

**Religion, Housing Discrimination, and Residential Attainment in Philadelphia:
Are Muslims Disadvantaged?**

Samantha Friedman
Associate Professor of Sociology
Department of Sociology
University at Albany, SUNY

Joseph R. Gibbons
Assistant Professor of Sociology
Department of Sociology
San Diego State University

Colleen Wynn
Doctoral Student
Department of Sociology
University at Albany, SUNY

September 25, 2015

Direct correspondence to Samantha Friedman, Department of Sociology, University at Albany, SUNY, 348 Arts and Sciences Building, 1400 Washington Avenue, Albany, NY 12222 (samfriedman@albany.edu); phone (518-442-5458); fax (518-442-4936).

Religion, Housing Discrimination, and Residential Attainment in Philadelphia: Are Muslims Disadvantaged?

Abstract

Since the tragic events taking place on September 11th, 2001, Muslims continue to experience discriminatory and prejudicial treatment in American society. What this means for Muslims in the housing market is not well known, as only three scholarly studies have focused on the impact of religion on housing discrimination and residential attainment in the US. This paper seeks to build upon this very limited literature by using a unique dataset collected biennially in the Philadelphia metropolitan area that explicitly asks respondents their religion, experiences with housing discrimination, and identifies respondents' census tracts, allowing us to merge American Community Survey data and examine neighborhood-level outcomes. Our preliminary analyses reveal that Muslims are significantly more likely than non-Muslims to experience housing discrimination and live in neighborhoods that are poorer, with higher levels of concentrated disadvantage, and in the central city, controlling for relevant socioeconomic and demographic factors.

Introduction

In 2014, Muslims comprised nearly 1% of the American population, more than doubling their share of the population from .4% in 2007 (Cooperman, Smith, and Ritchey 2015). Since the tragic events taking place on September 11th, 2001, Muslims continue to experience discriminatory and prejudicial treatment in American society, with the most recent incident involving Ahmed Mohamed who brought a homemade clock to school and was arrested on suspicions that he had made a bomb. In 2011, Muslims were surveyed by the Pew Research Center about challenges that they face from living in the US (Kohut, Keeter, and Smith 2011). Two of the most significant problems that they reported were negative views against Muslims (29%) and experiences with discrimination and prejudice (20%).

As far as actual experiences with negative treatment, 28% of Muslims surveyed reported that they were treated or viewed with suspicion while 22% reported being called offensive names. Comparing results from an earlier survey revealed that such discriminatory experiences have not lessened over time. The Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR) collected data on civil complaints filed by Muslims between 2003 and 2008 and found that the number reported to their organization increased by 168%, from 1,019 to 2,728 complaints (CAIR 2009, 2011). The places where the largest share of the complaints occurred in 2008 were in Muslim organizations or mosques, and the largest share of the type of alleged abuse was in the form of hate mail/propaganda/internet abuse.

Housing discrimination comprises a smaller share of all the complaints filed in 2008 (nearly 2%), although its representation has doubled from .9% in 2004 (CAIR 2009). These numbers are consistent with those reported by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). In fiscal year 2013, 3% of housing discrimination complaints was based on religion (HUD 2014). It is likely that housing discrimination is underreported because 63% of Muslims are foreign-born and probably have little knowledge about fair housing laws (Kohut et al. 2011).

Given the levels of discrimination that exist against Muslims in the wider society and the growing level of discrimination in the housing market, it is surprising that little academic research has focused on the impact of religion on housing discrimination and residential attainment. In the US, only two studies to our knowledge have examined housing discrimination (Carpusor and Loges 2006; Gaddis and Ghoshal 2015), and one has focused on residential attainment (Holsinger 2009). The former studies find that persons with Arab-sounding names face more constraints in accessing housing by landlords and roommates advertising rental housing on the internet than those with white-sounding names (Carpusor and Loges 2006; Gaddis and Ghoshal 2015). Holsinger (2009) focuses on the residential attainment of Arabs in four metropolitan areas and finds that Arabs have somewhat lower quality neighborhoods than whites, but after controlling for relevant factors, many of these differences disappear.

