C. C. H. R.
PAMPHLET
FILE

TOWARDS A SOCIAL GEOGRAPHY OF NEW YORK CITY

Harold Goldblatt and Mildred Zander

Report No. 16

City of New York
COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
August, 1964

STANLEY H. LOWELL
Chairman

ROBERT F. WAGNER
Mayor

MADISON S. JONES
Executive Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Education, Occupation, and Income as Measures of Area Status

The SES of an Area and Segregation

The SES of Tracts and Change in Their Racial Composition

SES Scores of the Boroughs and of Individual Tracts

Appendix A: Computation of SES Scores

Appendix B: Method for Estimating White and Nonwhite Population for the Portion of a 1950 Census Tract Coded to an Adjacent Census Tract

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Educational and Occupational Levels of Census Tracts

Table 2 Educational and Income Levels of Census Tracts

Table 3 Occupational and Income Levels of Tracts

Table 4 Racial Compostion of Tracts in 1960 by Median Number of Years of Formal Schooling

Table 5 Racial Composition of Tracts in 1960 by Per Cent Males Employed in White Collar Jobs

Table 6 Racial Composition of Tracts in 1960 by Median Family Income of Tract

Table 7 Racial Composition of Tracts in 1960 by Their Educational and Occupational Levels

Table 8 Per Cent of Tracts White or Nearly All-White by Per Cent of Male White-Collar Workers, Median Number of School Years, and Median Family income

Table 9 Census Tract SES Score and Racial Composition, 1960

Table 10 Census Tract SES Score and Puerto Rican Percentage, 1960

Table 11 Census Tract SES Score and Percentage Change in Nonwhite Population, 1950 - 1960

Table 12 Census Tract SES Score and Percentage Change in White Population, 1950 - 1960

Table 13 Distribution of Census Tracts Varying in SES by Borough

Table 14 SES Scores for Bronx Tracts

Table 15 SES Scores for Brooklyn Tracts

Table 16 SES Scores for Manhattan Tracts

Table 17 SES Scores for Queens Tracts

Table 18 SES Scores for Richmond Tracts

TOWARDS A SOCIAL GEOGRAPHY OF NEW YORK CITY

Harold Goldblatt and Mildred Zander

Introduction

The objective of the present report is to relate the distribution of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in New York in 1960 to variations in the socio-economic status (SES) of community areas.

Just as social distinctions are drawn among persons and social groups who live in this city so too are they drawn among the residential areas. Indeed, where people live is often used as one indicator of "who" they are socially. The fact has been recognized in the social reputations given to residential areas named, for examples, Park Avenue, Riverdale, Floral Park, Bellerose, Crown Heights, Dongan Hills, the Bowery, Hell's Kitchen, Harlem, East Harlem, the lower East Side, Greenwich Village, Little Italy, Chinatown, Bedford-Stuyvesant, Brownsville, Williamsburgh, Astoria, etc.[1]

These place names and others illustrate the strong tendency for the ethnic minority groups to have been assigned by social and economic processes initially to residential location in the oldest

[1]An attempt to delineate the community areas of the city was made by the Bureau of Planning, Research, and Reporting of the Department of Relocation. The attempt resulted in tentative definitions of the boundaries of some eighty-seven geographical areas. Not all of them evoke sharp, contrasting social images but all are distinctive enough to have historical place names--the first step perhaps towards establishing a social identity.

areas of the city. As members of these groups improved their social and economic position, they sought more or less successfully to move from the so-called ethnic ghettoes, residential areas of minimum choice, outward from the inner or central zones of the city.

Some interspersed residentially among others not of their own ethnic category--the desegregation route. Others congregated in so-called gilded ghettoes where the housing was newer, better, and more expensive than in the neighborhoods where their parents and grandparents dwelled but was also "reserved" for the ethnic minority. We would say now that they remained segregated whether voluntarily or involuntarily.

In the case of the Negro minority these locational processes were complicated by the racial issue and the post-war housing shortage. Between 1950 and 1960 the older Negro communities of Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant grew in geographical size and in population. They did so by considerable expansion at their peripheries while actually losing population at the core. In other words fewer Negroes were living at the very center of Harlem and of Bedford-Stuyvesant in 1960 than in 1950 but many more in the census tracts contiguous with and surrounding the core areas. A newer middle-class community at St. Albans-Jamaica also enlarged greatly during this decade. At the same time an increasing proportion of Negroes was indeed interspersed among the whites.[1] In other words, more Negroes were living segregated

1/ Mildred Zander and Harold Goldblatt "Trends in the Concentration and Dispersal of white and nonwhite Residents of New York City, 1950-1960" CCHR Research Report No. 14, November, 1962

in 1960 than in 1950 but also a higher proportion was desegregated in 1960 than in 1950.

As we shall see in the pages and statistical tables to come, areas high in socio-economic status in 1960 were more likely to be all-or nearly-all white than areas low in socio-economic status. But while this general finding is no surprise the details that document it are important in their own right to anyone interested in particular developments in this city over the past decade. A second point of interest is the way in which three component factors of the socio-economic rank of an area affects its racial composition <u>when interrelated</u>.

Educational and occupational attainment, and income, are three measures which sociologists use to establish a scale of socio-economic-status in order to measure the comparative social rank of individuals. For formal education is a necessary qualification of occupational attainment (though not a guaranty) while occupation is for most persons their chief if not sole source of income. The significance of income as a determinant of where and how people live is obvious, of course.

Social areas also may be ranked comparatively by measures of the median number of years of formal schooling, the proportion of residents in the area employed in a white-collar occupation, and the median family income. The purpose for doing this is to obtain a method for making comparisons <u>systematically</u> which will also be more precise and more objective than simple impressions of community areas based upon their social reputations. (It is important to note, however, that a measure of the social rank of an <u>area</u> is different

from the measure of the social rank of persons living in the area. The difference is that the area measure is an average of all the measures of individual residents. No inference is logically permissible about the social rank of any particular individual living in a census tract from knowledge of the rank of the tract as a whole. This is so because of the range of difference among the residents within the tract.)

Our first task is to describe each of the three indicators of area status. We will state the criteria for classifying a census tract as high, middle, or low on each of the three variables: educational level, occupational attainment, and income. Next we will show how these three measures of social status are related to each other. Then we will show how they affect racial segregation individually and in inter-relation with one another. Next we will introduce the composite index of the socio-economic-status of census areas--a relatively simple measure based on the combination of the three determinants of social status. Lastly, we will show according to the SES of the area the distribution of Negroes and of Puerto Ricans in the city in 1960 and the rate of growth of minority group population between 1950 and 1960. About one-third of the tracts of 1950 changed their boundaries in the following census. This required us to estimate what the 1950 non-white population would have been had the boundaries of these tracts been the same that year as in 1960.

Education, Occupation and Income as measures of area status

Education

Each tract was assigned a score varying from zero to ten according to the median number of school years attained by the residents of the tract. Eleven tracts whose residents attended school less than a median of seven years were assigned a score of 0 while one tract whose residents attained a median of sixteen or more years of formal schooling was assigned a score of ten.

About 28 per cent of the tracts were assigned scores of zero, one, or two. This means that the median number of school years attained by residents in such tracts was below nine years or relatively "low." About 40 per cent of the tracts were assigned scores of three or four as their residents attended school for a median of nine or ten years. Census tracts in this category were classified as "middle" in educational attainment. About 32 per cent of the tracts were assigned scores from five to ten as their residents attended school for a median of eleven years or more. This category is considered to have been relatively "high" in formal schooling.

Occupation

The percentage of males resident in the tract employed at white-collar jobs rather than in the manual trades was used to measure the tract's score on a scale of occupational status. (The percentage of males was computed on the assumption that the status of a family is usually determined by the occupation of the chief (male) wage earner. This assumption is weakened by the inclusion in the count of males who are not their families' chief wage earners and by the fact that some families are supported chiefly by women wage-earners.) By white collar jobs are meant those which the census classifies as professional, managerial, clerical, or sales.

