URBAN APPALACHIAN COUNCIL 2115 WEST EIGHTH STREET <u>CINCINNATI, OHIO</u> 45204

A COMPARISON OF APPALACHIAN, BLACK AND WHITE NEIGHBORHOODS OF CINCINNATI, 1960 - 1970

by

Dan M. McKee

WORKING PAPER NO. 9

Revised, November, 1977

Urban Appalachian Council

1015 Vine Street Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 513-421-2550



INTRODUCTION

Although the city of Cincinnati has a rich history of being a haven for migrants, the Cincinnati of today seldom receives many foreign migrants. The migrant of the present is Black or Appalachian or both. As has happened in many cities, the rural migrants have tended to be clustered together within the neighborhoods of Cincinnati. The purpose of this paper is not to theorize as to the "hows and whys" of this clustering. That is well beyond the scope of this project. The purpose of the paper is to attempt to compare the living conditions within the neighborhoods. Since the population of Cincinnati has three major groups, one useful way of comparing the neighborhoods would be to classify each community as either Black, Appalachian, or White. These terms are used in a cultural sense, not in a racial sense. Therefore Black Appalachians are considered Appalachian: and White Appalachians are also considered Appalachian and not culturally White.

The process of classifying the neighborhoods is a relatively simple task since the city has "statistical neighborhoods". The city has 119 census tracts which have been grouped into 44 Statistical Neighborhoods. The boundaries were formed in such a way as to approximate the mental maps of the community residents. Naturally not everyone agrees with this concept, but it is generally felt that the statistically imposed boundaries are acceptable representations of "real neighborhoods".

Since the statistical neighborhood is a reasonable approximation of the existing communities, it is very useful in studying the living conditions in Cincinnati. It has often been stated that Cincinnati is a typical city. If this is true, then the results of studies based on the neighborhoods could be generalized to the living conditions of Blacks. Appalachians, and/or Whites in other cities of similar population.

THE APPROACH

The organization of this paper will follow a four step process:

Identification of the neighborhoods, Definition of the variables. Comparison and analysis of the variables for the communities, and the Conclusions. Step 1

The neighborhoods are placed into the group that corresponds to the dominate group in the population of that community. If a neighborhood has 50 percent or more of it population as Black, then it would be classified as a Black neighborhood. For example, Lower Price Hill is estimated to be over 50 percent Appalachian. Therefore it is classified as an Appalachian neighborhood. A neighborhood is classified as White if it is not 50 percent Black or 50 percent Appalachian. Although it is possible for a community to be both Black and Appalachian, this does not seem to occur in Cincinnati. Population percentages are from Census Summary Data 1970 (full count and 20% sample) and 1970 Census Computer Tapes except the Appalachian estimates which were provided by the Urban Appalachian Council. Step 2.

All variables are patterned after the poverty

indices used by Maroney Maloney, and May in their adaptation of the Census Bureau's New Haven Project with the exception of the Nyden Ratio which was developed by Paul Nyden. The values of the variables are calculated from census data for 1970. This data set is available through the Behavioral Sciences Laboratory of the University of Cincinnati.

Step 3

The comparison and analysis techniques and methodology were completed via SPSS program package and the FINN program. Print outs of the results are available through the Behavioral Sciences Laboratory.

Step 4

The conclusions drawn from the results attempt to summarize the similarities and the differences among the living conditions of Black, Appalachian, and White Neighborhoods.

THE NEIGHBORHOODS

Appalachian Neighborhoods

(4)	Over-The-Rhine	(12)	0ak1ey	(17)	East	End
(20)	E. Price Hill*	(23)	S. Fairmount*	(24)	N.W.	Fairmount
(25)	L. Price Hill	(32)	Carthage	(33)	Harty	well
		(40)	Camp Washington			

Black Neighborhoods

(1) Avondale	(2) Corryville	(5) Mt. Auburn
(14) Kennedy Hats.	(22) N. Fairmount	(28) West End
(29) Evanston	(31) Walnut Hills	(36) Winton Hills
(43) Queens	sgate (27) S. C	Cumminsville

White Neighborhoods

< .

(3) N. Avondale	(6) (Clifton Hgts.	(7) Clifton
(8) Bond Hill	(9) F	Roselawn	(10) Hyde Park
(11) Mt. Lookout	(13)	Madisonville	(15) Pleasant Ridge
(16) Mt. Adams	(18)	Riverside	(19) Fernbank
(21) W. Price Hill	(26)	Northside**	(30) E. Walnut Hills
(34) College Hill	(35)	Mt. Airy	(37) Westwood
(38) Mt. Washington	(39)	California	(41) River-Road
(4	2) University	Hgts. (44) C.	Riverfront

*Although there is some uncertainity, these neighborhoods are now considered to have been Appalachian.

