Does Suburban Residence Mean Better Neighborhood Conditions for All Households? Assessing the Influence of Nativity Status and Race/Ethnicity

Samantha Friedman
Department of Sociology
The George Washington University

Emily Rosenbaum
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Fordham University

March 18, 2004

Paper prepared for presentation at the 2004 meetings of the Population Association of America, Boston, MA.

Does Suburban Residence Mean Better Neighborhood Conditions for All Households? Assessing the Influence of Nativity Status and Race/Ethnicity

Abstract

Suburban residence is considered symbolic of the American dream. Despite growth in suburban minority and immigrant populations, the question of whether access to high quality residential environments is available to all households has gone largely unexplored. This paper helps fill this gap by evaluating nativity-status and racial/ethnic differences in a range of neighborhood conditions for both suburban and central city residents. The study relies on data from the 2001 panel of the American Housing Survey and focuses on a range of neighborhood conditions, including indicators of social disorder, measures rarely examined in studies of locational attainment. Contrary to expectations based on spatial assimilation theory, we find that many foreign-born households reside in significantly *better* neighborhoods than their native-born counterparts. In addition, when nativity-status differences are in the favor of native-born households, suburban location does not necessarily attenuate them. With respect to the effect of race/ethnicity, we find that it is generally a more consistent predictor than nativity status of households' neighborhood conditions.

Introduction

Suburban residence has long been considered symbolic of the American dream, largely because of its perceived link to the opportunity structure. Location in suburbs, as compared to central cities, affords households access to higher quality schools, more job opportunities, and better quality housing, and reduces their exposure to crime. Implicit – but largely unexplored – in these observations is the notion that all households living in suburbs have access to such high quality residential environments.

In recent years, suburbs have increasingly become more diverse. Civil Rights legislation passed during the late 1960s and early 1970s reduced the strength of barriers that had prevented minorities from moving to such areas, resulting in an increase in the proportion of minorities, and particularly African Americans, living in the suburbs. Although the majority of the population in suburbs remains white, it is declining, moving from 85 percent in 1990 to 81 percent in 2000. Part of this increasing diversity is due to the influx of immigrants, many of whom are nonwhite, who bypass central cities and settle directly in suburbs.

The increasing diversity of suburbs and the importance of suburban location demands a study of the neighborhood conditions that immigrants and minorities experience in suburbs, relative to their native-born and white counterparts. Several studies reveal that suburbs confer significant advantages to minorities, with such residents being more likely than their central city counterparts to live in whiter and more affluent neighborhoods (see for example, Alba et al. 1999; Logan et al. 1996). However, the results of a handful of studies conducted in recent years suggest that previous work may have overstated the benefits of suburban living, particularly for minorities (Adelman 2004; Alba et al. 2000b; Logan et al. 2002; Patillo-McCoy 1999). While a sizeable share – 26.6 percent – of Los Angeles Mexicans live in ethnic neighborhoods in suburbs, such residence does not necessarily result in better living conditions (Logan et al. 2002). For example, the median income in such neighborhoods is $27,631, only about $1,000 more than the median in comparable central-city

ethnic neighborhoods; likewise, the mean percentage in high status occupations is 12.5 percent, which compares to 11.3 percent in central-city ethnic neighborhoods.

In a similar vein, Alba et al. (2000b) show that although middle-class blacks in Chicago, Cleveland, and Detroit who live in suburbs are significantly more likely than their counterparts in central cities to live in whiter neighborhoods, their white neighbors are not as affluent as those living with suburban, middle-class whites. Thus, suburban, middle-class blacks are probably not living in neighborhoods of the same quality as do their white counterparts, undermining the notion that suburban residence confers equal advantages to all of its residents. Likewise, Adelman (2004) shows that although segregation between middle-class whites and blacks has declined between 1970 and 1990 in cities and suburbs, middle-class blacks, on average, live in significantly poorer neighborhoods than middle-class whites.

Whether all households experience access to equally good neighborhoods within suburbs, therefore, remains an open question. Several limitations of the existing research necessitate a more in-depth analysis of this question. First, almost all of the studies on this topic use a fairly narrow range of neighborhood quality indicators – median household income of the neighborhood and the proportion of whites within the neighborhood. As the work by Alba et al. (2000b) and Adelman (2004) reveals, just focusing on these two dependent variables can be misleading. Even when the neighborhood's median household income is relatively high, it is still possible for relatively different levels of poverty to exist for different groups (e.g., blacks and whites) because the spread of the income distribution surrounding the median income value could be very different. Thus, there is a need to expand the neighborhood outcomes examined in these studies beyond those derived from census data in order to get more information about the quality of life in such neighborhoods.