In eight tracts fewer than ten per cent of the men were employed at white collar jobs and these tracts were assigned scores of zero. Tracts employing ten to nineteen per cent at white collar jobs were assigned scores of one, etc. About 29 per cent of the tracts assigned scores of zero, one, or two were considered to have a relatively "low" status on this indicator. About 41 per cent of the tracts assigned scores of three or four were considered "middle" on the occupational scale. Finally, about 30 per cent of

the tracts were classified as relatively "high" on this scale. These tracts were assigned scores between five and nine, meaning that fifty per cent or more of the males employed in the tract were engaged in white collar work.

Income

The third measure of the socio-economic status of the tract was the median family income for the tract excluding the contributions of "unrelated individuals" to the household. The range of family income was from "under $3,000 per year" to $25,000 a year or more. Tracts in the first category were assigned a score of zero while those in the latter were assigned a score of ten. About 35 per cent of the tracts were classified as relatively "low" in median family income. These had scores of zero, one, two or three meaning that the median family income was below $6,000. About 33 per cent of the tracts were assigned a score of four. The median family income for these tracts was between $6,000 and $6,999. These tracts are termed "middle" family income. A third set of tracts are relatively "high" in median family income. About 33 per cent of the total had scores from five to ten, meaning that their median family income was $7,000 or more.

A strong strain to consistency is to be found between the relative position of an urban area on one indicator of socio-economic-status and another. Otherwise stated, an area with a high proportion of well-educated residents is likely to be also high on a scale of occupational level and to have a higher than average median family income. On the other hand, areas low in educational level, are more than likely to be low also in occupational attainment and low too in income. The evidence for these statements is presented below in the form of findings describing the correlations between the three variables followed by the documentation.

TRACTS RELATIVELY LOW IN EDUCATIONAL LEVEL ARE LIKELY TO BE ALSO RELATIVELY LOW IN OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL WHILE, CONVERSELY, TRACTS RELATIVELY HIGH IN EDUCATIONAL LEVEL ARE LIKELY TO BE ALSO RELATIVELY

HIGH IN OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL. (Table 1)

According to Table 1 69.8 per cent of the tracts in which the median educational level was relatively low were also relatively low in percentage of males employed at white collar work, compared with 20.5 per cent of the tracts in which the median educational level was middle and 1.2 per cent of the tracts in which the median educational level was relatively high. Conversely, 0.4 per cent of the tracts in which the median educational level was low were relatively high in the percentage of males employed at white collar work compared with 14.3 per cent ot the tracts middle, and 75.3 per cent of those high in median educational level.

TRACTS RELATIVELY LOW IN EDUCATIONAL LEVEL ARE LIKELY TO BE ALSO RELATIVELY LOW IN INCOME LEVEL; CONVERSELY, TRACTS RELATIVELY HIGH IN EDUCATIONAL LEVEL ARE LIKELY TO BE ALSO RELATIVELY HIGH IN INCOME LEVEL. (Table 2)

Table 2 shows that 79.9 per cent of the tracts which were relatively low in median level of education were also relatively low in median family income compared with 26.9 per cent of the tracts which were middle in level of education and 6.5 per cent of the tracts which were high in median level of education. Conversely, only 0.1 per cent of the tracts which were low in median level of education were high in median family income compared with 22.2 per cent of the tracts middle in level of formal education and 72.4 per cent of the tracts high in median family income.

TRACTS RELATIVELY LOW IN OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL ARE LIKELY TO BE ALSO RELATIVELY LOW IN INCOME LEVEL WHILE, CONVERSELY, TRACTS RELATIVELY HIGH IN OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL ARE LIKELY TO BE ALSO RELATIVELY HIGH IN INCOME LEVEL. (Table 3)

Table 3 points out that 80.7 per cent of the tracts low in percentage of white collar males were also low in median family income compared with 26.2 per cent of the tracts middle in percentage of white collar

males and 4.2 per cent of the tracts low in percentage of white collar males. Conversely, 2.8 per cent of the tracts low in percentage of white collar males were high in median family income compared with 26.7 per cent of the tracts middle in percentage of white collar males and 68.2 per cent of the tracts high in percentage of white collar males.

The Educational, Occupational and Income Levels of the Area Related to Segregation

AS THE EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF A CENSUS TRACT INCREASES, THE LIKELIHOOD OF ITS BEING ALL-OR NEARLY ALL-WHITE INCREASES WHILE THE LIKELIHOOD OF ITS BEING FIFTY PER CENT OR MORE NEGRO DECREASES. (Table 4)

Of the 527 tracts low in median number of years of schooling, 36 per cent were less than one per cent Negro compared with 63 per cent of the 796 tracts middle in median number of years of schooling and 66 per cent of the 631 tracts high in median number of years of schooling. Conversely, of the tracts low in schooling 12 per cent were fifty or more per cent Negro compared with 11 per cent of the tracts middle in median years of schooling and 4 per cent of the tracts high in median years of schooling.

AS THE OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL OF THE CENSUS TRACT INCREASES, THE LIKELIHOOD OF ITS BEING ALL-OR NEARLY ALL-WHITE INCREASES WHILE THE LIKELIHOOD OF ITS BEING FIFTY PER CENT OR MORE NEGRO DECREASES. (Table 5)

Of the 539 tracts low in per cent of male white collar workers, 26 per cent were less than one per cent Negro compared with 65 per cent of the 824 tracts middle in per cent of male white collar workers and 72 per cent of the 591 tracts high in per cent of male white collar workers. Conversely, of the tracts low in per cent of male white collar workers 27 per cent were at least half Negro compared with 4 per cent of the tracts middle in per cent of male white collar workers and less than one-half of one per cent of those high in per cent of male white collar workers.

AS THE INCOME LEVEL OF THE CENSUS TRACT INCREASES, THE LIKELIHOOD OF ITS BEING ALL-OR NEARLY-ALL WHITE INCREASES WHILE THE LIKELIHOOD OF ITS BEING FIFTY PER CENT OR MORE NEGRO DECREASES. (Table 6)

> Of the 676 census tracts low in median family income, 21 per cent were less than one per cent Negro compared with 72 per cent of the 640 tracts middle in median family income and 79 per cent of the 638 tracts high in median family income. Conversely, of the tracts low in median family income 21 per cent were 50 per cent or more Negro compared with 4 per cent of the tracts middle in median family income and 2 per cent of the tracts high in median family income.

Table 1

Educational and Occupational Level of Tracts

Percentage of Professionals, Managerials, and White Collar Workers in tract was:	Percentage of tracts in which the Median school years completed was:		
	Low	Middle	High
Low	69.8%	20.5%	1.2%
Middle	29.8	65.2	23.5
High	0.4	14.3	75.3
TOTAL TRACTS	(527)	(796)	(631)

Table 2

Educational and Income Levels of Tracts

Percentage of tracts in which the median family income was:	Percentage of tracts in which the median school years completed was:		
	Low	Middle	High
Low	79.9%	26.9%	6.5%
Middle	19.4	50.9	21.1
High	0.1	22.2	72.4
TOTAL TRACTS	(527)	(796)	(631)

Table 3

Occupational and Income Levels of Tracts

Percentage of tracts whose median family income was:	Percentage of tracts in which the percentage of Professionals, Managerials, and White Collar Workers was:		
	Low	Middle	High
Low	80.7%	26.2%	4.2%
Middle	16.5	47.1	27.6
High	2.8	26.7	68.2
TOTAL TRACTS	(539)	(824)	(591)

Table 4

Racial Composition of Tracts in 1960
By Median Number of Years of Formal Schooling