Clearly, more research needs to be done to document the experiences of Muslims within the American housing market. The aforementioned studies are limited in that they are exclusively focusing on the experiences of Arab Americans and not the larger group of Muslims living in the US. In 2011, the majority of foreign-born Muslims came to the US from outside of

the Middle East and North Africa (Kohut et al. 2011). In addition, the study by Holsinger (2009) is further limited because she: uses the ancestry question to gauge Arab identity, which is prone to measurement error; uses data from the 1990 and 2000 censuses; and defines neighborhoods on the basis of PUMAs, which are larger than typical neighborhoods.

Our study seeks to build upon these few studies by taking advantage of a unique dataset collected biennially in the Philadelphia metropolitan area, the Public Health Management Corporation's Southeastern Pennsylvania Household Surveys (PHMC), that explicitly asks respondents their religion. In addition to being able to identify whether respondents are Muslim, the advantages of using these data are that they include a measure of whether respondents have experienced discrimination and include tract-level identifiers allowing us to merge data on neighborhoods at the census-tract level of analysis, which provide more reasonable measures of neighborhood characteristics. We use data from the 2006 and 2008 PHMC surveys and merge it with data from the 2006-2010 American Community Survey (ACS).

The main goals of our paper are to 1) examine the extent to which Muslims experience housing discrimination and reside in poorer-quality neighborhoods relative to non-Muslims, and 2) to the extent that such differences exist, whether they remain after controlling for relevant socioeconomic and demographic variables. In future analyses that we plan to do, we will measure the extent to which housing discrimination mediates the effect of religion on locational attainment.

Theoretical Background

Two broad theoretical perspectives are generally used to explain variation in residential outcomes. The main theoretical model used to explain such variation is the *spatial assimilation model* (Alba and Logan 1991; Charles 2003; Massey 1985). In general, the model maintains that the residential distribution of households across neighborhoods of varying neighborhood quality is influenced by household demographic factors, acculturation, and socioeconomic status. It suggests that minorities, such as Muslims, are likely to experience adverse neighborhood conditions relative to whites, but the minority-white disparities should be accounted for by the inequality in socioeconomic and acculturation-related characteristics between minority and majority group members.

The significance of structural constraints in maintaining racial/ethnic inequality in residential location has given rise to a second theoretical model, the *place stratification model* (Alba and Logan 1991, 1993; Logan and Alba 1993; Logan and Molotch 1987). The model maintains that household access to the best residential opportunities is constrained by the actions of powerful groups as well as structural factors that differentially allocate housing opportunities on the basis of race/ethnicity and other features that distinguish groups as minorities, like religion. A hierarchical ordering exists among groups within society, and more advantaged groups use their power to maintain social and physical distance from the least advantaged groups (Logan and Molotch 1987). This power is often manifested in various forms of discriminatory actions, which effectively constrain minority choices within the housing market and cause them to be segregated (Massey and Denton 1993; Turner et al. 2013; Yinger 1995). Given the experiences that Muslims have had with discrimination as well as the increase in civil complaints

filed by Muslims, it is likely that discrimination on the basis of religion, particularly against Muslims, could also be a way that powerful groups constrain minority access to majority-group members.

Both of these theories suggest that Muslim/non-Muslim disparities will exist in neighborhood outcomes. Based on the tenets of the spatial assimilation model, we expect that these disparities will be negligible after controlling for socioeconomic and demographic characteristics because the differences in these factors will account for the residential disparities. If the neighborhood quality differences remain, however, the analyses will reveal support for the tenets of the place stratification model, suggesting support for the notion that the powerful actors in society are purposefully constraining Muslim residential opportunities. Additional support for the principles of this model will be gleaned from the analyses of housing discrimination, if Muslims are significantly more likely than their non-Muslim counterparts to experience such discrimination, controlling for relevant factors.

Data and Methods

This study focuses on the Philadelphia metropolitan area. Focusing on a single case study has some drawbacks: the experiences of Muslims in a city generally characterized by a white and black dynamic may not be completely representative of the experiences for all of those who identify as Muslim in the United States. However, such a focus allows for a nuanced look at the interplay of individual and neighborhood characteristics. What's more, the experiences of racial/ethnic divide found in Philadelphia is indicative of the experiences of Muslims in other Northeastern and Midwestern post-industrial cities marked by small non-black minority communities.