**Although this community meets the criteria as being a White Weighborhood, it should be noted that it has a population that is 45 percent Appalachian and 12 percent Black.

,

Median Family Income

This is the sum total of the income from everyone inca family that resides in the same household. This would include the wages of husband, wife, children, and perhaps members of an extended family that live in a household.

Poverty Index

This is the percentage of all families whose total income is less than three thousand dollars in a year. It should be noted that this variable is not the same as the poverty level provided in the 1970 census. The census does not provide poverty figures in any previous census. Therefore, this data set used the under three thousand dollar variable since it is part of a time series comparison from 1950 to 1970.

Nyden Ratio

This is the total population of a community divided by the total number of persons employed. It is designed to show the ratio of people to workers. It can loosely be used to indicate the number persons supported per worker. Natural Family Index

This is the percentage of persons under eighteen 'years of age that live in two parent homes. Its compliment (100-nfi) is the number of children living in one or no parent homes. Its use in this study is primarily a measure of the number of potential wage earners in a family. It is not necessarily a reflection of home stability.

Overcrowding Index

This is the percentage of all housing units that have more than one person per room. In other words, it is the total number of persons living in a residence divided by the total number of rooms in the residence. <u>Occupation Index</u>

This is the percentage of persons living in a neighborhood that are bluecollar workers. This includes all forms of unskilled or semiskilled workers excluding service: workers. Service workers were not included because as a class of workers they can be bluecollar or whitecollar, unskilled to highly skilled. Including them could have inflated the resulting percentage.

Education Index

This is the percentage of 25 year old persons that do not have a high school diploma. It reflects the education level of the work force of a neighborhood.

SES Index

The variables used to compute the SES Index are: National Family Index, Median Family Income, Occupation Index, Education Index, and Overcrowding Index. The rank for each of the 119 census tracts was determined for each of the five variables. These ranks were then summed and the results were divided by five (the mean rank). This produced an SES Index for each census tract. To convert this into a SES Index for neighborhoods, it was necessary to sum the indices within a neighborhood and then divide that result by the number of tracts in the neighborhood (the mean SES Index). It is designed to be a general measure, of SES and it is useful in looking at the overall differences between Appalachian, Black and White neighborhoods.

Median Years of School

This is the median years of school completed by persons over 25 years old who live in that neighborhood. It is used to indicate the typical amount of school completed by the major portion of the work force. <u>Median Family Income in 1967 Dollars</u>

This variable was created by converting the Median Family Income into 1967 dollars. The 1967 dollars are based on the consumer price index for each of the census years of 1960 and 1970 (see Appendix D). This corrects for the effect that inflation has had between 1960 and 1970. Therefore, it produces a value that can be compared across time.

COMPARISON AND ANALYSIS

These data transformations required were done by SPSS and the analysis of the data was accomplished via the FINN program. The procedure selected to analyze the data was the Multivariate Analysis of Variance. This procedure allows one to determine if there is a significant difference between the middle value, and the high or low was tested by establishing confidence intervals around the means generated by the MANOVA procedure. If the intervals do not overlap then there is said to be a significant difference at the .05 risk level.

Comparison of the Means for the Variables by Neighborhood

Variable	Appalachian	Black	White
Natural Family Index	74.8	53.8	79.1
Occupation Index	55.5	43.2	33.3
Education Index	72.9	65.6	49.9
Median Family Income	7793	6349	9988
Poverty Index	14.9	23.8	8.9
Overcrowding Index	13.4	15.0	7.8
Nyden Ratio	2.7	3.1	4.3

sample of 44 neighborhoods. Therefore all the values were compared and tested for significance. Naturally this testing process takes the sample size into consideration. The following are the results of the comparison and testing.*

Variables	Appalachian Neighborhoods	White Neighborhoods	Significantly Different
Natural Family Index	74.8	79.1	NO
Occupation Index	55.5	33.3	YES
Education Index	72.9	49.9	YES
Median Family Income	7793	998 8	YES
Poverty Index	14.9	8.9	YES
Overcrowing Index	13.4	7.8	YES
Nyden Ratio	2.7	4.3	NO