Racial Composition of Tracts: Percent Negro in 1960	Median Number of Years of Schooling		
	Low	Middle	High
Less than 1 %	36%	63%	66%
1 - 9.9	28	16	24
10 - 49.9	24	10	6
50% or more	12	11	4
TOTAL TRACTS	(527)	(796)	(631)

Table 5

Racial Composition of Tracts in 1960
By Percent Males Employed in White Collar Jobs

Racial Composition of Tracts: Percent Negro in 1960	Per Cent Males Employed in White Collar Jobs		
	Low	Middle	High
Less than 1 %	26%	65%	73%
1 - 9.9	21	21	24
10 - 49.9	26	10	3
50% or more	27	4	*
TOTAL TRACTS	(539)	(824)	(591)

Table 6

Racial Composition of Tracts in 1960
By Median Family Income of Tract

Racial Composition of Tracts: Percent Negro in 1960	Median Family Income of Tract		
	Low	Middle	High
Less than 1 %	21%	72%	79%
1 - 9.9	29	18	17
10 - 49.9	29	6	2
50% or more	21	4	2
TOTAL TRACTS	(676)	(640)	(638)

The three findings just stated relate education, occupation, and income separately to racial segregation. Let us turn now to consider how these factors affect segregation in combination. Suppose we hold the educational level of the tract constant, is occupation still a factor in segregation? Does it, in other words, have an independent relation to segregation? Suppose we hold both education, and occupation constant, does the income level of the tract have an independent influence on racial segregation? Do these three factors all work alike? How do they compare in relative strength of influence? Is occupation more or less influential than income in making for segregation?

THE EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF THE TRACT HELD CONSTANT, THE LIKELIHOOD OF ITS BEING ALL OR NEARLY-ALL WHITE BECOMES GREATER AS THE OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL OF THE TRACT RISES WHILE THE LIKELIHOOD IF ITS BEING FIFTY PER CENT NEGRO OR MORE BECOMES SMALLER. (Table 7)

> Of the tracts low in educational level (median years of formal schooling) 26 per cent were less than one per cent Negro in the tracts low in occupational level compared with 59 per cent of the tracts middle in occupational level. Likewise: among the tracts middle in educational level, 28 per cent of those low in occupational level were less than one per cent Negro compared with 71 per cent of the tracts middle in occupational level and 79 per cent of those high in occupational level. Also: among the tracts high in educational level, 51 per cent middle in occupational level were less than one per cent Negro compared with 71 per cent of the tracts high in occupational level.
>
> Conversely, 17 per cent of the tracts low in educational and also in occupational level were 50 per cent Negro or more compared with 0 per cent of the tracts middle in occupational level though low in educational level. Likewise; of the tracts middle in educational level, 46 per cent of those low in occupational level were 50 per cent Negro or more compared with 3 per cent of those middle in occupational level and 0 per cent of those high in occupational level. Also: among the tracts high in educational level, 14 per cent which were middle in occupational level were 50 per cent or more Negro while less than ½ of 1 per cent of the tracts high in occupational level were comparably Negro.

Table 7

RACIAL COMPOSITION OF TRACTS IN 1960
BY THEIR EDUCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL LEVELS

	Educational level of census tract								
	Low			Middle			High		
Occupational Level:	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
Racial composition: Per cent Negro									
Less than 1%	26%	59%		28%	71%	79%		51%	71%
1 - 9.9	25	33		10	17	18		21	25
10 - 49.9	32	8		16	9	3		14	4
50% or more	17	0		46	3	0		14	*
Total tracts 100%	(368)	(157)		(163)	(519)	(114)	(8)	(148)	(475)

THE EDUCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL OF THE TRACT HELD CONSTANT, THE HIGHER THE MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME IN THE TRACT THE GREATER THE LIKELIHOOD THAT IT WAS ALL-OR NEARLY ALL-WHITE. (Table 8)

> Of the tracts with a low per cent of male white collar workers and a low median number of school years attended, 19 per cent of the tracts low in median family income were less than one per cent Negro compared with 81 per cent of the tracts middle in median family income.
>
> Reading down each of the other columns in this table the percentages increase consistently with increase in the median family income of the tract.

THE EDUCATIONAL AND INCOME LEVEL OF THE TRACT HELD CONSTANT, THE HIGHER THE OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL OF THE TRACT, THE GREATER THE LIKELIHOOD THAT IT WAS ALL-OR NEARLY ALL-WHITE (With two exceptions. Table 8)

> The first exception to the rule just stated is this: 75 per cent of the tracts middle in median number of school years attended and in family income were less than one per cent Negro if they were high in per cent of male white collar workers compared with 79 per cent of the corresponding tracts which were only middle in per cent of male white collar workers. The second exception is that 87 per cent of the tracts middle in median school years attended and high in median family income were less than one per cent Negro if they were high in per cent of male white collar workers while the corresponding percentage of tracts middle in per cent of male white collar workers was the same.

BUT THE OCCUPATIONAL AND INCOME LEVEL OF THE TRACT HELD CONSTANT, THE HIGHER THE EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF THE TRACT, THE SMALLER THE LIKELIHOOD THAT IT WAS ALL-OR NEARLY ALL-WHITE. (Table 8)

> Of the tracts with a low per cent of male white collar workers and also a low median family income, 19 per cent were less than one per cent Negro if they were low in median number of school years attended compared to 8 per cent of those middle in median number of school years attended.

Table 8

PER CENT OF TRACTS WHITE OR NEARLY ALL-WHITE BY PER CENT OF MALE WHITE-COLLAR WORKERS, MEDIAN NUMBER OF SCHOOL YEARS, AND MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME

Median Family Income	Per Cent Male White Collar Workers: Low			Middle			High		
	Median Number of School Years Attended								
	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
	Per Cent of Tracts Less Than 1 % Negro								
Low	19	8	*	37	29	4	*	*	7
Middle	81	67	*	92	79	30	*	75	55
High	*	75	*	*	87	75	*	87	77

*Fewer than ten census tracts in this category. Percentages would be too unreliable to depend upon.

The number of census tracts in each of the above categories is as follows:

325	108	2	94	98	24	2	8	15
43	43	3	59	286	43	0	76	87
0	12	3	4	135	81	0	30	373

The same pattern of decrease with increasing educational level holds true consistently for all the other comparisons which can be made.

The SES of an Area and Segregation

A simple index of the socio-economic-score of 1,954 census tracts was computed based upon the education, occupational and income levels of the tracts. (The computational details are given in Appendix A.) The range of socio-economic scores was from one to thirty but no tract was found to have a score smaller than four or larger than twenty-eight.

A census tract map of the city was colored according to the following scheme. (This map is available for inspection at the office of the City Commission on Human Rights.)

SES Scores	Map Color
4 - 8	Burnt umbre
9 - 11	Burnt ochre
12 - 14	Orange
15 - 17	Yellow
18 - 28	Lemon yellow
Unknown*	Green shading

Inspection of the map that results from this operation shows two major areas colored burnt umbre which are low in socio-economic status. The first of the major burnt umbre areas consists of central and east Harlem in Manhattan and, across the Harlem River, south and central Bronx; the second of the major burnt umbre areas consists of the lower East Side and, across the East River, of South Brooklyn, Williamsburgh, Bedford-Stuyvesant and Brownsville.

Contiguous with the burnt umbre areas are census tracts in the next higher category colored burnt ochre. These tend to be north of and adjacent to the lowest socio-economic areas of central Harlem, central Bronx, Bedford-Stuyvesant and Brownsville and south of the South Brooklyn area. The burnt ochre areas, in turn, tend to shade off to orange, thence to yellow, while at the outermost parts of the city (Riverdale, Queens, lower Brooklyn, Staten Island) are to be found most of the lemon-yellow census tracts. There is an important and noticeable exception to this geographical patterning however in, of course, Manhattan. Central Manhattan bordering the park on the east, south and west is largely lemon-yellow, consisting of tracts in the fifth or highest socio-economic category. Manhattan is indeed very largely either burnt umbre or lemon yellow, another way of describing it as consisting of tracts classified either in the lowest or in the highest socio-economic category.

