and 1976 were lower than the respective maximum income figures. These estimates permitted the comparison of the racial composition of a project with the racial composition of low-income households living in the area which contained the project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Personal Interview with William Darnell, Executive Director, Dallas Housing Authority, Dallas, Texas, February 3, 1977.*
The major difficulty encountered in the 1976 survey data was one of non-response to the question on household income. This was especially prevalent in the West Dallas -- Stemmons and Simpson Stuart communities. The non-response rate approached forty-five per cent in these areas. The rate in the White Rock Creek Industrial--Jim Miller community was twenty-nine per cent. Other statistical communities had relatively low non-response rates of approximately twelve per cent. No allocations of these non-response data were made. Estimates of the number of low-income households were derived from the number of households who reported their incomes.

The Index of Dissimilarity

The index of dissimilarity (D), a segregation index discussed by Duncan and Duncan (2, p. 211), was used to measure the racial segregation of black and white households in the Dallas projects. This index is considered to be a standard measure of residential dissimilarity and segregation (7, p. 14).

"The index indicates the percentage of one population that would have to redistribute itself in order to have the same percent distribution by spatial units as another population" (3, p. 30). In other words, it gives the percentage of black households that would have to change their place of residence, being replaced by an
equal number of white households, in order to achieve an equal areal distribution of racial groups throughout an area at a certain time. It is a measure of the unevenness of population distributions (6, p. 64).

Two sets of desegregation indexes were computed using the project data. The first set analyzed the racial composition of all residents in the Dallas projects. Since segregation in public housing was the result of the inequitable placement of applicants, the second set of indexes measured the segregation of households which had moved into the projects within the six-month period preceding each occupancy report date.

The following formula was adapted from Taeuber and Taeuber (8, p. 236) to compute the indexes of dissimilarity:

\[ D = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{B_i - W_i}{B_i + W_i}}{2} \times 100 \]

where \( D \) represents the segregation index for each set of biannual project occupancy reports from June, 1970, to June, 1976. \( B_i \) is the number of black households living in (or recently moved into) project \( i \). \( B \) is the total number of black households living in (or recently moved into) all projects. \( W_i \) is the number of white and Mexican-American households living in (or recently moved into) all projects.
into) project \( i \). \( W \) is the total number of white and Mexican-American households living in (or recently moved into) all projects. \( N \) is the number of public housing projects. The index is the sum of the absolute proportional differences between blacks and whites in all public housing projects, divided by two (6, p. 64).

When converted to percentages, the scores range from 0 to 100. A low index value indicates that black and white households are equally distributed throughout the public housing projects. A score of 100 indicates that no project has both blacks and whites living in it. High values indicate high levels of racial residential segregation (9, p. 829).

There are several limitations on the use of the index of dissimilarity. (1) It indicates the percentage of households that would have to be redistributed to achieve desegregation "but gives no information about how far or in what direction this move must occur." (2) It is not a measure of racial residential clustering. (3) The unit of analysis affects the value of the index (6, p. 14). The effects of these limitations are minimized through the use of the index as a summary measure of the levels of racial residential segregation among Dallas public housing projects from 1970 to 1976.
The process of redistribution, ghettoization, and intra-project segregation are not analyzed.

Summary

The methodological procedures followed during the course of this investigation of racial residential segregation in Dallas public housing projects from June, 1970, to June, 1976, have been reported in this chapter. The projects were the area of analysis, and their locations within the central city have been illustrated. The treatment of the 183 biannual occupancy reports has been described, and the application of the index of dissimilarity as a summary measure of racial residential segregation has been discussed. Also discussed were the procedures used to determine the number of low-income households by race who were eligible in 1970 and 1976 for public housing in each of the nine statistical communities containing projects.
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CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The results of the study of racial residential segregation in Dallas public housing projects are presented in this chapter. First described are the racial compositions of the projects and the statistical communities in which they were constructed. Indexes of dissimilarity are then used as measures of segregation in the projects from 1970 to 1976.

The Racial Compositions of Projects and Communities

On June 30, 1970, there were 6,369 units of conventional public housing in Dallas, and ninety-one per cent (5,832) were occupied. The racial composition of these units was eighty-one per cent black, fourteen per cent white, and five per cent Mexican-American.

Three high-rise projects designed for elderly households and the Turnkey III project were constructed during the early Seventies. When Park Manor opened in 1970, seventy-nine per cent of its 156 units were rented by elderly black households, and twenty-one per cent of its
units were leased to elderly whites. Black households moved into the Turnkey III project when it opened in 1970, and elderly whites occupied Brooks Manor (1971) and Cliff Manor (1974).