A brief interpretation of the chart would be that, in 1970, White Neighborhoods had more skilled and whitecollar workers, more highly educated people, higher levels of income, less overcrowding in the homes, and a smaller proportion of families living in poverty. However, the Appalachian Neighborhoods seem to have the same proportion of two parent homes as their white counterparts. Since there is a difference in the income levels, a difference in income could indicate that althought they are not in formal poverty, Appalachians in these neighborhoods are forced to exist on considerably less than persons living in White Neighborhoods. *refers the reader to the Appendix

Variables	Black Neighborhoods	White Neighborhoods	Significantly Different
Natural Family			
Index	53.8	79.1	YES
Occupation Index	43.2	33.3	YES
Education Index	65.6	49 .9	YES
Median Family Income	6349	9988	YES
Poverty Index	23.8	8.9	YES
Overcrowding Index	15.0	7.8	YES
Nyden Ratio	3.1	4.3	NO

A brief interpretation of the differences between White Neighborhoods and Black Neighborhoods reveals White Communities tend to have a higher percentage of two parent homes, more highly educated persons, more income per family, a smaller percentage of families in poverty, and less overcrowding in the homes. The statistical test indicates that Black Communities have a smaller proportion of skilled or White collar workers as do the White neighborhoods. In short, Black Neighborhoods are worse off than White Neighborhoods in every aspect measured except the ratio between the total population and the number of persons employed.

Variables	Appalachian Neighborhoods	Black Neighborhoods	Significantly Different
Natural Family Index	74.8	53.8	YES
Occupation Index	55.5	43.2	YES
Education Index	72.9	65. 6	NO
Median Family I nco me	7793	6349	YES
Poverty Index	14.9	23.8	YES
Overcrowding Index	13.4	15.0	NO
Nyden Ratio	2.7	3.1	NO

Appalachian Neighborhoods and Black Neighborhoods are similar in their amount of overcrowding in the homes and their proportions of persons without a high school diploma. Despite a similar level of education, the Black Community has a larger percentage of skilled and whitecollar workers but tends to have a lower income level. This suggests that there was, in 1970, discrimination in wages and employment practices. One wonders if ' such practices still continue today. Other differences between Black and Appalachian Neighborhoods have fewer families living in poverty and have more children living in two parent homes than their Black counterparts. However one must take caution before making too mush of this finding. The Census Bureau reports a curious phenomenon.

Black males in their early twenties disappear from the population figures and do not reappear until their mid-thirties. It is also a commonly reported item that some black fathers are absent from the home during "welfare visits" in order to continue to receive benefits. Those fathers feel that they are virtually forced to "disappear" to insure that their children are fed. The prospects of losing the meager benefits may also be preventing some single parents from re-marrying. It could very well be that these situations keep the "apparent" number of children living in two parent homes "lower" than homes in White and Appalachian Neighborhoods.

 $\widehat{}$

So far we have looked at the differences of the variables one at a time. However, by using the multivariate analysis of variance one can further understand how these variables function together and the contribution that the variables make to the overall situation while controlling for the effects of those variables that make a larger contribution. In other words, it helps to find out if education is really significantly different due to its own effect or does it appear to be significant only because it is highly related to a variable that makes a greater contribution to explaining the differences between communities such as Occupation Index.

When one looks at the overall effect of all the variables at once, it can be seen that there are significant differences between the neighborhoods of Cincinnati. After the variables have been placed in what is felt to be their order of importance, one can observe the magnitude of the contributions of each variable while controlling for the other variables. In this case the ones that explain most of the differences between the communities are Median Family Income, Natural Family Index, and Occupation Index.

When we look at the effect of each individual variable, we see that the Poverty Index, the Education Index, and the Overcrowding Index were significantly different among the neighborhoods. However, when the effect of the Median Family Income, Natural Family Index, and the Occupation Index are removed, the others do not remain significantly different. Therefore it can be concluded that poverty overcrowding, education and the Nyden indices are not any different for White, Black, or Appalachian Neighborhoods. The things that make the communities differ in their living conditions are the level of income, the number of two parent homes, and the number of skilled and whitecollar werkers - with White Neighborhoods faring better in all three than their Black and Appalachian Counterparts.

Perhaps the next issue is the question of changes in the neighborhoods. Are the living conditions in the Black and Appalachian Communities improving? In an attempt to answer this question, the SES Index which was definded earlier from 1960 was compared with the same measure in 1970.*

SES Index	Appalachian Neighborhoods	Black Neighborhoods	White Neighborhoods
1960	40.7	38.0	71.6
1970	45.4	36.8	80.3
Significant Difference	NO	NO	NO

* Maloney, Michael, The Social Areas of Cincinnati

A brief interpretation of the preceding chart leads one to the conclusion that the Socio-Economic Status for each of the neighborhood types has not changed throughout the 1960's. Therefore, if the SES Index can be used as a single summary indicator of the living conditions in the neighborhoods of Cincinnati, then one would be forced to conclude that all the efforts of the social service system and Johnson's War on Poverty have failed to produce any improvement in the living conditions within the neighborhoods of Cincinnati by 1970. Perhaps their contribution can be seen by 1980.