SES and Segregation

THE HIGHER THE SES OF THE TRACT THE GREATER THE LIKELIHOOD OF ITS BEING ALL-OR NEARLY-ALL WHITE: CONVERSELY, THE LOWER THE SES OF THE TRACT THE GREATER THE LIKELIHOOD OF ITS BEING AT LEAST FIFTY PER CENT NEGRO (Table 9)

> Five-hundred and fifty-six tracts scored ten or lower on the SES index. Of these 24.5 per cent were all or nearly all-white. Four hundred sixty-three tracts were classified as having scores of seventeen or higher on the SES. Of these 74.5 per cent were all or nearly all-white. Conversely, of the tracts scording ten or less in SES, 22.1 per cent were fifty or more per cent Negro while of the tracts scoring

seventeen or higher only 1.3 per cent were fifty or more per cent Negro.

THE HIGHER THE SES OF THE TRACT THE GREATER THE LIKELIHOOD THAT FEW OR NO PUERTO-RICANS LIVED THERE: CONVERSELY THE LOWER THE SES OF THE TRACT THE GREATER THE LIKELIHOOD OF ITS BEING AT LEAST TEN PER CENT PUERTO RICAN. (Table 10)

Of the tracts scoring ten or lower on the SES index 22.1 per cent had fewer than one per cent Puerto Ricans living there while, on the other hand, 80.8 per cent of the tracts scoring seventeen or higher on the SES index had no Puerto Ricans or less than one per cent. Conversely, of the tracts scoring ten or lower on the SES index, 42.8 per cent were at least ten per cent Puerto Rican compared with 0.0 per cent of the tracts scoring seventeen or more on the SES index.

Table 9

CENSUS TRACT SES SCORE AND RACIAL COMPOSITION, 1960

Racial composition of tract: % Negro	Tract SES Score 4-10	11-13	14-16	17-28
Less than 1 %	24.5	66.2	68.1	74.5
1 - 9.9	25.4	17.7	20.2	22.0
10 - 49.9	28.1	8.9	7.7	2.2
50% or more	22.1	7.3	3.9	1.3
Total tracts	(556)	(496)	(439)	(463)

Table 10

CENSUS TRACT SES SCORE AND PUERTO RICAN PERCENTAGE, 1960

Percent of tract Puerto Rican	Tract SES Score 4-10	11-13	14-16	17-28
Less than 1 %	22.1	59.9	71.1	80.8
1 - 9.9	35.0	36.9	27.1	19.2
10 - 49.9	37.8	3.2	1.8	0.0
50% or more	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total tracts	(556)	(496)	(439)	(463)

The Socio-Economic-Status of Census Tracts and Change in Racial Composition Between 1950 and 1960

Between 1950 and 1960 approximately one-third of the census tract changed boundaries. In order to learn where the non-white population increased most and where it decreased we undertook to recompute the census tract population figures for 1950 as if the boundaries in that year were the same as the following census. This required us to estimate the non-white population of the tract from a knowledge of the number of the dwelling units in the unadjusted and adjusted tract boundary. (The computational procedure is described in Appendix B.) A map colored to show the census tracts by amount of increase or decrease in non-white population is available for inspection in the office of the City Commission on Human Rights.

EXCEPT FOR THE LOW STATUS TRACTS, THE HIGHER THE TRACT SES IN 1960 THE GREATER THE LIKELIHOOD THAT FEWER NON-WHITES LIVED THERE IN 1960 THAN IN 1950. Otherwise states: THE NON-WHITE POPULATION DENSITY AT THE CORE OF HARLEM AND OF BEDFORE-STUYVESANT DIMINISHED BETWEEN 1950 AND 1960 WHILE IT INCREASED AT THE PERIPHERY OF THESE TWO COMMUNITIES. (Table 11)

> Of the 404 tracts with SES scores of ten or less 79.2 per cent had more non-whites living there in 1960 than in 1950; the corresponding percentage for the 162 tracts with SES scores of eleven to thirteen was 99.4 per cent; for the 132 tracts with SES scores of fourteen to sixteen it was 88.6 per cent; for the 105 tracts with SES scores of seventeen or more it was 65.7 per cent. (These percentages are only calculated for census tracts with a minimum of fifty non-whites in 1950.)

Table 11

CENSUS TRACT SES SCORE AND PERCENTAGE CHANGE
IN NONWHITE POPULATION, 1950 - 1960

Percentage Change in Non-white population between 1950 and 1960	Tract SES Score			
	4 - 10	11 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 28
Increase of:				
3200%	8.2%	19.1%	27.3%	11.4%
1000 - 3199%	10.1	13.6	9.1	1.9
400 - 999.9	10.3	13.0	15.2	5.7
101 - 399.9	24.0	22.2	17.4	21.9
67 - 100.9	7.2	9.3	3.8	2.9
34 - 66.9	5.7	6.8	4.5	7.6
10 - 33.9	7.9	3.7	5.3	7.6
0 - 9.9	5.4	3.7	6.1	6.7
Decrease of:				
0.1 - 9.9	5.0	1.2	0.8	3.8
10.0 - 33.9	10.4	4.3	2.3	8.6
34.0 - 66.9	3.7	2.5	3.0	10.5
67.0 - 100%	1.7	0.6	5.3	11.4
Total decrease	20.8%	8.6%	11.4%	34.3%

THE HIGHER THE CENSUS TRACT SES SCORE IN 1960 THE GREATER THE LIKELIHOOD THAT MORE WHITES LIVED THERE IN 1960 THAN IN 1950. (Table 12)

> Of the 546 tracts with an SES score of ten or lower, 8.5 per cent increased their white population in 1960 over that of 1950. The corresponding figure for the 496 census tracts with an SES score of eleven to thirteen was 24.6 per cent; for the 438 tracts with an SES score between fourteen and sixteen it was 36.7 per cent; for the 462 tracts with an SES score between seventeen and twenty-eight it was 58.4 per cent. (These percentages were calculated only for census tracts which had a minimum of fifty whites in 1950.)

SES Scores of the Boroughs and of Individual Tracts

Table 13 shows that 29.4 per cent of Manhattan's census tracts are in the lowest SES category. This is more proportionately than in any of the other boroughs. At the same time 28.1 per cent of this borough's tracts are in the highest SES category and this, too, is proportionately more than in any of the other boroughs. Both Queens and Richmond have very small proportions of census tracts lowest in SES score: 2.1 per cent and 1.4 per cent respectively while, on the other hand, both are above average in the proportion of census tracts highest in SES score: 24.5 per cent and 17.8 per cent. Brooklyn and the Bronx, the latter particularly might accurately be described as the poorest of the five boroughs, for both have more than their share of low-status areas while at the same time they have less than their fair share of the highest SES areas.