For our data, we made use of the 2006 and 2008 waves of the Public Health Management Corporation's (PHMC) Southeastern Pennsylvania Household Surveys and the 2006-2010 American Community Survey (ACS). The PHMC is a biennial telephone survey that has been administered for over thirty years. This survey is drawn from the Philadelphia metropolitan area, including the counties of Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, and Philadelphia (coterminous with the city of Philadelphia). The PHMC surveys have been recognized as a reliable estimation of the neighborhood characteristics of the Philadelphia metropolitan area (Yang, Matthews, and Shoff 2011; Gibbons and Yang 2015). While the survey is mainly focused on questions of health, it also offers detailed questions on religion, socio-economic status, and other demographic characteristics. We aggregated the 2006 and 2008 waves of the PHMC to maximize the number of Muslims for a total of 18,444 respondents. Balancing weights offered by the survey were applied for all analyses in this study to adjust for sampling bias. Each respondent comes with the identifier of their census tract, a government determined approximation of neighborhoods, which allows the inclusion of ACS data. In all, there are 956 census tracts within the Philadelphia metropolitan area covered by the PHMC survey.

Our study has several key dependent variables. We include a measure of ***housing discrimination*** (1= yes, 0=no), based on the survey question: "*Have you ever experienced discrimination, been prevented from doing something or been hassled or made to feel inferior in the following situations because of your race, ethnicity or color?.....Getting housing (Y/N).*"

Next, we use a series of neighborhood outcomes to establish the implications of housing discrimination as it translates into residential attainment. These measures, from the ACS, include the *percent living in poverty* and *percent foreign-born*. To better contextualize the percent poverty measure, we also include a measure of *concentrated disadvantage*. Loosely based on Sampson's (2012) measure, this score is derived from a primary component analysis (PCA) of ACS variables, including percent of crowded housing units (more than 1 person per room), percent of female-headed families, unemployment and poverty rate, as well as the percent of family receiving public assistance, capturing over 70 percent of the variation within these variables. This variable is useful to include in addition to percent poverty alone because it captures communities suffering from more comprehensive disadvantage. Finally, we use a dummy variable indicating whether the respondent lives in *suburbs* as an outcome given its perceived role in residential attainment (Friedman and Rosenbaum 2007).

Our key predictors for this study come from the PHMC. Our primary predictor gauges whether one identifies as *Muslim* (1=yes, 0= no). In addition, we bring back *housing discrimination* as an independent variable in our analyses of the other dependent variables. Because race/ethnicity is inextricably linked to housing discrimination and residential outcomes, we create three dummy variables gauging race/ethnicity for the following groups (non-Hispanic *Black*, *Hispanic*, and *other* non-Hispanic races) and use non-Hispanic *White* as the reference group.

As far as other control variables, we control for demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. Demographics include *age*, *gender*, *marital status*, *number of children* in household, and *self-rated health*. Respondent self-reported age is included in the analysis as a continuous variable. Gender consists of whether one identifies as female (1=yes, 0=no). Marital status is a dichotomous variable (1=married, 0=not married). Number of children is included in the analysis as a continuous variable. Self-related health may also impact social mobility, and is also a dichotomous measure (1 = Poor/Fair, 0 = Good/Excellent).

Socioeconomic status is comprised of three variables. *Poverty* is a binary variable, 1= income below the federal poverty line, otherwise, 0. *Employment status* is categorized into five groups: unemployed (reference group), full time employed, part time employed, retired, and other employment status. *Educational attainment* has five levels: without a high school diploma (reference group), high school graduate, some college education, bachelor degree, and post-college degree. Key socioeconomic variables not present in this study worth mentioning are home ownership and housing tenure, recognized as a key variables in residential attainment studies (Logan et al. 1996). These variables unfortunately were not available in the waves of the PHMC used in this study. We recognize these omissions may inhibit the predictive power of our findings.

We also include a measure of *community connection* to account for social isolation and mistrust. Based on Gibbons and Yang (2015), this variable is a composite score derived by PCA of the following: willingness to working with neighbors, a sense of belonging to a neighborhood, and does one trust their neighbors. The PCA results suggested that one factor is sufficient to capture over 60 percent of the variance among these three questions and each question has a factor loading higher than 0.75 and we used the regression method to obtain the factor score

(with a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1). A higher score indicates stronger community connection.