In the opinion of the author, one cannot attribute this lack of improvement to "negative aspects" of the neighborhood residents. It seems that we have created a social system that does not permit everyone to be a success". Therefore, it becomes the responsibility of the system to insure that all persons are well cared for. But are we living up to that responsibility?

The next issue is the question of changes in the neighborhoods. Are the living conditions in the Black and Appalachian communities improving? In an attempt to answer this question in a general context, the SES Index from 1960 was compared with the same measure from 1970.*

1960-1970	COMPARISON OF S	ES INDICES	DICES		
Census	Appalachian	Black	White		
1960	40.7	38.0	71.6		
1970	45.4	36.8	80.3		
Significant Difference	NO	NO	NO		

A brief interpretation of the preceding chart leads one to the conclusion that the Socio-Economic Status for each of the neighborhood types has not changed throughout the 1960's. Therefore, if the SES Index can be used as a single summary indicator of the living conditions in the neighborhoods of Cincinnati, then one would be forced to conclude that all the efforts of the social service system and Johnson's War on Poverty have failed to produce relative improvement in the living conditions within the neighborhoods of Cincinnati by 1970. Perhaps their contribution can be seen by 1980.

In the absence of any support evidence that the overall gap between the living conditions in the White communities and the others is lessening, perhaps the next task is to investigate the other variables for changes across time.

* Although there is some uncertainty, the Urban Appalachian Council feels that those Appalachian neighborhoods in 1970 were also Appalachian in 1960.

Census	Appalachian	Black	White	
1960	84.9	70.8	88.8	
1970	74.8	53.8	79.1	11111111111111111111111111111111111111
Significant Difference	YES	YES	YES	

1960-1970 COMPARISON OF NATURAL FAMILY LIVING

By looking at the above chart, one can see that all three types of Cincinnati neighborhoods have had large decreases in the percentage of children living in two parent homes. The most pronounced change was for the Black communities. Their decline was almost twice the decline in White neighborhoods. The Appalachian neighborhoods also had a significant decline that was approximately equal to the decline in the White communities.

The remaining questions are: Why has there been such a dramatic decline in the percentage of children living in two parent homes. and Why is the decline so much greater for Black neighborhoods? At this stage it is only an opinion but perhaps it is a function of the economy. During times of depression, family relationships may come under strain which causes an increase in family disintegration. Since the Black neighborhoods tend to have a higher percentage of families in poverty and suffer from a greater extreme of poverty, then their apparent rate of family disintegration would be much more pronounced. It certainly is an area that requires further study.*

*Although there is some concern about this variable, it is felt that these concerns probably could not explain away such a magnatude of difference. See pages 12-13.

1960-1970	COMPARISON OF OCCUP	MPARISON OF OCCUPATION INDICES		
Census	Appalachian	Black	White	
19 60	55.8	50.4	34.7	
1970	55.5	43.2	33.3	
Significant Difference	NO	YES	NO	

By investigating the above chart one can see that Appalachian and White communities did not have a significant decline in the percentage of unskilled and semi-skilled workers. However the Black neighborhoods showed a 7.2% decrease. This represents a significant lessening of the Black-White gap.

1960-1970	COMPARISON OF EDU	CATION INDIC	ES	
Census	Appalachian	Black	White	
1960	79.9	74.5	59.8	
1970	72.9	65.6	49.9	and a start of the st
Significant Difference	YES	YES	YES	

As can be seen, all three neighborhood types showed a significant decrease in the percentage of persons over 25 that do not have a high school diploma. This decrease was approximately equal for all groups with the Appalachian communities having a slightly smaller decrease. Although this decrease is certainly desirable, it is also noticeable that the gap between the neighborhoods did not change.

A new variable was added at this point to further the investigation of educational changes across time. It is the median years of school completed by persons over 25 years old. As stated earlier in the paper, it is used to indicate the typical amount of school completed by the major portion of the work force.