Table 12

CENSUS TRACT SES SCORE AND PERCENTAGE CHANGE
IN WHITE POPULATION, 1950 - 1960

Percentage change in White population between 1950 and 1960	Tract SES Score 4 - 10	11 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 28
Increase of:				
75% or more	3.3%	3.3%	8.0%	17.3%
50 - 74.9	0.2	2.0	2.5	7.1
34 - 49.9	0.5	2.5	3.4	8.0
10 - 33.9	1.6	7.5	11.6	14.5
0 - 9.9	2.9	9.3	11.2	11.5
Total increase	8.5%	24.6%	36.7%	58.4%
Decrease of:				
0.1 - 4.9	2.9	10.8	10.0	7.1
5 - 9.9	10.6	24.6	15.3	10.4
10 - 14.9	18.7	23.9	16.9	11.5
15 - 19.9	17.0	14.3	8.0	5.2
20 - 33.9	21.2	15.3	8.5	3.5
34 - 64.9	14.7	6.8	2.5	2.2
65 - 100%	6.3	4.3	2.1	1.7

Table 13

DISTRIBUTION OF CENSUS TRACTS VARYING IN SOCIO-ECONOMIC-STATUS SCORE BY BOROUGH

	SES Score	City of New York	Borough				
			Bronx	Brooklyn	Manhattan	Queens	Richmond
Low:	4 - 8	13.5	14.5	18.9	29.4	2.1	1.4
	9 - 11	22.9	23.9	26.5	19.5	20.3	16.4
	12 - 14	25.9	35.4	21.7	10.0	30.6	39.7
	15 - 17	19.8	18.5	19.7	13.0	22.5	24.7
High:	18 - 28	17.9	7.7	13.2	28.1	24.5	17.8
Total tracts	(100%)	1,954	(297)	(736)	(231)	(617)	(73)

Table 14 SES Scores for Bronx Tracts

Bronx

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
1		41	08	74	
2	09	43	07	75	07
4		44	09	77	07
5		46	08	78	12
6	13	47	08	79	05
10	12	48	13	83	08
11	07	49	07	84	
14		50	11	85	08
15		52	10	86	13
16		54	11	87	08
17	07	56	11	88	
18		57	11	89	07
20	09	59	21	91	
23	07	60	11	92	12
25	07	62	09	94	12
27	07	64	13	97	
27-1	08	65	08	98	12
28		66	11	99	11
31	09	67	08	104	
33	08	68	10	107	
35	08	69	09	110	
37	07	70	11	115	12
38		71	08	115-1	10
39	09	72	12	118	14
40	11	73	68	119	08

Table 14 SES Scores for Bronx Tracts (Continued)

Bronx

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
121	08	161	10	206	10
123	07	162	11	206-1	13
125	08	164	12	207	15
127	07	165	06	208	14
129	06	166	14	210	18
130	13	167	07	211	14
131	08	169	06	212	18
132	14	173	11	213	12
133	09	175	10	213-1	15
135	09	177	11	214	
137	09	179	11	215	15
138	12	181	14	216	15
139	06	183	17	217	14
141	08	184	12	217-1	13
143	08	189	14	218	12
144	09	193	12	219	11
145	09	194	11	220	10
147	06	195	17	221	14
149	09	196		223	14
151	09	197	14	224	15
153	08	198	12	225	15
154	13	199	14	227	15
155	08	200		227-1	13
156	12	201	12	228	15
157	08	202	12	229	12
158	11	204	12	229-1	13
160	13	205	17	230	11

Table 14 SES Scores for Bronx Tracts (Continued)

Bronx

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
231	10	258		299	
232	12	261	21	300	12
233	15	263	16	301	23
234	11	264	12	302	
235	15	265	15	304	
236	10	266	13	306	
237	15	267	17	307	24
239	13	269	17	308	
240	10	271	15	310	17
241	12	273	16	311	
242		274	14	312	14
243	12	277	14	313	
244	12	279	16	314	17
245	16	281	17	315	
246	15	283	15	316	17
247	20	284		317	
248	17	285	15	318	18
249		286	12	319	
250	13	287	15	320	16
251	12	288	19	321	21
252	13	289	11	322	15
253	14	291		323	23
254	12	293	23	324	14
255	16	295	22	328	14
256	12	296	18	329	22
257	17	297	23		

Table 14 SES Scores for Bronx Tracts (Continued)

Bronx

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
330	15	362	16	387	10
332	14	363	10	388	11
333		364	12	389	09
336	13	365	10	390	10
338	13	366		391	09
339	20	367	12	392	12
340	11	368	10	393	09
341	19	369	10	394	14
342	10	369-1	09	395	
343	17	370	15	396	11
344	12	371	09	397	15
345	17	372	12	398	13
346	15	373	11	399	13
347		374	13	401	14
350	14	375	09	403	15
351	20	375-1	11	404	13
352	12	376	13	405	14
354	13	377	09	406	10
355		378	13	407	15
356	12	379	11	408	14
357	19	380	09	410	
358	13	381	16	411	14
359	10	382	14	413	16
360		383	11	414	11
361	09	385	09	415	18
		386	14		

Table 14 SES Scores for Bronx Tracts (Continued)

Bronx

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio Economic Score
418	13	458	09
419	15	460	
420	14	462	
421	15	462-1	10
422	12	464	
423	15	484	12
424	12	502	
425	14	504	
426	14	516	14
428	13	540	
429	17		
429-1	14		
430	11		
431	16		
432	12		
436	12		
438	15		
440	10		
442	12		
446	14		
448	14		
449	17		
449-1	15		
451	19		
451-1	19		
454	15		

Table 15 SES Scores for Brooklyn Tracts

Brooklyn

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
1	17	38	19	64	14
2	07	39	06	65	09
3	23	40	24	66	15
3-1		41	06	67	09
5	21	42	22	68	13
7	13	43	07	69	08
9	16	44	23	70	14
11		45	10	71	09
13	24	46	19	72	11
18		47	04	74	10
20	08	48		75	09
21	08	49	08	76	09
22	08	50	20	77	09
23	08	51	06	78	09
25	06	52	20	80	09
27		52-1	21	82	09
29	07	54	17	84	09
29-1	04	55	08	85	06
30	16	56	20	88	10
31	21	56-1	18	90	09
32	17	57	08	92	11
33	06	58	13	93	
34	18	59	08	94	13
35	09	60	15	96	12
36	20	62	13	98	09
37		63	08	100	10

Table 15 SES Scores for Brooklyn Tracts (Continued)

Brooklyn

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
101	09	131	07	158	14
102	13	132	14	159	14
104	10	133	09	160	14
106	11	134	14	161	08
108	11	135	09	162	17
110	10	136	16	163	12
112	12	137	10	164	
113		138	15	165	20
114	13	139	10	167	14
116	13	140	16	168	18
117	09	141	10	169	11
118	10	142	14	170	12
119		143	09	171	16
120	09	144	19	172	11
121	09	145	09	173	
122	12	146	19	174	13
123		147	10	175	
124	12	148	15	176	14
125	09	149	10	178	10
127	06	150	13	179	07
128	13	151	10	180	10
128-1	13	153	12	181	09
129	06	155	14	182	10
129-1	08	156	15	183	08
130	14	157	14	184	15

Brooklyn

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
185	08	210	11	236	17
185-1	08	212	11	237	08
186	11	213	18	238	17
187	10	214	10	239	07
188	12	215	16	240	14
189		216	13	241	07
190	09	217	12	242	13
191	07	218	11	243	07
192	09	219	13	244	11
193	19	220	12	245	09
194	09	221	09	246	12
195	17	222	15	247	05
196	10	223	09	248	12
197	16	224	10	249	09
198	13	225	08	250	11
199	11	226	08	251	07
200	12	227	07	252	13
201	07	228	10	253	07
202	13	229	07	254	11
203	08	230	10	255	07
204	17	231	07	256	12
205	09	232	09	257	04
206	16	233	07	258	13
207	15	234	17	259	07
208	13	235	08	259-1	06

Table 15 SES Scores for Brooklyn Tracts (Continued)