A second limitation of the existing research is that it could be overstating the extent of access that minorities and foreign-born households have to more affluent and whiter neighborhoods.

Because these studies rely on census data, the neighborhood characteristics they examine are at the census-tract level. Significant variation exists, however, within census tracts as to where minorities live, relative to whites. Indeed, levels of residential segregation are often greater at the block-group level, a smaller level of geography within census tracts, than at the census-tract level (Iceland et al. 2002). Thus, it would be better to gauge conditions within the immediate proximity of respondents' housing units. A third limitation relates to the recency of the data used in these studies. Most of the data for these studies come from the 1970, 1980, or 1990 decennial censuses. Therefore, it is unclear whether the patterns in access to better neighborhood outcomes has improved or worsened in light of the continuing diversification of suburban neighborhoods.

The final limitation relates to the relative omission of foreign- and native-born households within each racial/ethnic group as distinct entities. That is, while immigration-related variables are frequently used to help explain the locational attainment process of racial/ethnic groups, rarely, if ever, is the foreign-born contingent of a given racial/ethnic group analyzed separately from its native-born counterpart, nor evaluated against native- and foreign-born whites (for at least one exception, see Adelman et al. 2001). Given the diversity of households living in suburbs, it is important to interact nativity status and race/ethnicity and evaluate the outcomes of all the resulting groups of households in order to see if suburban residence affords the same advantages to all households. Taken together, the limitations of the existing research on this topic may mask larger differences in neighborhood quality that exist between foreign- and native-born minority households, relative to whites, residing in suburbs.

The question that remains, then, is whether suburban living affords all households neighborhood conditions of equal quality. To address this issue, bivariate and multivariate analyses of the 2001 panel of the American Housing Survey (AHS) are conducted in this paper. The distinct advantage of these data is that they are current, and they contain information from respondents on the quality of their neighborhoods – in terms of crime, open green spaces, and the presence of

abandoned buildings, buildings with bars on the windows, and trash/litter/junk – within a half a block of their housing unit. Several questions will be addressed in the analyses of these data: 1) Within suburbs and central cities, to what extent are white, black, Hispanic, and Asian immigrants living in poorer quality neighborhoods as compared to their native-born counterparts, and particularly to native-born and foreign-born whites? 2) Are nativity- status and racial/ethnic differences smaller within suburbs than within central cities? 3) Is race/ethnicity more salient than nativity status in predicting differences in households' neighborhood conditions in suburbs and central cities?

Explaining Variation in the Neighborhood Conditions of Households by Residential Location

The main theoretical model used to explain variation in foreign- and native-born households' neighborhood outcomes, within and between racial/ethnic groups, is *the spatial assimilation model* (Alba and Logan 1991; Massey 1985). The model identifies residential assimilation as one outcome of the status attainment process. Upon their arrival, it is assumed that immigrants settle in central-city neighborhoods, which are not typically of the highest quality, to live among coethnics. As immigrants acquire higher levels of education, enter the mainstream economy, and earn higher incomes, they seek to move to neighborhoods that are more in line with their improved socioeconomic status. Thus, over time, immigrants leave ethnic neighborhoods as they undergo this process, ultimately settling in neighborhoods inhabited by majority-group members. As a result, the spatial and social distance between majority-group members and immigrant and racial/ethnic minorities is significantly reduced over time.

The spatial assimilation model, therefore, maintains that the residential distribution of households across neighborhoods of varying socioeconomic status and quality is influenced by their acculturation and socioeconomic status. It suggests that, on the whole, immigrants should be disadvantaged, when compared to native-born and majority-group households, in terms of their

neighborhood characteristics, but that these differences should diminish or disappear in the presence of controls for socioeconomic status and acculturation-related variables.

One of the main assumptions inherent in the spatial assimilation model is that the process ultimately involves a move to the suburbs. Indeed, suburban residence represents a significant stage in the assimilation process because it allows immigrants and minorities to inhabit neighborhoods that are more affluent and are comprised more of majority-group members than coethnics (Massey and Denton 1988). Implied here – but not explicitly tested – is that residence in suburbs is likely to attenuate nativity-status and racial/ethnic differences in households' neighborhood conditions.