We conduct bivariate and multivariate analyses of these data. Bivariate analyses were used to determine how identifying as Muslim, or non-Muslim, impacts individual perceptions of housing discrimination and consequently neighborhood conditions. Multivariate analyses were then used to identify the impact of being Muslim on housing discrimination and neighborhood conditions, after controlling for neighborhood race/ethnicity, other demographic factors, and socioeconomic characteristics. Logistic regression was used for the analyses of housing discrimination and suburban residence, Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) was used for analyses of poverty, concentrated disadvantage, and levels of immigration within neighborhoods. Robust standard errors are employed in the estimation of all bivariate and multivariate results to correct for potential for autocorrelation of the results due to clustering of respondents in tracts. In future analyses, we plan to utilize mediation analyses to examine whether the effect of religion on neighborhood outcomes is mediated by housing discrimination.

Preliminary Results

How does religion affect housing discrimination and neighborhood outcomes in the Philadelphia region? Table 1 addresses this question, presenting the means for our main dependent variables and focusing on comparisons between Muslim and non-Muslim respondents. Our results show that Muslims appear to be more residentially disadvantaged than their non-Muslim counterparts. Just over 16% of Muslims report having experienced housing discrimination, compared to about 4% of non-Muslims. Moreover, the average neighborhood poverty level and concentrated disadvantage are significantly higher for Muslims relative to non-Muslims. There appears to be no significant difference in the average level of immigration in the neighborhoods of Muslims and non-Muslims. However, only 19.3% of Muslims live in suburbs compared to 58.3% of non-Muslims.

<Table 1 about here>

It is likely that variation in demographic, socioeconomic, and other relevant characteristics likely contribute to the residential disparities observed between Muslim/non-Muslim. Table 2 reports the results from bivariate analyses of these characteristics. Several notable differences are likely to contribute to these residential disparities. Muslims are significantly more likely to be poor, black, less educated, and foreign-born than their non-Muslim counterparts.

<Table 2 about here>

Controlling for the variation in demographic, socioeconomic, and other relevant characteristics, does religion continue to shape Philadelphians residential attainment? Tables 3 through 7 show the results of our preliminary multivariate analyses that begin to address this question. Overall, the results from the multivariate analyses are consistent with those found in the bivariate analyses reported in Table 1 indicating that religion shapes residential attainment even after the inclusion of such important control variables. Column 4 of Table 3 reveals that

Muslims are significantly more likely to experience housing discrimination than their non-Muslim counterparts, even after controlling for respondents' race/ethnicity, nativity status, and other relevant factors. Indeed, the odds of Muslims experiencing discrimination are 1.69 times ($\exp(.523)$) the odds of non-Muslims.

<Table 3 about here>

With respect to residential outcomes, Table 4 reveals that the average poverty rate of Muslims is 2.269 units higher than that of non-Muslims, controlling for relevant factors, including the race/ethnicity of respondents. It is notable that effect of housing discrimination on neighborhood poverty is not significant. Further analyses will be undertaken to examine the extent to which the effect of religion on neighborhood-level poverty and the other outcomes is mediated by housing discrimination. Column 4 of Table 5 shows that the average level of concentrated disadvantage in the neighborhoods of Muslims is significantly higher than in the neighborhoods of non-Muslims, although the magnitude of the difference is smaller than that observed for neighborhood-level poverty. Consistent with the results in Table 1, column 4 of Table 5 reveals that the level of immigration in neighborhoods does not differ between Muslims and non-Muslims. However, the final model in Table 6 reveals that Muslims are significantly less likely to reside in suburbs than their non-Muslim counterparts, even controlling for other relevant factors.

<Table 4-7 about here>

Taken together, the preliminary results discussed here suggest that religion is an important, yet understudied dimension in the larger stratification system that is shaping residential disadvantages found in American society. These results, although preliminary, suggest support for the tenets of the place stratification model. With the continued growth of the Muslim population in the US, more attention should be paid to the consideration of this minority group's residential attainment beyond the Philadelphia region.