Brooklyn

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
260	12	283	07	307	06
261	07	284	12	308	08
262	11	285	04	309	08
263	08	285-1	08	311	09
264	12	286	16	313	13
265	07	287	08	314	08
266	13	288	13	315	12
267	08	289	07	317	12
268	14	290	15	317-1	12
269	07	291	07	319	15
270	16	292	14	320	
271	07	293	07	321	15
271-1	06	294	14	323	15
272	13	295	09	325	16
273	08	296	14	326	08
274	12	297	10	327	15
275	11	298	13	328	10
276	10	299	06	329	16
277	07	300	11	330	09
278	13	301	07	331	16
279	08	302	13	333	18
280	15	303	07	335	17
281	07	304	12	336	17
282	14	306	10	337	14

Table 15 SES Scores for Brooklyn Tracts (Continued)

Brooklyn

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
339	11	365-1	09	396	12
340	13	366	13	397	10
341	13	367	09	398	09
342	06	369	08	399	11
343	10	370	17	400	10
345	10	371	07	401	10
347	10	373	09	402	11
348	09	374	17	403	10
348-1	08	375	07	404	12
349	14	377	09	405	11
351	11	379	08	406	09
352		381	08	408	10
353	12	382	11	409	09
354	08	383	10	410	12
355	16	385	09	411	09
356	08	386	10	412	12
357	11	387	07	413	10
359	09	388	13	414	18
360	11	389	07	414-1	19
360-1	11	390	14	415	09
361	08	391	07	416	15
362	11	392	15	417	09
363	08	393	09	418	16
364	12	394	14	419	09
365	08	395	10	420	15

Table 15 SES Scores for Brooklyn Tracts (Continued)

Brooklyn

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
421	09	445	10	480	14
422	16	446	11	481	09
423	08	447	10	482	15
424	12	448	18	483	07
425	07	450	19	484	15
426	12	452	20	486	11
427	08	453	07	487	04
428	15	454	14	488	18
429	09	455		489	09
430	14	456	19	490	16
431	09	458	22	491	05
432	13	460	19	492	14
433	09	462	18	493	08
434	15	462-1	15	494	17
435	10	464	12	495	09
436	13	465	07	496	15
437	10	468	12	497	09
438	17	470	13	498	15
439	09	472	14	499	10
440	17	473	09	500	17
441	09	474	17	501	09
442	17	476	14	502	11
443	09	477	10	502-1	13
444	15	478	13	503	09

Table 15 SES Scores for Brooklyn Tracts (Continued)

Brooklyn

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
504	18	530	16	556	15
505	08	531	08	557	09
506	16	532	21	558	17
507	04	533	10	559	
508	18	534	15	560	19
509	08	535	09	562	21
510	18	536	18	563	10
511	07	537	07	564	19
512	21	538	17	565	11
513	09	539	09	566	17
514	21	540	16	567	10
515	08	542	18	568	16
516	17	543		569	11
517	09	544	18	570	19
518	21	545	08	571	09
519	08	546	17	572	15
520	17	547	08	573	10
522	21	548	21	574	16
523	07	549	06	575	09
524	18	550	19	576	17
525	08	551	08	577	
526	17	552	16	578	15
527	08	553	08	579	09
528	21	554	15	580	12
529	09	555	09	582	13

Table 15 SES Scores for Brooklyn Tracts (Continued)

Brooklyn

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
584	11	632	18	690	13
586	14	636	17	692	15
588	14	638	17	694	
589	09	640	19	696	14
590	13	642	21	698	15
591	10	644	15	700	
592	16	646	14	702	20
593	10	648	16	706	14
594	14	650	15	710	
594-1	19	652	17	712	
596	18	654	17	722	19
598	18	656	16	724	18
600	15	658	15	726	16
606	18	660	16	728	18
608	15	662	14	730	17
610	13	670	15	732	18
610-1	16	672	13	734	17
612	22	674	13	736	16
614	21	676	15	738	15
616	19	678	17	740	16
618	23	680	11	742	17
622	11	682	13	744	18
626	18	686	19	746	18
628	12	688	17	748	20

Table 15 SES Scores for Brooklyn Tracts (Continued)

Brooklyn

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
750	20	802	15	856	15
752	24	804	13	858	12
754	23	806	13	860	14
756	19	810	15	862	15
758	22	812		864	15
760	21	814	16	866	15
762	18	816	15	868	14
764	19	818	15	870	14
766	21	820	18	872	16
770	19	822	16	874	16
772	19	824	13	874-1	
774	20	826	13	876	17
776	18	828	13	878	16
778		830	16	880	17
780	20	832	14	882	14
782	17	834	16	884	12
784	18	836	15	886	13
786	15	838	17	888	12
788	14	840	14	890	12
790	14	842	15	892	12
792	13	844		894	10
794	11	846	10	896	11
796	18	848	17	898	09
798	18	850	15	900	08
800	14	854	16	902	07

Table 15 SES Scores for Brooklyn Tracts (Continued)

Brooklyn

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
904	05	952		1012	13
906	06	954		1014	18
908	06	956		1016	
910	07	958	10	1018	21
912	08	960		1020	20
914	05	962	12	1022	12
916	08	964	12	1024	14
918	05	966	12	1026	
920	08	968	09	1028	
922	13	970	12	1034	17
924		972		1070	
926		974	13	1078	
928	15	982	08	1098	12
930	16	984		1100	
932		986	15	1102	13
934	15	988	15	1106	17
936	16	990	11	1110	14
938	15	992	13	1112	
940	18	994	14	1114	
942		996	14	1118	10
944	19	1004	17	1120	11
944-1	15	1006	18	1122	11
948-1		1008	14	1124	12
950		1010	12	1126	11

Table 15 SES Scores for Brooklyn Tracts (Continued)

Brooklyn

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
1128	11	1174	12		
1130	09	1176	12		
1132	10	1176-1	11		
1134	08	1178	12		
1136	08	1180			
1138	07	1182	11		
1140	09	1182-1	12		
1142		1184	12		
1142-1	15	1186	12		
1142-2	15	1188	10		
1146	11	1190	11		
1148	08	1192	10		
1150	09	1194	10		
1152	09	1196	10		
1154	09	1200	11		
1156	08	1202	11		
1158	10	1208	09		
1160	10	1210	08		
1162	08	1214	08		
1164	09	1220	08		
1166	08				
1168	09				
1170	09				
1172	14				
1172-1	12				

Table 16 SES Scores for Manhattan Tracts

Manhattan

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
2	06	31		59	25
3		32	09	60	28
5		33		61	25
6	06	34	08	62	
7		36	06	63	25
8	10	38	09	64	16
9		39		65	13
10	15	40	09	66	09
10-1	07	41	07	67	17
12	11	42	09	68	20
13		43	07	69	
14	06	44	22	70	13
15		45		71	21
16	04	47	08	72	17
18	04	48	14	73	19
20	08	49	11	74	20
21		50	20	75	16
22	06	51	17	76	
24	07	52		77	19
25	06	53		78	20
26	08	54		79	19
27		55	20	80	24
28	08	56		81	13
29	07	57		82	24
30	06	58		83	10

Table 16 SES Scores for Manhattan Tracts (Continued)

Manhattan

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
84		110	17	135	08
85		111	08	136	17
86	26	112	24	137	23
87	12	113		138	13
88	21	114	25	139	15
89	9	115	07	140	23
90	19	116	16	141	
91	14	117		142	25
92	23	118	18	144	18
93	13	119	14	145	22
94		120	23	146	11
95	06	121	10	147	
96		122	24	148	20
97	10	123		149	20
98	20	124	12	150	25
99		125	13	151	09
100	24	126	21	152	19
101		127	09	153	18
102		128	25	154	09
103	08	129	07	155	18
104	24	130	24	156	07
106	25	131	16	157	19
106-1	25	132	13	158	18
108	19	133	09	159	21
109		134	16	160	23
				161	17
				162	06

Table 16 SES Scores for Manhattan Tracts (Continued)