1960-1970	COMPARISON. OF MEDI	AN YEARS OF	SCHOOL COMPLETED	
Census	Appalachian	Black	White	
1960	8.9	9.0	10.8	
1970	8.5	10.0	11.6	
Significant Difference	NO	YES	YES	

The chart indicates that the Appalachian communities did not have any change in the amount of school completed. In fact, there may have been a slight decrease in the amount of education received. This was unexpected since they had a significant decrease in persons over 25 without a high school diplomas. One explanation could be that fewer persons are "dropping out" but those that do, "drop out" at an earlier grade.

1960-1970	COMPARISON OF MEDIAN	I FAMILY INCOME	IN 1957 DOLLARS
Census	Appalachian	Black	White
1960	6176	5307	7827
1970	6878	5603	8815
Significant Difference	YES	NO	YES

After correcting Median Family income for inflation by converting it into 1967 (consumer price) dollars, (see appendix D), we can see that the Appalachian neighborhoods had a significant increase in buying power from 1960 to 1970. The White neighborhoods had an even larger increase in buying power. However, the Black communities did not have a large enough increase for it to be significant. Therefore, inspite of significant increases in job skills and education, the Black neighborhoods did not increase their buying power. In contrast, the Appalachian neighborhoods (who tend to have fewer job skills) did not show any increase in the proportion of skilled workers, but did have a substantial increase in buying power. The White communities, like the Appalachian neighborhoods, had no increase in job skills; yet they had the largest increase in buying power.

The reasons that the Black neighborhoods did not experience an increase in buying power inspite of an increase in education and job skills might be explained by the following:

- 1) Racial discrimination in wages and employment
- The gains made in education and job skills were negated by the increase in one parent homes. This would reduce the potential number of wage earners per family. Therefore, this would reduce the income for a family.
- 3) A combination of the reasons given above

Regardless of the reason for such a discrepancy a severe problem exists that requires immediate and extensive attention.

1960-1970	COMPARISON OF POVERTY INDICES						
Census	Appalachian	Black	White				
1960**	13.5	22.5	9.7				
1970*	14.9	23.9	8.9	<u></u>			
Significant Difference	NO	NO	NO				

* \$3000 was the poverty line in 1970

** \$2300 was the poverty line in 1960

\$2300 in 1960 = \$3000 in 1970

Apparently, there has been no change in any types of the neighborhoods of Cincinnati in the percentage of families below the poverty line. Obviously, there was no progress toward narrowing the gap between the White neighborhoods and the Black or the Appalachian neighborhoods.

1960-1970	COMPARISON OF OV	ERCROUCING	INDICES	٩٠
Census	Appalachian	Black	White	
1960	20.9	21.3	11.1	
1970	13.4	15.0	7.9	
Significant Pifference	YES	YES	YES	

It appears that each and every type of neighborhood had a significant reduction in the percentage of overcrowded homes from 1960 to 1970. The Appalachian communities had the largest decline, but the Black neighborhoods also had a substantial decline. Certainly, progress like this is highly desirable, but the gap between the White communities and the Black or Appalachian neighborhoods is still very large.

COMPARISON OF NYD	EN RATIOS		
Appalachian	Black	White	
2.63	3.01	2.65	
2.68	3.09	2.50	
NO	NO	NO	
	COMPARISON OF NYD Appalachian 2.63 2.68 NO	COMPARISON OF NYDEN RATIOSAppalachianBlack2.633.012.683.09NONO	COMPARISON OF NYDEN RATIOSAppalachianBlackWhite2.633.012.652.683.092.50NONONO

The Nyden ratio did not seem to substantially change from 1960 to 1970. This means that the ratio between the population of a neighborhood and the number of workers has not changed. In summary, when we looked at the effect of the variables

individually we found that:

- 1. White Communities were better off than Black Neighborhoods in every factor measured except the Nyden Ratio.
- 2. White Neighborhood were significantly better off than Appalachian Communities in five of the variables measured. The only similarities between the two groups of neighborhoods were the Nyden Ratio and the percentage of children living in two parent homes which indicated an equal (potentially) number of wage earners per family. Nevertheless the level of income is still considerably less.
- 3. Appalachian Neighborhoods were significantly better off than Black Communities in all variables measured except in overcrowding and education, which are very similar, and occupation which shows Blacks as being better off.

Therefore we can conclude that Black Neighborhoods have the least desirable living conditions. Appalachian Neighborhoods although they fare better than their Black counterparts, still do not equal the living conditions of the White Communities.

When we looked at the effect of all the variables working at once, the ones that accounted for most of the differences between the neighbor-

hoods were:

- 1. The proportion of children living in two parent homes
- 2. The Median Family Income
- 3. The proportion of skilled and whitecollar workers

ł

Once the above variables were controlled, the remaining variables were no longer significantly different between the Neighborhoods.