References

- Alba, Richard D. and John R. Logan. 1991. "Variation on Two Themes: Racial and Ethnic Patterns in Attainment of Suburban Residence." *Demography* 28:431-53.
- Alba, Richard D. and John R. Logan. 1993. "Minority Proximity to Whites in Suburbs: An Individual-Level Analysis of Segregation." *American Journal of Sociology* 98:1388-1427.
- Charles, Camille Z. 2003. "The Dynamics of Racial Residential Segregation." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:167-207.
- Cooperman, Alan, Gregory Smith, and Katherine Ritchey. 2015. *America's Changing Religious Landscape*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR). 2007. *The Status of Muslim Civil Rights in the United States, 2007: Presumption of Guilt*. Washington, DC: CAIR.
- Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR). 2009. *The Status of Muslim Civil Rights in the United States, 2009: Seeking Full Inclusion*. Washington, DC: CAIR.
- Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). 2014. *Annual Report on Fair Housing, FY 2012-2013*. Washington, DC: HUD.
- Friedman, Samantha, and Emily Rosenbaum. 2007. "Does Suburban Residence Mean Better Neighborhood Conditions for All Households? Assessing the Influence of Nativity Status and Race/ethnicity." *Social Science Research* 36 (1): 1-27.
doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2005.09.002.
- Gibbons, Joseph, and Tse-Chuan Yang. 2015. "Connecting Across the Divides of Race/Ethnicity: How Does Segregation Matter?" *Urban Affairs Review Online* First: 1-28. doi:DOI: 10.1177/1078087415589193.
- Kohut, Andrew, Scott Keeter, and Gregory Smith. 2011. *Muslim Americans: No Signs of Growth in Alienation or Support for Extremism*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Logan, John R. and Richard D. Alba. 1993. "Locational Returns to Human Capital: Minority Access to Suburban Community Resources." *Demography* 30(2):243-268.
- Logan, John R., Richard D. Alba, Tom McNulty, and Brian Fisher. 1996. "Making a Place in the Metropolis: Locational Attainment in Cities and Suburbs." *Demography* 33 (4): 443.
doi:10.2307/2061779.
- Logan, John R. and Harvey Molotch. 1987. *Urban Fortunes*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Massey, Douglas S. 1985. "Ethnic Residential Segregation: A Theoretical Synthesis and Empirical Review." *Sociology and Social Research* 69:315-350.
- Massey, D.S. and N.A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sampson, Robert J. 2012. *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect*. 1st ed. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Turner, Margery A., Rob Santos, Diane K. Levy, Doug Wissoker, Claudia Aranda, and Rob Pitingolo. 2013. *Housing Discrimination against Racial and Ethnic Minorities, 2012*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Yang, Tse-Chuan, Stephen A. Matthews, and Carla Shoff. 2011. "Individual Health Care System Distrust and Neighborhood Social Environment: How Are They Jointly Associated with Self-Rated Health?" *Journal of Urban Health* 88 (5): 945–58. doi:10.1007/s11524-011-9561-x.
- Yinger, John. 1995. *Closed Doors, Opportunities Lost: The Continuing Costs of Housing Discrimination*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Table 1. Bivariate Analyses of Housing Discrimination and Neighborhood Outcomes

| Dependent Variables | Percent: | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| | Muslim | Non-Muslim |
| | (1) | (2) |
| <i>Individual level</i> | | |
| Housing discrimination | 16.2*** | 4.20 |
| <i>Neighborhood level</i> | | |
| Neighborhood poverty level | 23.09*** | 10.70 |
| Neighborhood disadvantage | 95.0*** | 7.80 |
| Foreign-born | 9.36 | 8.91 |
| Living in the suburbs | 19.3*** | 58.30 |
| N | 197 | 18247 |

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05

Table 2. Bivariate Analyses of Demographic, Socioeconomic, and Control Variables

| Independent Variables | Percent: | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| | Muslims | Non-Muslims |
| | (1) | (2) |
| Sex of householder = female | 66.0 | 67.2 |
| Below poverty line | 26.9*** | 8.6 |
| Race/Ethnicity | | |
| White | 8.1*** | 67.6 |
| Black | 75.6*** | 21.8 |
| Latino | 5.1 | 7.8 |
| Asian | 5.6** | 1.1 |
| Other race/ethnicity | 5.6* | 1.7 |
| Age | 37.7*** | 51.7 |
| Marital Status | | |
| Married | 38.6** | 49.8 |
| Not Married | 61.40 | 50.2 |
| Employment | | |
| Fulltime work | 42.6 | 48.0 |
| Part-time work | 15.7 | 11.7 |
| Retired | 2.0*** | 22.6 |
| Other employment | 11.7* | 6.0 |
| Educational attainment | | |
| Less than high school | 10.2 | 8.3 |
| High school | 37.1 | 31.9 |
| Some college | 28.4* | 20.7 |
| College | 15.2** | 23.6 |
| Graduate | 9.1** | 15.6 |
| Self-rated health | 21.8 | 21.2 |
| Foreign-born | 20.8*** | 9.0 |
| Lives in suburb | 19.3*** | 58.3 |
| Number of children in home | 1.325*** | 0.6 |
| N | 197 | 18247 |