Manhattan

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
163	19	189	07	210	15
164	09	190	06	211	15
165	16	191	16	212	09
166	07	192	07	213	09
167	20	193	08	213-1	06
168	07	194	06	214	16
169	14	195	18	216	09
170	06	196	06	217	08
171	20	197		217-1	06
172	06	197-1	09	218	06
173	13	198	07	219	07
174	05	199	16	220	06
175	21	200	07	221	10
177	12	201	21	221-1	09
178	08	201-1	09	222	06
179	18	202	05	223	08
180	07	203	21	224	07
181	14	204	06	225	11
182	07	205	21	226	07
183	16	206	08	227	09
184	07	207	19	227-1	07
185	24	207-1	07	228	09
186	06	208	06	229	11
187	17	209	08	230	07
188	07	209-1	09	231	09

Table 16 SES Scores for Manhattan Tracts (Continued)

Manhattan

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
231-1	06	265	16		
232	08	267	17		
233	11	269	10		
234	09	271	16		
235	11	273	20		
235-1	09	275	21		
236	08	277	11		
237	11	279	16		
238		281	21		
239	10	283	17		
240		285	14		
241	14	287	17		
243	10	289	14		
243-1	10	291	11		
245	12	293	13		
247	17	295	16		
249	10	297			
251	10	303	16		
253	11	307	20		
255	18	309	14		
261	10				
263	14				

Table 17 SES Scores for Queens Tracts

Queens

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
2	14	36	12	67	11
4	12	38	10	69	10
6	12	39	07	71	10
7	10	40	12	73	14
8	13	40-1	11	75	13
10	13	41	10	77	10
12	14	42	12	79	10
14	13	43	13	81	11
16	15	44	13	83	10
17		44-1		86	12
18	15	45	20	87	09
19		47	12	88	11
20	14	49		91	11
22	13	51	09	94	14
24	15	52	10	95	11
25	07	53	12	96	14
26	16	54	12	97	12
27		55	10	98	12
28	12	57	11	100	14
29	10	58	10	101	12
30	16	59	12	102	15
31	11	61	11	103	12
32	12	62	20	104	13
34	14	63	11	105	14
35		65	11	106	12

Table 17 SES Scores for Queens Tracts (Continued)

Queens

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
107		137	11	165	
108	13	138	19	166	14
110	12	140	17	168	13
111	12	141	08	169	17
112	13	142	11	170	12
113	12	142-1	11	171	
114	09	143	12	172	12
115	11	144	12	174	11
116	13	145	12	176	11
117	11	147	12	178	10
118	13	148	12	179	14
119	10	149	11	180	09
120	14	150	13	181	16
121	12	151	12	182	11
122	14	152	12	183	15
123	12	153	12	184	11
124	14	154	13	184-1	13
126	11	155	10	185	15
126-1	11	156	12	186	10
128	15	157	09	187	13
130	17	158	12	188	
132	16	159	11	189	15
134	19	161	11	190	10
135	12	163	14	191	
138	21	164	12	192	14

Table 17 SES Scores for Queens Tracts (Continued)

Queens

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
194	11	245	12	273	16
194-1	13	246		274	
196	11	247	13	275	19
197	09	248	07	276	
198	09	249	13	277	18
202	11	250		278	
204	08	251	12	279	19
205	11	252	07	280	13
205-1	14	253	14	281	20
206	10	255	14	282	14
208	10	257	11	283	19
212	12	258	07	284	12
213		259	12	285	21
214	18	260	08	287	21
216	20	261	12	288	11
220	21	262	09	289	22
220-1	21	263	14	290	11
230	17	264	09	291	18
232	20	265	13	292	13
235	12	266	12	293	14
236	17	267	18	295	15
238	16	269	18	297	14
240	15	270	11	299	
243	13	271	18	304	12
244		272	10	309	16

Table 17 SES Scores for Queens Tracts (Continued)

Queens

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
317	18	376	14	426	
320	11	377	11	427	09
327	15	379	10	432	17
328	14	381	12	434	14
329	15	383		437	09
330	13	384	14	439	08
334	13	394	14	440	09
337	15	398	15	442	11
339	18	399	09	443	09
347	15	400	17	446	14
351	17	401	10	446-1	16
352	13	402	17	448	16
353	12	403	10	450	15
355	13	404	14	452	
358	15	405	09	453	14
361	11	407	11	454	21
363	10	409	10	456	20
365	08	410	10	457	14
366	16	411	12	458	22
367	13	413	10	459	16
368	15	414	10	460	14
369		415	09	461	15
371	15	420	18	462	13
373	11	422	21	463	13
375	11	424		464	23
				465	14

Table 17 SES Scores for Queens Tracts (Continued)

Queens

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
466	22	499	12	528	15
467	18	500	16	529	09
468	14	501	16	530	16
469	19	502-1	16	532	14
470	13	504	18	534	15
471	17	505	12	535	09
472	22	506	18	536	15
473	14	507	15	538	16
475	13	508	15	539	11
476	22	510	13	540	13
478	20	511	13	541	
479	15	512	16	542	15
480	16	513	12	543	10
481	16	515	14	545	10
482	21	516	16	547	11
483	14	517	11	548	14
484	14	518	15	549	10
485	16	519		551	10
489	14	520	17	552	16
492	18	521	10	553	11
493	13	522	15	554	14
493-1	10	524	15	555	09
495	12	525	12	556	17
496	14	526	11	557	10
497	11	527	10	558	17

Table 17 SES Scores for Queens Tracts (Continued)

Queens

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
559	10	596	17	626	15
560	16	597	11	627	11
561		598	16	629	11
562	16	599	13	630	18
564	17	600	18	632	20
565	08	601	11	633	13
566	17	602	15	633-1	14
567	13	603	12	635	14
568	15	604	14	635	14
569	14	606	16	638	14
577	11	607	14	639	14
578	13	608	17	641	17
579	11	610	16	645	14
580	15	612	14	646	19
581	11	613	12	650	21
583	11	614	16	653	
585	11	616	21	654	16
587	11	616-1	17	655	12
588	16	618	18	656	14
589	11	619	10	657	11
590	14	620	18	657-1	14
591	10	621	12	659	12
592	17	621-1	12	660	17
593	11	623	12	661	17
594	15	624		663	16
595	11	625	11	664	15

Table 17 SES Scores for Queens Tracts (Continued)

Queens

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
665	16	719	19	779-2	19
667	12	721	21	779-3	19
669	14	725		779-4	
671	16	727	25	788	11
671-1	15	729	16	790	10
677	16	731	18	792	13
679	18	733	23	797	20
680	15	735	25	799	14
682	13	737	21	803	14
683		739	23	803-1	18
687	11	741	21	809	19
690	13	743	20	814	12
693	19	745	21	818	11
694	14	747	21	837	17
695	19	757	23	838	13
697	21	766	09	840	13
703	16	768		845	19
707	22	769	22	846	13
709	21	769-1	22	846-1	
711	21	771	24	851	15
713	22	773	22	853	19
713-1	21	773-1	21	855	19
714		775	21	857	19
716		779	19	859	19
717	81	779-1	21	861	19

Table 17 SES Scores for Queens Tracts (Continued)

Queens

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
863	18	945	16	1081	
864	12	947	13	1081-1	23
865	19	952	11	1083	16
867		962	12	1091	21
871	08	964	11	1097	18
875		972	12	1099	15
878		973	17	1113	20
884	15	981	16	1123	15
889	18	987	16	1129	20
892	16	991	22	1133	18
895		992	15	1139	18
907		997	19	1141	20
914	14	997-1	21	1147	19
916-1		998	17	1151	21
918		999		1155	16
919	11	1008	19	1157	19
922	22	1010	17	1159	20
925	10	1017	19	1161	21
928	22	1029	17	1163	20
929	12	1032	13	1167	18
934	17	1033	16	1171	17
938	13	1039	15	1175	18
939	13	1047	18	1181	16
942		1059	18	1185	16
942-1	07	1072	12	1187	17