When we looked at changes in the living conditions between

neighborhoods, we observed:

1. That there was no significant gain made toward narrowing the gap between White Neighborhoods and the others.

2. That there were no improvements in the living conditions in the Appalachian or Black Neighborhoods from 1960 to 1970.

When we looked at the overall changes in the living conditions

between neighborhoods, we observed:

- 1) That there were no significant gains made toward narrowing the gap between the White neighborhoods and the Black or the Appalachian neighborhoods.
- 2) That there were little or no improvements in the living conditions in the Appalachian or the Black neighborhoods from 1960 to 1970.
 - a) The Appalachian neighborhoods showed an increase in the percentage of children in one parent home. They showed no change in job skills, the percentage of families in poverty, or the Nyden ratio. Educationally, they apparently have fewer persons without high school diplomas, but there was not an increase in buying power, it apparently was not enough to decrease the poverty. The only progress toward an improved living standard was in the reduction of over-crowding.
 - b) The Black neighborhoods showed an improvement in job skills, the percentage of high school graduates, and the median years of school completed. However in spite of these improvements the Black neighborhoods did not have any improvement. in the buying power of the families or the percentage of families in poverty. This might be explained by racial discrimination, a decrease in the number of wage earners per family, or both of the latter.
 - c) The White neighborhoods, like the others showed an increase in the number of one parent homes. They apparently had no improvenment in the area of job skills. Educationally they show an increase in the median years of school completed, and a smaller percentage of persons without a high school diploma. The buying power of families in White communities also increased, but the percentage of families in poverty did not change.

In conclusion, the period between the 1960 census and the 1970 census showed little or no improvement in the living conditions of those neighborhoods most in need - Black and Appalachian communities. However the neighborhoods that seemingly improved the most were White - the ones that had the least need. In the opinion of the author, one can not attribute this lack of improvement to "negative aspects" of the neighborhood residents. It seems that we have created a social system that does not permit everyone to be a success - indeed it may even prevent some persons from obtaining "success". Therefore it becomes the responsibility of the system to insure that all persons have adequate care.

Therefore, it is sadly concluded not only that the living conditions in the Black and Appalachian Neighborhoods are not as good as they should be, but it appears that things did not improve throughout the 1960's. But then again any Black or Appalachian living in Over-The-Rhine can tell you that - he lives it everyday.

			Appendix	<u>A</u>		
	OBSERVE	D CELL MEA	NS ROW	IS ARE CEL	LS-COLUMNS AR	E VARIABLES
1 NFI	2 OCCIN	3 FDIN	4 MFI	5 PCVIN	6 OVERIN	7 NYDEN
74.810 53.800 79.087	55.520 43.218 33.335	72.870 65.627 49.917	7792.800 6348.818 9987.565	14.890 23.855 8.870	13.430 15.027 7.861	2.676 3.092 4.290
	OBSERVED	CELL STD	DEVSROWS	ARE CELLS	-COLUMNS VARIA	ABLES
] NFI	2 OCCIN	3 FDIN	4 MFI	5 PCVIN	6 OVERIN	7 NY DEN
9.441 9.559 10.571	12.570 9.348 15.358	13.820 14.579 16.940	1716.534 1959.180 1764.794	9.694 10.273 6.558	8.908 5.938 5.337	1.015 0.643 9.150
VARIABLE		VAI (Erro	RIANCE or Mean Squa	res)	STANDARD DEVI	ATION
1 MFI 2 OCCIN 3 FDIN 4 MFI 5 POVIN 6 OVERIN 7 NYDEN		10 182 247 3363757 71 41 45	1.810608 2.564494 7.749158 7.119599 .601094 .303842 5.350811		10.0901 13.5115 16.7400 1806.5871 8.4617 6.4268 6.7343	
		D.	F. = 41.			

.....

ERROR TERM FOR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (WITHIN CELLS)