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05

Table 3. Logistic Regression Models of Housing Discrimination

| | <i>Dependent variable:</i> | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Housing Discrimination | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| Muslim | 1.491 ^{***} (0.197) | 0.651 ^{***} (0.201) | 0.523 ^{**} (0.206) |
| Black | | 2.103 ^{***} (0.092) | 1.956 ^{***} (0.108) |
| Hispanic | | 2.032 ^{***} (0.137) | 1.841 ^{***} (0.151) |
| Asian | | 0.755 (0.433) | 0.508 (0.436) |
| Other Race | | 2.364 ^{***} (0.181) | 2.158 ^{***} (0.188) |
| Foreign | | -0.138 (0.132) | -0.138 (0.134) |
| Age | | | 0.0001 (0.003) |
| Female | | | -0.229 ^{***} (0.083) |
| Poor | | | 0.361 ^{***} (0.110) |
| Married | | | -0.240 ^{***} (0.088) |
| Number of Children | | | -0.009 (0.034) |
| Employed Full Time | | | -0.273 ^{**} (0.111) |
| Employed Part Time | | | -0.202 (0.143) |
| Retired | | | -0.629 ^{***} (0.149) |
| Other Employed Status | | | -0.136 (0.179) |
| High School Diploma | | | 0.238 |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | (0.140) |
| Some College | | | 0.673 ^{***} |
| | | | (0.147) |
| Bachelors | | | 0.793 ^{***} |
| | | | (0.158) |
| Graduate | | | 1.086 ^{***} |
| | | | (0.172) |
| Poor/Fair Self-Rated Health | | | 0.448 ^{***} |
| | | | (0.088) |
| Community Connection | | | -0.186 ^{***} |
| | | | (0.028) |
| Suburb Residence | | | -0.060 |
| | | | (0.092) |
| Constant | -3.131 ^{***} | -4.249 ^{***} | -4.387 ^{***} |
| | (0.037) | (0.077) | (0.257) |
| Observations | 18,426 | 18,426 | 18,426 |
| Log Likelihood | -3,255.600 | -2,901.940 | -2,808.194 |
| Akaike Inf. Crit. | 6,515.199 | 5,817.879 | 5,662.389 |
| <i>Note:</i> | ***p<0.01; **p<0.05; *p<0.1 | | |

Table 4. OLS Regression Models of Neighborhood-Level Poverty

| | <i>Dependent variable:</i> | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Neighborhood-Level Poverty | | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| Muslim | 12.390 ^{***} (0.941) | | 4.063 ^{***} (0.789) | 2.269 ^{***} (0.700) |
| Discrimination | | 8.286 ^{***} (0.474) | | 0.205 (0.359) |
| Black | | | 15.221 ^{***} (0.198) | 8.098 ^{***} (0.206) |
| Hispanic | | | 17.665 ^{***} (0.353) | 10.042 ^{***} (0.336) |
| Asian | | | 1.321 (0.790) | 0.840 (0.702) |
| Other Race | | | 10.551 ^{***} (0.615) | 5.783 ^{***} (0.550) |
| Foreign | | | 1.264 ^{**} (0.337) | 0.869 [*] (0.299) |
| Age | | | | -0.021 ^{***} (0.006) |
| Female | | | | 0.206 (0.155) |
| Poor | | | | 2.385 ^{***} (0.283) |
| Married | | | | -1.089 ^{***} (0.157) |
| Number of Children | | | | 0.268 ^{***} (0.072) |
| Employed Full Time | | | | -1.796 ^{***} (0.254) |
| Employed Part Time | | | | -2.196 ^{***} (0.306) |
| Retired | | | | -1.939 ^{***} (0.296) |
| Other Employed | | | | -1.108 ^{**} |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Status | | | | (0.371) |
| High School Diploma | | | | -2.768*** (0.289) |
| Some College | | | | -4.195*** (0.310) |
| Bachelors | | | | -5.097*** (0.316) |
| Graduate | | | | -5.749*** (0.336) |
| Poor/Fair Self-Rated Health | | | | 0.856*** (0.191) |
| Community Connection | | | | -0.711*** (0.059) |
| Suburb Residence | | | | -9.127*** (0.169) |
| Constant | 10.695*** (0.097) | 10.470*** (0.099) | 5.687*** (0.099) | 19.679*** (0.512) |
| Observations | 18,426 | 18,426 | 18,426 | 18,426 |
| R ² | 0.009 | 0.016 | 0.320 | 0.470 |
| Adjusted R ² | 0.009 | 0.016 | 0.320 | 0.470 |
| Residual Std. Error | 13.133 (df = 18424) | 13.087 (df = 18424) | 10.884 (df = 18419) | 9.609 (df = 18402) |
| F Statistic | 173.448*** (df = 1; 18424) | 304.964*** (df = 1; 18424) | 1,442.844*** (df = 6; 18419) | 710.484*** (df = 23; 18402) |