Findings from several studies focused on the residential outcomes of racial and ethnic groups have largely supported the main tenets of the spatial assimilation model. For example, socioeconomic status is found to be positively associated with residential outcomes, such as location in suburban areas and tract-level median income and proportion of residents who are white (Alba and Logan 1991, 1993; Alba et al. 1999, 2000; Logan et al. 1996a,b). Socioeconomic status is also found to be positively related to non-census derived measures of neighborhood quality in New York City, such as neighborhood crime, poverty and teen fertility rates, and school quality (Rosenbaum et al. 1999; Rosenbaum and Friedman 2001, 2004). In addition, acculturation-related variables, such as nativity status, years in the United States, and English proficiency, are found to be positively associated with residential outcomes, although for Asians, the effect of English proficiency is not always statistically significant (Alba and Logan 1991, 1993; Alba et al. 1999; Logan et al. 1996a).

While the traditional version of the spatial assimilation model views suburban residence as the key endpoint of the process, the recent emergence of immigrant enclaves in suburban areas raises questions concerning the continuing relevance of this position. For example, Logan et al. (2002) find that for Cubans in the New York metropolitan area, and Mexicans, Chinese, Japanese, and Vietnamese in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, suburban location is *positively* associated with the presence of ethnic neighborhoods, contrary to the assumptions of the model. In a similar

vein, Allen and Turner (2003) examined immigrants' settlement patterns in 15 metropolitan areas and found that about 40 percent of Hispanic, and almost half of Asian, immigrant enclave populations lived in suburbs. How these changes translate into residential outcomes for these groups remains an open question. The emergence of suburban ethnic enclaves also raises the possibility that the convergence of residential conditions postulated by spatial assimilation theory may also be in question. Specifically, it may be that a similar pattern of differences in neighborhood conditions prevail in both central city and suburban locations.

In support of this possibility is the often-reported finding that black suburban residents live in lower-quality neighborhoods than do their white counterparts (Adelman 2004; Alba et al. 2000; Alba, Logan, and Bellair 1994; Logan and Alba 1993, 1995; Logan et al. 1996). This racial difference points to the relative inability of the spatial assimilation model to successfully describe the locational attainment process for groups characterized by African ancestry. The difficulties that blacks, Puerto Ricans, and non-white Hispanics face in terms of spatially assimilating suggest that opportunities for converting social and economic achievement into improved residential outcomes are constrained by being black. The significance of structural constraints in maintaining racial/ethnic inequality in residential outcomes 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 posits that even in the presence of controls for the individual-level characteristics relating to acculturation, socioeconomic status, and life-cycle stage, significant disadvantages in housing and neighborhood outcomes will remain -- relative to native-born whites -- for those groups most adversely affected by structural barriers within the housing market.

The place stratification model maintains that households' access to the best residential opportunities involves the actions of other more powerful groups in society as well as structural factors that differentially allocate housing opportunities on the basis of race/ethnicity, thereby weakening the effectiveness of socioeconomic factors in achieving parity in housing outcomes. The

model maintains that a hierarchical ordering exists among groups within society, and that 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 minorities' choices within the housing market (Massey and Denton 1993; Turner et al. 2002; Yinger 1995).

According to this model, the lower quality of blacks' and Hispanics' neighborhoods, relative to that of whites, is ultimately due to the discrimination that the former groups encounter within the housing market rather than to differences between the groups in terms of their individual- or household-level characteristics. Because the large majority of today's immigrants are nonwhite, they may be more likely to experience discrimination in the housing market than are native-born households, whose members are largely white (U.S. Bureau of the Census 2002b,c). Results from the 2000 Housing Discrimination Study are consistent with this proposition (Turner et al. 2002). In paired tests conducted among white and black, and white and Hispanic, renters and home buyers, researchers found that both Hispanics and blacks were favored significantly less often in housing transactions than were their white counterparts. In fact Hispanics were even *less* likely to be favored, relative to whites, than were black home seekers. Because 45 percent of Hispanics are born outside of the United States (U.S. Bureau of the Census 2002a,d), this suggests that foreign-born home seekers may be encountering structural barriers in the housing market.