(

APPENDIX B

a

F-RATIO FOR MULTIVARIATE TEST OF EQUALITY OF MEAN VECTORS= 6.1584

D.F. 14. AND 70.0000 P LESS THAN 0.0001

 $(LIKELIHGOD_{RATIO} = 0.200786235 00 LOG = -0.16055145E 01)$

VARIABLE	UNIVARIATE F	P LESS THAN	STEP DOWN F	P LESS THAN
1 MFI	16.3194	0.0001	16.3194	0.0001
		STEP-	DOWN MEAN SQUARES = (**	********
2 POVIN	11.7424	0.0001	1.1496	0.3271
		STEP	- DOWN MEAN SQUARES = (36, 7872/32,0040)
3 MFI	23.9459	0.0001	10.3805	0.0003
		STEP-I	DOWN MEAN SQUARES = (35	9,2207/ 34,6049)
4 OCCIN	9.6207	0.0004	4.9498	0,0123
		STEP-1	DOWN MEAN SQUARES = (78	5,7048/ 158,7339)
5 FDIN	8.6864	0.0008	1.0705	0.3533
		STEP -	- DOWM MEAN SQUARES = (9	7,8193/ 91,3809)
6 OVERIN	5.6146	0.0070	2.0563	0,1427
		STEP-!	DOWN MEAN SQUARES= (3	5.0170/ 17.0294)
7 NYDEN	9.2459	0.7832	2.6562	0,0844
		STEP-I	DOWN MEAN SOUARES= (8	4.6890/ 31.8834)

APPENDIX C

VARIABLE	NUMBE	R MEAN	STANDARD	STANDARD	2-TAIL	т	DEGREES OF	2-TAIL
CECTICE	OF CASE	<u>S</u>	DEVIATION	ERROR	CORR.PROB.	VALUE	FREEDOM	PROB.
SE214 0	10	40.7000	23.166	7.325	0 867 0 001	_1 12	o	0 201
	10	45,4000	26.609	8.415	3 .007 -91,991	-1,16	5	0.291
SESIN 7								
w	T-TEST: E	LACK NEIGHBORHO	DODS	90 90 - 90 - 90 - 90 - 90 - 90 - 90 -				
SESIN 6		38.0000	28:443	8.576				
	11				0.941 0.000	0.40	10	0.699
SESIN 7		36.8182	24,604	7.418	nga kanalara panganan na sa kanala sa		1999 - 199 Marcall Marcall (199 - 1994) - 1994 - 1994 - 1994 - 1994 - 1994 - 1994 - 1994 - 1994 - 1994 - 1994 -	
	T-TEST:	WHITE NEIGHBORH	OODS	anna ball. Mgar anna - ann a dhlanna ann a dhanna bhanna ann g h	<u></u>			
SEDIN D		6 6.1 591	31.668	4.774				
SESIN 7	44	61.4773	30.718	4.630	0.839 0.000	-1.99	43	. 0, 053
CECTURE.	T-TEST:	ALL NEIGHBORHOO	DS	-				
SESIN 6		71.552	24.175	6.083	0.680 0.000	-1.94	22	0.066
ESIN 7	23	80.2609	22.103	4.510				
((

١

APPENDIX D

CONVERSION OF MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME INTO 1967 DOLLARS VIA THE

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

In 1967, \$100.00 would have been <u>\$88.63</u> in 1960 and <u>\$116.39</u> in 1970.*

Equations for conversion of Median Family Income into 1967 dollars are:

MFI60 conv. = $\frac{MFI60}{.8863}$ MFI70 conv. = $\frac{MFI70}{1.1639}$

Poverty line used in this study was \$3000 in 1970. An equivalent poverty line in 1960 would be :

(.8863 / 1.1639) (3000) = \$2286.16 \$2300.00

Therefore the poverty line in 1960 was determined to be \$2300.00.

* these figures were obtained form the National Bureau of Economic Research - Time Series Data. They were extracted from the Behavioral Sciences Laboratory Archive. They are stored on a standard tabe - VOL = UC2869, DSN=NBERM, LABEL=4.

APPENDIX E

T-TEST APPALACHIAN NEIGHBORHOODS

VARIABLE	NUMBER	84T A 81	STANDARD	STANDARD	Т	DEGREES	SOF '2-TAIL
FAMDEX6	UF LASES	84.8399	4.648	1.470	VALUE.	FREEDU	PRUB.
	10				4.68	9	0.001
FAMDEX7		74.8099	9.442	2.986			
OCCIN6		55.7599	11.004	3.569			
	10				0.07	9	0.945
OCCIN7		55.5199	12.570	3.975			
EDIN6		79.9399	11.021	3.485			
	10				4,43	9	6.002
EDIN7		72.8699	13.821	4.371			
MDFAMING		5429.1992	876.460	277.161			
MÐFAMIN7	10	7792.7969	1716.513	542.809	-8.19	9	0,000
POVIN6		13.5000	6.716	2.124			
	10				-1.09	q	0.303
POVIN7	10	14.8900	9.694	3.066		2	0.000
OVERIN6		20.8700	10.865	3.436			
	10				4.22	9	0.002
OVERIN7		13.4300	8,900	2.817			
NY DEN6		2.6291	0.497	0.157			
	10				-0.21	C,	J. 24;
NYDEN7		2.6760	1.0:5	0.321			