From June, 1970, to June, 1976, 10,796 households moved into public housing in Dallas, and blacks constituted an increasing majority of these households. Eighty per cent of the 4,362 households which moved into the projects between June, 1970, and December, 1972, were black. Fifteen per cent of the households were white, and six per cent were Mexican-American. Eighty-four per cent of the 6,434 units that were rented between January, 1973, and June, 1976, were occupied by blacks. Eleven per cent of the apartments were rented by whites, and five per cent were leased by Mexican-American households.

There were 7,374 units of public housing in Dallas on June 30, 1976. The occupancy rate dropped from ninety-one per cent in 1970 to eighty-three per cent (6,096 occupied units) in 1976 due to high vacancy rates in the West Dallas projects and the Turnkey III complex. The racial composition of the projects was eighty-three per cent black, thirteen per cent white, and four per cent Mexican-American.

Whether one considers all households living in the projects or the households who moved into public housing
between 1970 and 1976, the racial composition of the tenants averaged about eighty-two per cent black, thirteen per cent white, and five per cent Mexican-American. An equitable distribution of all households by race throughout the projects would result in each project having the above racial composition. Table III presents the actual racial compositions of the public housing projects in 1970 and 1976. Comparable data are presented for low income households in the nine statistical communities.

The percentages of low income households that were black increased in both the projects and in the statistical communities. The majority of households of all races that were eligible for public housing lived in these nine communities. Three categories were used to classify the areas: predominantly black, predominantly white, and racially mixed. The racial compositions of the projects were compared to the racial compositions of the communities in which they were located, using the data in Table III.

In 1970 and 1976, blacks constituted the majority of households that reported low incomes in four statistical communities: Trinity--South Central Industrial, West Dallas--Stemmons, South Dallas--Fair Park, and Simpson Stuart. Seven projects were located in these
TABLE III
RACIAL COMPOSITIONS OF STATISTICAL COMMUNITIES AND PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS: 1970 AND 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical Community* Public Housing Project**</th>
<th>Black Low Income Households</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Dallas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseland Homes</td>
<td>1,604</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,306</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Place</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>626</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson--Cockrell Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks Manor</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>255</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff Manor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Springs Place</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Lawn--Central Business District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Mexico</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>692</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson Stuart</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>515</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnkey III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dallas--Fair Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazier Court</td>
<td>8,533</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,898</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Manor</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>503</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity--White Rock Creek Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brackins Village</td>
<td>3,059</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,556</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dallas--Stemmons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar Ward</td>
<td>4,002</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,823</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer Scott Place</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Loving Place</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>352</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dallas--Fair Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazier Court</td>
<td>8,533</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,898</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Manor</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>503</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity--White Rock Creek Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brackins Village</td>
<td>3,059</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,556</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dallas--Stemmons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar Ward</td>
<td>4,002</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,823</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer Scott Place</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Loving Place</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>352</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dallas--Fair Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazier Court</td>
<td>8,533</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,898</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Manor</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>503</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity--White Rock Creek Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brackins Village</td>
<td>3,059</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,556</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dallas--Stemmons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar Ward</td>
<td>4,002</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,823</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer Scott Place</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Loving Place</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>352</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dallas--Fair Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazier Court</td>
<td>8,533</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,898</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Manor</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>503</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity--White Rock Creek Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brackins Village</td>
<td>3,059</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,556</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dallas--Stemmons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar Ward</td>
<td>4,002</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,823</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer Scott Place</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Loving Place</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>352</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dallas--Fair Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazier Court</td>
<td>8,533</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,898</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Manor</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>503</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity--White Rock Creek Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brackins Village</td>
<td>3,059</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,556</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dallas--Stemmons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar Ward</td>
<td>4,002</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,823</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer Scott Place</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Loving Place</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>352</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dallas--Fair Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazier Court</td>
<td>8,533</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,898</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Manor</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>503</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: 1970 U. S. Census, Department of Urban Planning, Dallas, Texas; 1976 Dallas City Profile Survey, Department of Housing and Urban Rehabilitation, Dallas, Texas.

TABLE III --Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White Low Income Households</th>
<th>Mexican-American Low Income Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,832</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,121</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,348</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
communities, and all reported that the majority of their tenants were black. In 1970 and 1971, an increase in the percentage of black households was observed at Elmer Scott Place. Its racial composition changed from fifty-seven per cent black and thirty-nine per cent Mexican-American in 1970 to eighty-five per cent black and fifteen per cent Mexican-American in 1976.