However, because the place stratification model focuses more specifically on the role of race/ethnicity than immigrant status in determining spatial outcomes, it suggests that the experience of, and consequences from, discrimination are limited to certain groups of immigrants, notably those of African and Hispanic ancestry.[1] In contrast, since white immigrants should not be subjected to

[1] The potential for this is voiced by segmented assimilation theorists. This theory argues that immigrants who share the racial/ethnic ancestry of historically disadvantaged groups may be at risk of experiencing downward mobility over time and generation because of the constraints on opportunity inherent to the racial/ethnic stratification system.

discrimination due to their race *per se*, then these immigrant households should experience few, if any, disadvantages in gaining access to well-appointed neighborhoods.

Thus, the persistence of racial/ethnic inequalities in the housing market, in combination with the racial/ethnic diversity of contemporary immigrants, points to the importance of controlling for interactions between nativity status and race/ethnicity in models predicting neighborhood outcomes. Doing so will address the question of whether nativity status or race/ethnicity plays the larger role in determining locational attainment. That is, are foreign- and native-born non-whites *both* more likely to live in poorer quality neighborhoods than *both* native- and foreign-born whites? If so, then race/ethnicity is the more important determinant, a finding that would provide support for the basic tenets of the place stratification framework. Or, are foreign-born households more likely than native-born households, regardless of race/ethnicity, to live in poorer quality housing? If this turns out to be the case, then it is nativity status that plays the larger role. Thus, by comparing foreign- and native-born households from specific racial/ethnic groups, we provide a more-complete test of hypotheses concerning immigrant-status differences in neighborhood outcomes derived from the spatial assimilation and place stratification models than has been accomplished so far.[2]

With respect to predicting nativity-status and racial/ethnic differences by residential location, the place stratification model suggests that these differences will persist across both locations. The existence of a dual housing market is not expected to be place specific. In fact, it could be the case that discrimination within suburbs may be *greater* because powerful, majority-group members may have more at stake in protecting their wealth interests. Whites are the group most likely to own homes within suburbs, relative to other groups (Fong and Shibuya 2000).

---

[2] Previous research that has performed such an analysis to predict the neighborhood conditions of households in New York City suggests that race/ethnicity is the dominant predictor (Rosenbaum et al. 1999; Rosenbaum and Friedman 2001, 2004). Adelman et al. (2001) have also employed such an analysis and found similar results across the entire United States in 1970 and 1980.

Hypotheses

The preceding discussion suggests the following hypotheses. Consistent with the spatial assimilation model, we expect that education, income, age of the householder, presence of children, and headship by married couples will all be positively associated with high quality locations as will time since arrival. These relationships should hold regardless location in central cities or suburbs. With respect to the analysis of neighborhood conditions by residential location, we expect that at the bivariate level, immigrants in central cities will be more likely than their native-born counterparts to live in poorer quality neighborhoods, but nativity-status differences in neighborhood conditions will be minimal among suburbanites. In the multivariate analyses, such differences should disappear or be moderated to the extent that the assimilation-related factors can be controlled for.

The tenets of the place stratification model suggest, however, that group differences in neighborhood conditions among households in central cities and suburbs will remain even in the face of controls for individual-level factors. The pattern of residual group differences predicted by the place stratification model is one of a "racial hierarchy," with foreign- and native-born blacks and Hispanics being less likely than native-born whites to live in better quality neighborhoods, and with foreign-born whites and Asians exhibiting few, if any neighborhood disadvantages. As above, it may be the case that suburban location *exacerbates* racial/ethnic differences because of majority members' increased stake in maintaining their advantaged position in the suburban housing market.

Data and Methods

Data

The analyses are based on data from the American Housing Survey (AHS), a multistage probability sample of approximately 50,000 housing units located throughout the United States that is surveyed every other year. We take advantage of the data from the 2001 AHS, the only panel of AHS data so far to ask the nativity status of individuals in households, because these data allow for

the first analysis of immigrants' neighborhood conditions across metropolitan areas within the United States.[3] Up until now, researchers studying immigration and residential location on a national level only had access to data from special tabulations of decennial census data (e.g., Alba et al. 2000a; Logan et al. 2002). The AHS also collects a variety of socioeconomic and demographic data for household members. Sampling weights (scaled down to maintain unweighted cell sizes) are used in all bivariate and multivariate analyses to correct for sampling design effects and potential undercoverage.