Table 17 SES Scores for Queens Tracts (Continued)

Queens

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
1189	17
1191	13
1193	16
1195	18
1199	15
1201	15
1203	17
1205	11
1207	16
1215	14
1223	18
1227	16
1227-1	17
1241	18
1247	20
1257	14
1265	14
1267	17
1273	24
1275	24
1291	20
1291-1	23
1301	19
1333	21

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
1339	21
1341	21
1347	21
1367	19
1377	19
1385	22
1399	20
1403	20
1409	21
1409-1	18
1417	19
1417-1	
1429	18
1435	16
1441	18
1447	12
1451	17
1451-1	16
1459	17
1463	16
1467	18
1471	18
1479	
1479-1	19

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
1483	23
1507	20
1507-1	21
1529	20
1529-1	20
1551	19
1567	
1571	18
1571-1	14
1579	17
1579-1	17
1579-2	15
1617	15
1621	16

Table 18 SES Scores for Richmond Tracts

Richmond

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score	Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
3	14	77	11	168	
6	13	81	13	169	15
7	16	89		170	15
8	12	91	22	173	12
9	15	96	13	176	11
11	11	97	14	177	18
15		105	13	179	18
17	17	112	12	185	
18		114	14	187	16
20	17	121	19	189	14
21	10	122	16	196	15
27	12	125	12	197	15
29	12	128	13	201	14
33	19	132	18	207	11
36	12	132-1	17	208	15
39	20	133		213	12
40	15	133-1	10	219	13
47	18	134	19	223	11
50	13	138	19	226	12
59	19	141	12	231	12
64	13	146	16	236	
65	20	147	20	239	11
70	12	151	16	244	13
74	10	154		247	11
75	13	156	17	248	12

Table 18 SES Scores for Richmond Tracts (Continued)

Richmond

Census Tract Number	Socio-Economic Score
251	16
273	
277	
279	17
291	13
303	10
319	08
319-1	10
323	

Appendix A: Computation of SES Scores

Appendix B: Method for Estimating White and Nonwhite Population for the Portion of a 1950 Census Tract Coded to an Adjacent Census Tract

Appendix A

Socio-Economic Scores of New York City Census Tracts

The socio-economic score is a measure of the social and economic levels of the various census tracts in the five boroughs in New York City. Our computations are based on the 1960 United States Census of Population. The occupations and the median number of school years completed were the social indicators, and the median family income was the economic indicator. These are the three variables that were used for the socio-economic score.

Each census tract in New York City is classified for the above variables according to the following instructions.

The range of the median family income was divided into the categories listed below:

Median Income

Under $3000	was	assigned	a	weight	of 1
$3000-$3999	"	"	"	"	" 3
$4000-$4999	"	"	"	"	" 4
$5000-$5999	"	"	"	"	" 5
$6000-$6999	"	"	"	"	" 6
$7000-$7999	"	"	"	"	" 7
$8000-$9999	"	"	"	"	" 8
$10000-$14999	"	"	"	"	" 9
$15000-$24999	"	"	"	"	" 10
$25000- or over	"	"	"	"	" 11

The range of the median number of school years completed was divided into the following categories:

Median School Years

Under 7	was	assigned	a	weight	of 0
7-7.9	"	"	"	"	" 1
8-8.9	"	"	"	"	" 2
9-9.9	"	"	"	"	" 3
10-10.9	"	"	"	"	" 4
11-11.9	"	"	"	"	" 5
12-12.9	"	"	"	"	" 6
13-13.9	"	"	"	"	" 7
14-14.9	"	"	"	"	" 8
15-15.9	"	"	"	"	" 9
16.0 or over	"	"	"	"	" 10

The range of the percent of the white collar employees was divided into the following categories:

(White Collar includes professional, managerial, clerical, and sales)

Percent White Collar Employed						
0-9.9%	was	assigned	a	weight	of	0
	"	"	"	"	"	1
	"	"	"	"	"	2
	"	"	"	"	"	3
	"	"	"	"	"	4
	"	"	"	"	"	5
	"	"	"	"	"	6
	"	"	"	"	"	7
	"	"	"	"	"	8
	"	"	"	"	"	9

The three weights for each census tract were added and recorded. This sum we call the socio-economic score and there is one socio-economic score for each census tract. The socio-economic score ranges from four to twenty eight. We distributed this score for one thousand, nine hundred and fifty four census tracts in New York City. One hundred and ninety-six census tracts were incomplete on one or more of the three variables and therefore could not be summed. The distribution was divided as evenly as was applicable, into five parts. The first part contains socio-economic scores from four to eight, the second part contains scores from nine to eleven, the third part contains scores from twelve to fourteen, the fourth part contains scores from fifteen to seventeen, and the fifth part contains scores from eighteen to twenty-eight.

The first part is the lowest group and is indicative of unskilled and manual occupations, low median family incomes, and a small number of median school years completed. It naturally follows that the fifth part or the highest socio-economic scores represent a high percentage of professional, managerial, clerical and sales

occupations, high median family income and the highest number of median school years completed. All these scores were also obtained for each of the five boroughs.

The following chart illustrates the weights that were used for each variable for the sum which we call the socio-economic score.

Median Family Income	Median No. School Years Completed	Percent White Collar Employed
1	0	0
3	1	1
4	2	2
5	3	3
6	4	4
7	5	5
8	6	6
9	7	7
10	8	8
11	9	9
	10	

The sum of any combination of the numbers in the three columns that equals 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8, make up the first part. The sum of any combination of the numbers in the three columns that equals 9, 10, or 11, make up the second part. The sum of any combination of the numbers in the three columns that equals 12, 13, or 14, make up the third part. The sum of any combination of the numbers in the three columns that equals 15, 16, or 17, make up the fourth part. The sum of any combination of the numbers in the three columns that equals 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, or 28 make up the fifth part.

Appendix B

Method for Estimating White and Nonwhite Population for the Portion of a 1950 Census Tract Ceded to an Adjacent Census Tract

Two-thirds of the census tracts had the same boundaries in 1960 as in 1950. However, the number of tracts whose boundaries changed was too large to ignore. For these tracts the racial composition of the 1950 tract was computed with its 1950 boundaries redefined to be the same as in 1960. The computation yielded an estimate rather than an exact figure, for the racial composition of individual blocks is not given in the census of population. The census of housing block statistics does, however, tell white from non-white dwelling units. This could be used as a basis for estimating the racial composition of portions of a 1950 census tract ceded to an adjacent census tract to make up its 1960 boundary. A correction factor was needed to take account of the average difference in the population of a non-white as compared with a white dwelling unit. The estimation procedure, devised by Martin Oling of the City Planning Commission Research Department, is reproduced below.

"From" 1950 census tract no._____ "To" 1950 census tract no._____

Basic Data

1. Total population ceded from census tract_____
2. White dwelling units ceded from census tract_____
3. Non-white dwelling units ceded from tract_____
3a. Total dwelling units ceded from tract_____
4. Census tract white population_____
5. Census tract non-white population_____
6. Census tract white dwelling units_____
7. Census tract nonwhite dwelling units_____

Computations

8. Line 2 ÷ Line 6 (White du's ceded divided by total white du's)
9. Line 3 ÷ Line 7 (Nonwhite du's ceded divided by total nonwhite du's)
10. Line 8 x Line 4 (Estimated number of whites ceded)
11. Line 9 x Line 5 (Estimated number of nonwhites ceded)
12. Line 10 +Line 11 (Estimated total ceded)
13. Line 1 - Line 12 (Actual ceded divided by estimated total ceded)
14. Line 10x Line 13 (Adjusted white population ceded)
15. Line 11x Line 13 (Adjusted non-white population ceded)