Note:

*** p<0.01; ** p<0.05; * p<0.1

Table 5. OLS Regression Models of Neighborhood-Level Concentrated Disadvantage

| | <i>Dependent variable:</i> | | | |
|--------------------|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Neighborhood-Level Concentrated Disadvantage | | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| Muslim | 0.872 ^{***} (0.069) | | 0.231 ^{***} (0.057) | 0.113 [*] (0.051) |
| Discrimination | | 0.616 ^{***} (0.035) | | 0.009 (0.026) |
| Black | | | 1.161 ^{***} (0.014) | 0.667 ^{***} (0.015) |
| Hispanic | | | 1.264 ^{***} (0.026) | 0.751 ^{***} (0.025) |
| Asian | | | 0.120 ^{**} (0.057) | 0.059 (0.052) |
| Other Race | | | 0.773 ^{***} (0.045) | 0.433 ^{***} (0.040) |
| Foreign | | | 0.134 ^{***} (0.025) | 0.102 ^{***} (0.022) |
| Age | | | | -0.001 ^{**} (0.0005) |
| Female | | | | 0.025 ^{**} (0.011) |
| Poor | | | | 0.170 ^{***} (0.021) |
| Married | | | | -0.087 ^{***} (0.011) |
| Number of Children | | | | 0.012 ^{**} (0.005) |
| Employed Full Time | | | | -0.131 ^{***} (0.019) |
| Employed Part Time | | | | -0.135 ^{***} (0.022) |
| Retired | | | | -0.127 ^{***} (0.022) |
| Other Employed | | | | -0.053 [*] |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Status | | | | (0.027) |
| High School Diploma | | | | -0.209*** (0.021) |
| Some College | | | | -0.277*** (0.023) |
| Bachelors | | | | -0.258*** (0.023) |
| Graduate | | | | -0.239*** (0.025) |
| Poor/Fair Self-Rated Health | | | | 0.037** (0.014) |
| Community Connection | | | | -0.042*** (0.004) |
| Suburb Residence | | | | -0.702*** (0.012) |
| Constant | 0.078*** (0.007) | 0.060*** (0.007) | -0.301*** (0.007) | 0.643*** (0.038) |
| Observations | 18,426 | 18,426 | 18,426 | 18,426 |
| R ² | 0.009 | 0.017 | 0.333 | 0.471 |
| Adjusted R ² | 0.009 | 0.017 | 0.333 | 0.470 |
| Residual Std. Error | 0.965 (df = 18424) | 0.961 (df = 18424) | 0.792 (df = 18419) | 0.706 (df = 18402) |
| F Statistic | 159.265*** (df = 1; 18424) | 312.434*** (df = 1; 18424) | 1,531.259*** (df = 6; 18419) | 711.657*** (df = 23; 18402) |

Note:

*** p<0.01; ** p<0.05; * p<0.1

Table 6. OLS Regression Models of Neighborhood-Level Percent Foreign Born

| | <i>Dependent variable:</i> | | | |
|--------------------|---|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | Neighborhood-Level Percent Foreign Born | | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| Muslim | 0.453 (0.525) | | 0.630 (0.526) | 0.212 (0.514) |
| Discrimination | | 0.146 (0.266) | | 0.130 (0.263) |
| Black | | | -1.013*** (0.132) | -3.092*** (0.151) |
| Hispanic | | | 1.078** (0.235) | -0.649 (0.246) |
| Asian | | | 2.468*** (0.526) | 1.894*** (0.514) |
| Other Race | | | 0.336 (0.410) | -1.181*** (0.403) |
| Foreign | | | 2.323*** (0.224) | 2.287*** (0.219) |
| Age | | | | 0.001 (0.005) |
| Female | | | | -0.316*** (0.114) |
| Poor | | | | -0.270 (0.207) |
| Married | | | | -0.177 (0.115) |
| Number of Children | | | | 0.045 (0.053) |
| Employed Full Time | | | | 0.649*** (0.186) |
| Employed Part Time | | | | 0.345 (0.225) |
| Retired | | | | 0.514** (0.217) |
| Other Employed | | | | 0.626** |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Status | | | | (0.272) |
| High School Diploma | | | | 0.775 ^{***} (0.212) |
| Some College | | | | 0.971 ^{***} (0.227) |
| Bachelors | | | | 0.890 ^{***} (0.232) |
| Graduate | | | | 0.743 ^{***} (0.246) |
| Poor/Fair Self-Rated Health | | | | -0.282 ^{**} (0.140) |
| Community Connection | | | | -0.325 ^{***} (0.044) |
| Suburb Residence | | | | -3.843 ^{***} (0.124) |
| Constant | 8.905 ^{***} (0.054) | 8.903 ^{***} (0.055) | 8.799 ^{***} (0.066) | 10.692 ^{***} (0.375) |
| Observations | 18,426 | 18,426 | 18,426 | 18,426 |
| R ² | 0.00004 | 0.00002 | 0.022 | 0.077 |
| Adjusted R ² | -0.00001 | -0.00004 | 0.021 | 0.076 |
| Residual Std. Error | 7.329 (df = 18424) | 7.329 (df = 18424) | 7.250 (df = 18419) | 7.045 (df = 18402) |
| F Statistic | 0.744 (df = 1; 18424) | 0.304 (df = 1; 18424) | 67.510 ^{***} (df = 6; 18419) | 66.834 ^{***} (df = 23; 18402) |

Note:

*** p<0.01; ** p<0.05; * p<0.1

Table 7. Logistic Regression Models of Residential Location in Suburbs

| | <i>Dependent variable:</i> | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Residential Location in Suburbs | | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| Muslim | -0.390 ^{***} (0.035) | | -0.594 ^{***} (0.198) | -0.566 ^{**} (0.204) |
| Discrimination | | -0.266 ^{***} (0.018) | | -0.012 (0.090) |
| Black | | | -2.426 ^{***} (0.044) | -2.136 ^{***} (0.047) |
| Hispanic | | | -2.036 ^{***} (0.073) | -1.615 ^{***} (0.078) |
| Asian | | | -0.389 ^{**} (0.153) | -0.486 ^{***} (0.159) |
| Other Race | | | -1.600 ^{***} (0.118) | -1.405 ^{***} (0.123) |
| Foreign | | | -0.129 (0.071) | -0.151 (0.073) |
| Age | | | | 0.011 ^{***} (0.002) |
| Female | | | | -0.029 (0.039) |
| Poor | | | | -0.524 ^{***} (0.074) |
| Married | | | | 0.534 ^{***} (0.037) |
| Number of Children | | | | 0.122 ^{***} (0.019) |
| Employed Full Time | | | | 0.219 ^{***} (0.064) |
| Employed Part Time | | | | 0.308 ^{***} (0.078) |
| Retired | | | | 0.017 (0.074) |
| Other Employed Status | | | | 0.223 ^{**} |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | | (0.095) |
| High School Diploma | | | | 0.372 ^{***} |
| | | | | (0.073) |
| Some College | | | | 0.674 ^{***} |
| | | | | (0.077) |
| Bachelors | | | | 0.891 ^{***} |
| | | | | (0.079) |
| Graduate | | | | 0.803 ^{***} |
| | | | | (0.084) |
| Poor/Fair Self-Rated Health | | | | -0.200 ^{***} |
| | | | | (0.047) |
| Community Connection | | | | 0.054 ^{***} |
| | | | | (0.015) |
| Constant | 0.583 ^{***} | 0.590 ^{***} | 1.083 ^{***} | -0.540 ^{***} |
| | (0.004) | (0.004) | (0.021) | (0.125) |
| Observations | 18,426 | 18,426 | 18,426 | 18,426 |
| Log Likelihood | -13,080.650 | -13,030.740 | -10,240.780 | -9,758.729 |
| Akaike Inf. Crit. | 26,165.300 | 26,065.480 | 20,495.560 | 19,563.460 |
| <i>Note:</i> | | | *** p<0.01; ** p<0.05; * p<0.1 | |