With respect to nativity status, birth place and citizenship are identified for all household members. For individuals born outside of the United States, year of entry is also identified. One limitation of the data is that information on English proficiency is not collected. This has the potential of overstating the effect that nativity status and other acculturation variables have on immigrants' neighborhood conditions. However, in recent years, the effect of English language proficiency on immigrants' locational attainment has decreased, particularly for Asians (Alba et al. 1999), suggesting that any overstatement of group differences arising from the omission of this variable will likely not be large.

The central dependent variables in our analyses are households' neighborhood conditions. To measure neighborhood conditions, we focus on the reference person's answers to questions about the characteristics of the neighborhood immediately surrounding the housing unit that are indicative of physical quality and social disorder. The immediate neighborhood is defined as being a half block in any direction from the front of the building in which the unit is located. We focus on the presence four conditions: trash, litter, or junk in the streets, roads, empty lots or on any

[3]A comparison of data from the AHS with data from 2001 CPS and 2000 Census Supplemental Survey (C2SS) reveals that the AHS slightly undercounts the foreign-born population (see Drew [2002] for details). In the AHS, 10.6 percent of households are headed by a foreign-born person as compared to 11.6 percent of households in the CPS and 11.5 percent of households in the C2SS. However, the differences in the data between the AHS and the other surveys are not substantial enough to call into question the viability of these data. It should be noted that although the 2003 panel of the AHS has been fielded, the data have not yet been released to the public, making the 2001 data the most current.

properties; open spaces, such as parks, woods, farms, or ranches; abandoned buildings; and buildings with bars on the windows. We also use a question asking respondents about whether crime is present within their neighborhoods, although this question references the whole neighborhood rather than the area within a half block of the respondent's unit. Thus, in total, we use five measures of neighborhood conditions in our analysis. By examining aspects of neighborhood quality beyond those available in the census, particularly measures indicative of physical and social disorder, we make a significant contribution to the literature on disparities in neighborhood conditions.

Our key predictors are households' nativity status, acculturation-related variables, and race/ethnicity. The nativity status of households is determined by the reference person's place of birth. Reference persons born in the United States or in outlying areas, including Puerto Rico, are considered native born, while those born outside of the United States are considered foreign born. Because year of entry is an important predictor of neighborhood outcomes, we create two dummy variables interacting nativity status with year of entry. Households headed by native-born persons form the reference group and foreign-born households are disaggregated into two groups – 1) foreign-born households who entered in 1980 and later; and 2) those that entered before 1980.

With respect to race/ethnicity, we use following four categories based upon the race and Hispanic origin of the reference person: 1) non-Hispanic white; 2) non-Hispanic black; 3) Hispanic; and 4) Asian and Pacific Islander. We interact race/ethnicity with the nativity-status/year-of-entry variables. Thus, for central city dwellers and suburbanites, we have two dummy variables for the foreign-born contingent of each racial/ethnic group. For example, for foreign-born white central city dwellers, we focus on those that entered in 1980 or later and those that entered before 1980.

We also control for a range of other variables, including measures of life cycle and socioeconomic status. Life cycle factors are represented by the householder's age and two dummy variables indicating: (1) whether the household is headed by a married couple and (2) whether

children under 18 are present. We also use a dichotomous variable to assess whether adults other than those in the nuclear family are living in the housing unit. Although we do not specify whether these "other" individuals are extended kin or friends of the family, this measure allows us to roughly assess immigrants' use of a multiple-earner economic strategy, which could enable a move to a high quality location. Socioeconomic status is measured by the reference person's educational attainment (represented by three dummy variables indicating whether the reference person has less than a high school education, a high school diploma, or some college or more education), household income, and a dichotomous variable indicating whether any members of the household receive public assistance. We also control for households' housing tenure.[4]

Finally, we employ controls for the context in which native- and foreign-born households reside. In general, variation in households' neighborhood conditions are associated with supra-neighborhood level housing market conditions. Previous research has shown that metropolitan-level housing characteristics, including levels of construction, vacancy rates, and the proportion of the population living in suburbs, can shape the mobility of households (South and Crowder 1997a,b, 1998; South and Deane 1993), which in turn is likely to affect their locational attainment. Ideally, we would like to control for these effects and the specific characteristics of metropolitan areas that affect neighborhood conditions. Due to the Census Bureau's efforts to maintain confidentiality of respondents within the AHS, however, 40 percent of housing units within metropolitan areas are not identified, preventing us from identifying, and creating measures for, individual metropolitan areas. Therefore, we use one simple measure available to us to control for geographic context, geographic region (West is the reference category).