(

T-TEST: APPALACHIAN NEIGHBORHOODS, (Continued)

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FRIEDOM	re-tail <u>Prop</u>	
CP67MF 16		6176.5625	997.099	315.310				
CP57MI 17	10	6878.0156	1515.040	479.098	-3.53	9	0,006	
MEDEDG		8,9000	0.762	0.241				
MEDED7	10	8.5100	2.650	0.838	0.42	9	0.682	

APPENDIX F

T-TEST: BLACK NEIGHBORHGODS

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD Error	T V/LI'E	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PSOB.
FAMDEX6		70.8726	11.001	3.317	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••		P
	11				8.18	10	0.000
FAMDEX7		53,8000	9,560	2.882			
OCCIN6		50,3818	12.079	3.642			
	11				2,23	10	0.050
OCCIN7		43.2181	9,348	2.819			
EDIN6		74.4999	14,243	4.295			
	11				2.33	10	0.042
EDIN7		65,6272	14.580	4.396			
MDFAMIN6		4665.2695	1287.161	388,094			
	11				-6.58	10	0,000
MDFAMIN7		6348.8164	1969.154	593,722		_	
POVIN6		22.5454	10.278	3.099			
	11	• .			-1.01	10	0,337
POVIN7		23.8545	10.273	3,097			
OVERIN6		21.2909	8.274	2,495			
	11				4,66	10	0.001
OVERIN7		15.0273	5,938	1,790			
NYDEN6		3.0086	0.730	0.220			
	11				0.80	10	0.442
NYDEN7	· · ·	3.0914	0.643	0.194			

ĺ

VPPENDIX F

· · ·

T-TEST BLACK NEIGHBORHOODS,(continued)

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERRGR	T VALUE	DEGREES	OF 2-TAIL PROB.
CP67MF16		5307.4727	1 . 1464.340	441.515			
CP67MF17	11	5603.5489	1738.003	524. 028	-1.71	10	0.119
MEDED6		9.0545	1.295	0.390			
MEDED7	11	9,9636	0.971	0.293	-4.08	10	0.002

(

APPENDIX G

T-TEST: WHITE NEIGHBORHOODS

VARTABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD Error	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PRCB.
		88,8303	C. 000	1.101			
FAMDEX7	23	79.0869	10.571	2.204	6.98	22	0.000
OCCIN6	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	34.7347	14.83?	3.093			·····
0001117	23	33 3347	15 353	3 202	0.49	22	0.629
EDING		58.7782	16.687	3.480			
EDIN7	23	/0 0173	16 940	3 532	5.75	22	0.000
MDFAMIN6		6880.0000	1598.213	333.250			
MDEAMIN7	23	0087 5625	1764 767	367 070	-13.05	22	0.0000
POVING		9.6565	4.761	0.993			
ΡΩντησ	23	8 8696	6 853	1 //30	0.82	22	0.423
OVERIN6		11.0870	7.885	1.644			
OVERIN7	23	7.8609	5.337	1,113	3.09	22	0.005
NY DEN6		2.6516	0.369	0.077			
	23				2.25	22	0.035
NY DEN7		2.5044	0.319	0.066			

1

APPENDIX G

T_TEST: WHITE NEIGHBORHOODS, (continued)

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD Error	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.	
CP57MF16		7827.0508	1818.304	379.143				
6P67MF17	23	8815.1367	1557.671	324.797	-4.08	22	0.000	
MEDED6		10.7913	1.511	0.315				
MEDED7	23	11.5869	1.239	0.258	-5.36	22	0.000	

.

.

٦

BIBLIOGRAPHY

<u>Census Tracts:</u> 1960 Census of Population and Housing (Cincinnati - Ohio - Ky. - Ind. Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas). Washington D.C. U.S. Department of Commerce-Bureau of the Census, May 1962.

Census Tracts: 1970 Census of Population and Housing (Cincinnati - Ohio-Ky.-Ind. Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas). Washington D.C. U.S. Depart. of Commerce-Bureau of the Census, May 1972.

Finn, Jeremy. <u>Multivariance: User's Guide</u> (Version H, Release 2) Chicago, Illinois: National Educational Resources, June, 1974.

Nie, et al. <u>Statistical Package for the Social Sciences</u> (2nd Ed.) McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Maloney, Michael. <u>The Social Areas of Cincinnati: Toward an Analysis</u> of Social Need. Cincinnati, Ohio : Human Relations Commission, January, 1974.