The Jefferson--Cockrell Hill statistical community was a middle-income area that was predominantly white in 1970. By 1976, its population had changed to include larger proportions of low-income black and Mexican-American households. The two projects for the elderly in this community--Brooks Manor and Cliff Manor--were occupied by white households.

Love Field, Oak Lawn--Central Business District, White Rock Creek Industrial--Jim Miller, and East Dallas were racially mixed statistical communities, and the six projects located within these areas varied in their racial compositions. Increases in the percentages of black and Mexican-American households were evident at Cedar Springs Place after June of 1974. This project was ninety-five per cent white in 1970, but by 1976, blacks occupied sixteen per cent of the units, and twenty-two per cent were rented by Mexican-Americans. Rhoads Terrace, Turner Courts, and Roseland Homes were occupied
by black households. Washington Place underwent the transition from white to black occupancy between 1970 and 1976. The racial composition of this project in 1976—seventy-seven per cent black, seventeen per cent white, and six per cent Mexican-American—approximated the equitable distribution of households by race in Dallas public housing.

Indexes of Dissimilarity

Indexes of dissimilarity are used to measure the evenness of the distributions of black and white households among the Dallas public housing projects, based on biannual occupancy reports from June, 1970, to June, 1976. Data concerning Mexican-American households were included in the racial category "white." The indexes are summary measures of the extent of racial residential segregation in the Dallas projects.

Table IV presents two sets of indexes of dissimilarity for all households in the Dallas public housing projects from June, 1970, to June, 1976. All of the projects are included in the first set, and the second set excludes the three high-rise projects for the elderly. When all of the projects are considered, no changes in the levels of racial segregation are noted during the six-year period. The mean value of the indexes is 79.3, and the observed indexes do not vary from this mean.
### TABLE IV

**INDEXES OF DISSIMILARITY FOR ALL HOUSEHOLDS IN DALLAS PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Date</th>
<th>All Public Housing</th>
<th>Non-elderly Public Housing*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June, 1970</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 1970</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1971</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 1971</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1972</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 1972</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1973</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 1973</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1974</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 1974</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1975</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 1975</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1976</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes Brooks Manor, Cliff Manor, and Park Manor.*
Similar high levels of racial segregation are indicated by the second set of indexes. In general, the values average 78.0, but they decrease after June of 1974, indicating small declines in the levels of racial segregation in the non-elderly projects. The indexes of dissimilarity remain high and relatively constant even though the racial compositions of certain projects changed. This indicates that, when all households are considered, no real gains were made towards the goal of racial desegregation in Dallas public housing from 1970 to 1976.

Racial segregation in public housing was the result of the inequitable placement of households by race throughout the projects. Since all households living in the projects were included when computing the indexes presented in Table IV, it could not be determined whether households which moved into public housing between January, 1970, and June, 1976, were segregated by race. Therefore, another two sets of indexes of dissimilarity were computed, and these indexes are presented in Table V. They measure the extent to which black and white applicants for public housing were evenly dispersed throughout the projects.

The first set of indexes presented in Table V measures the racial segregation of households which moved
TABLE V

INDEXES OF DISSIMILARITY FOR HOUSEHOLDS WHICH
MOVED INTO PUBLIC HOUSING DURING THE
SIX-MONTH PERIOD PRECEDING
THE REPORT DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Date</th>
<th>All Public Housing</th>
<th>Non-elderly Public Housing*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June, 1970</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 1970</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1971</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 1971</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1972</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 1972</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1973</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 1973</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1974</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 1974</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1975</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 1975</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1976</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes Brooks Manor, Cliff Manor, and Park Manor.
into all of the Dallas projects. The index values increase from December, 1971, to June, 1973, and decrease after June, 1974. High levels of segregation are evident for the June, 1971, and June, 1974, occupancy reports. These scores resulted from the opening of Brooks Manor and Cliff Manor; both projects were occupied by elderly white households.

The second set of indexes excludes the three high-rise developments for the elderly. The opening of the Turnkey III project late in 1970 resulted in an index value of 79.2 and a subsequent decline of 69.5 for the June, 1971, report. An increase in racial segregation is noted for households which moved into the non-elderly projects between June, 1971, and June, 1973. The segregation index drops from 74.4 for the six-month period prior to June, 1974, to 58.7 for the December, 1974, occupancy report--a decrease of almost sixteen percentage points. The segregation index values remain at about 63 for the year preceding June, 1976.