We expect households living in the North and West to be experience poorer neighborhood conditions, regardless of their location in central cities or suburbs, than those living in the South and

[4]The AHS contains no measure of a household's wealth. Therefore, the effects of nativity status or race/ethnicity on neighborhood conditions may be overstated in this analysis.

Midwest, because the former two areas have higher levels of immigration and tighter housing markets. We expect that households residing in the North will live in lower quality neighborhoods than households in other regions because neighborhoods in the North are among the oldest in the country. For the same reason, we anticipate that nativity-status differences among households residing in central cities and suburbs will be less severe than in other parts of the country.

Methodology

Bivariate analyses are conducted to identify how nativity status interacted with race/ethnicity predicts neighborhood conditions for both central city dwellers and suburbanites. In addition, nativity-status and racial/ethnic differences in demographic and socioeconomic characteristics are compared overall, and then disaggregated by their residential location. Throughout the bivariate analyses we perform significance tests as appropriate.

To describe the relationship between nativity-status/year-of-entry, race/ethnicity, and neighborhood outcomes, while controlling for a range of theoretically relevant independent variables, we specify several logistic regression models which estimate the following logit specifications of P_i, the probability that household *i* lives in neighborhoods with: 1) trash, litter, or junk in the streets, roads, empty lots or on any properties; and 2) open spaces, such as parks, woods, farms, or ranches; 3) abandoned buildings; 4) buildings with bars on the windows; and 5) crime, all where $0 < P_i < 1$:

$$\log\left(\frac{P_i}{1-P_i}\right) = \alpha + \sum_j \beta_j N_{ji} + \sum_n \beta_n X_{ni}$$

The vector N represents the nativity status, year of entry, and race/ethnicity of the reference person. For each of the five dependent variables specified above, we run models for central city residents and suburbanites, for a total of ten models. For each dependent variable, the model specified uses a vector of nativity-status/year-of-entry dummy variables interacted with race/ethnicity (also

mentioned above).[5] We use native-born, non-Hispanic white households as the reference group for the 11 remaining groups (native-born blacks, Hispanics, and Asians; and foreign-born whites, blacks, Hispanics and Asians who entered in 1980 or later or before 1980). The vector X measures the control variables used in the analysis (i.e., the measures of life cycle and socioeconomic status, and region).

Results

As discussed above, we address three questions in our analysis. First, within suburbs and central cities, to what extent are white, black, Hispanic, and Asian immigrants living in poorer quality neighborhoods as compared to their native-born counterparts, and particularly relative to native-born and foreign-born whites? Second, are nativity- status and racial/ethnic differences smaller within suburbs than within central cities? Third, is race/ethnicity more salient than nativity status in predicting differences in households' neighborhood conditions in suburbs and central cities? To begin to address these questions, we employ simple descriptive comparisons.

Table 1 presents the neighborhood characteristics of foreign- and native-born households according to race/ethnicity. Two sets of significance tests are presented. The first set evaluates nativity-status differences within racial/ethnic groups (indicated by shading), and the second evaluates differences using native-born whites as the common reference group (indicated by conventional symbols). There are two panels within Table 1. Panel A shows the results for central city dwellers and Panel B reveals the results for suburbanites.

<Table 1 about here>

[5]It would have been preferable to use the double cohort method (see Myers and Lee [1996]) to assess immigrants' neighborhood conditions over time. In order to do so, we would need data at two points in time, ideally separated by ten years. However, the AHS did not begin asking respondents about their immigration experience until 2001. Therefore, we use nativity-status/year-of-entry dummy variables to assess immigrants' neighborhood conditions over time, recognizing the limitations of such an analysis and being cautious in our interpretation of the results.

The results in Table 1 reveal that nativity-status differences in residential outcomes within racial/ethnic groups are not always in the direction expected under the spatial assimilation model. For several neighborhood conditions, no significant nativity-status differences exist or they are in the opposite direction than would be expected. Moreover, it appears that among the nativity-status differences that are consistent with hypotheses based on the spatial assimilation model, such differences are not necessarily attenuated between foreign- and native-born households within suburbs.