The slight decline in the indexes reported in Table IV for all residents of the non-elderly projects may be attributed to the decrease in the racial segregation of households who moved into public housing after June, 1974. Levels of segregation were not reduced by moving white households into all-black projects; black households
moved into Elmer Scott Place, Washington Place, and Cedar Springs Place.

Summary

The racial compositions of the projects and the nine statistical communities and the results of the analysis of racial residential segregation in the Dallas projects have been presented in this chapter. In order to summarize the results, the research questions proposed in Chapter I are answered.

What were the levels of racial residential segregation in Dallas public housing projects from 1970 to 1976?

Low-income households in the projects were highly segregated by race. In general, the levels of segregation did not change between 1970 and 1976, but decreases in the segregation of new applicants for public housing were noted after June, 1974.

Did the racial compositions of the projects change between 1970 and 1976?

Projects that were predominantly black in 1970 remained so in 1976. One complex in a racially mixed statistical community contained Mexican-American households, and two newer projects in a white statistical community were occupied by elderly white households. Increases in the proportions of black households were
noted in projects that were located in black and racially mixed statistical communities.

Was the nondiscrimination policy effective in reducing the levels of racial segregation in the projects?

The "central tenant assignment plan," adopted in May, 1975, was not effective in reducing the levels of segregation. Lower levels of segregation of households which moved into the projects after June, 1974, were observed, but the decrease in segregation occurred about six months before the implementation of the open-housing policy.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The eleven conventional public housing projects located within the central city of Dallas were opened during a time when racial segregation was prevalent. Efforts to desegregate public housing were made by the federal government during the Sixties, but these policies were not effective (5, p. 435). As a result, residents of the Dallas projects were found to be racially segregated when the June, 1970, occupancy reports were analyzed. Segregation continued into the Seventies; only one of the four projects constructed during the early Seventies contained both black and white households.

After a change in administrative personnel late in 1974, the Dallas Housing Authority adopted the "central tenant assignment plan" on May 20, 1975. This procedure was not effective in reducing racial segregation in the projects. Although the racial compositions of three projects changed to include more black households, high levels of segregation were noted for each set of occupancy reports when all residents were considered.
Racial segregation in public housing was the result of the inequitable placement of applicants for housing units. Two factors determined the selection of a project: the preference of the applicant and the force of discriminatory housing policies. For households which moved into the non-elderly projects (Table V), the indexes of dissimilarity dropped from 74.4 to 58.7 after June of 1974. This improvement in the placement of households preceded the adoption of the "central tenant assignment plan," and it corresponded with the changes in administrative personnel in the Dallas Housing Authority. An interpretation of this result is that racial discrimination was minimized at the local level late in 1974; the observed levels of segregation in 1975 and 1976 may have resulted from applicants' preferences to live in projects where their racial group constituted a majority. If nondiscrimination policies at the local level continued for several years, it is possible that racial segregation could be reduced but not eliminated in public housing.

The achievement of the goal of racial desegregation in public housing depends, to a considerable degree, on the support of the goal by the local authorities (4, pp. 156-158). However, they may not be able to effectively control the racial compositions of their projects in the face of increasing numbers of black applicants. They must contend
with the possibility that their projects will become one-
hundred per cent black despite official policies which
encourage desegregation (6, pp. 872-873). In the Dallas
projects, eighty-four per cent of the applicants were
black. Desegregation could only be achieved by moving
these black applicants into white or racially mixed
projects; few whites were available to desegregate pre-
dominantly black projects. In time, this trend would
result in all projects being black.

One solution to the problem of too many black appli-
cants is to recruit white tenants. There are three major
difficulties underlying this approach. First, one cannot
estimate the need for public housing among the white
population. Table III indicates that there were approxi-
mately 20,000 white households in the nine statistical
communities which were eligible for public housing in
1976. This high figure does not represent their need for
public housing, as being eligible for assistance does not
mean that one needs assistance (3, p. 447). Second,
whites may be reluctant to apply for housing in projects
that are predominantly black (5, p. 435). Finally, once
whites are accepted for public housing, they tend to move
out faster than do blacks (1, p. 116). Because of these
difficulties, recruitment of white tenants as an effort to
desegregate black projects is probably not justified.
Whether one is considering the extent of racial segregation in public housing, in school systems, or in other forms of social institutions, the goal of racial desegregation should be implemented in the housing patterns of the cities before it can succeed in the institutions. High levels of racial segregation exist in American cities (2, p. 497). The norms which reinforce these levels of segregation have to be altered before significant changes can be made in any one social institution (3, p. 455). Desegregation policies which are applicable to public housing must be accompanied by normative changes in the city, in order to be effective.
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