Among central-city whites, for example, foreign- and native-born households are equally likely to report the presence of trash or junk, open spaces, or abandoned buildings within one-half block of their housing unit, while foreign-born whites are significantly *less* likely to report crime in their neighborhoods. There are only two findings that are consistent with hypotheses derived under the spatial assimilation model for whites: foreign-born households are significantly more likely to report buildings with bars on windows within one-half block of their housing unit, and the nativity-status difference on this characteristic is smaller among suburban than central city residents (compares Panels A and B). The finding that foreign-born whites are about 12 percentage points less likely than native-born whites to report living near open green spaces only in suburbs is inconsistent with hypotheses derived under the model, as is the finding that foreign-born whites in suburbs are significantly less likely than their native-born counterparts to report the presence of abandoned buildings in their neighborhoods.

Among blacks, all of the findings are contrary to the tenets of the spatial assimilation model. Among central-city dwellers, foreign-born blacks are significantly *less* likely than their native-born counterparts to report trash or junk and abandoned buildings within their neighborhoods. On the other three neighborhood outcomes, no significant nativity-status differences emerge. Panel B shows that within suburbs, foreign-born blacks are also significantly less likely than native-born blacks to report trash or junk within their neighborhoods, and the foreign-born advantage is actually

greater than is the case within central cities. Although in the suburbs, the nativity-status difference with respect to abandoned buildings disappears, one emerges in terms of crime. Yet again this difference operates in favor of the foreign born, with foreign-born blacks in suburbs significantly less likely to report crime within their neighborhoods. While the findings for blacks are contrary to hypotheses under the spatial assimilation model, they are consistent with findings from previous research and suggest that foreign-born blacks enter the United States with more resources to afford to live in better quality neighborhoods and may be less likely to experience discrimination in the housing market than their native-born counterparts (Crowder 1999; Freeman 2002; Friedman and Rosenbaum 2004; Logan et al. 1996; Rosenbaum and Friedman 2001; Waters 1999).

Among Hispanics, the nativity-status differences are a bit more consistent with hypotheses derived under the spatial assimilation model. Panel A reveals that among central-city residents, foreign-born Hispanics are significantly less likely than native-born Hispanics to reside in neighborhoods with open green spaces. At the same time, they are significantly more likely than native-born Hispanics to report that their neighborhoods contain buildings with barred windows. With respect to the other characteristics, however, no significant nativity-status differences are evident. Panel B shows that the significant nativity-status differences do not disappear among suburban Hispanics and actually become slightly larger, contrary to what might be expected under the spatial assimilation model. For example, foreign-born Hispanics continue to be significantly less likely than native-born Hispanics to report the presence of open green spaces within their neighborhoods; the gap between the groups actually widens between residential locations, from 6.27 in central cities to 8.26 in suburbs. In addition, suburban Hispanics are significantly less likely than their native-born counterparts to report the presence of crime within their neighborhoods.

Finally, among Asians, the results again offer only weak support for the spatial assimilation model. Panel A shows that although foreign-born Asians are significantly less likely than their native-born counterparts to live in neighborhoods with open green spaces, they are significantly *less*

likely than native-born Asians to live in neighborhoods with abandoned buildings. With respect to the other three neighborhood conditions, no nativity-status differences exist. Among suburban residents, the nativity-status difference in open green spaces becomes insignificant, consistent with hypotheses under the spatial assimilation model, but the unexpected finding for abandoned buildings remains.

Taken together, the results in Table 1 reveal extremely weak support for the main tenets of the spatial assimilation model. Within racial/ethnic groups, nativity-status differences in neighborhood outcomes are either nonexistent or reveal that foreign-born households are doing better than native-born households. Moreover, for those differences that are consistent with hypotheses generated under the spatial assimilation model, they do not necessarily diminish among suburbanites. Interestingly, there appear to be varying results between crime and the presence of buildings with bars on windows (for whites) and abandoned buildings (for Hispanics). For example, among whites in central cities, foreign-born households are more likely than native-born households to report living in neighborhoods with buildings with barred windows, they are less likely than native-born households to report having crime in their neighborhoods. Perhaps the presence of buildings with bars on windows and abandoned buildings (in the case of Hispanics) are more "objective" indicators of social disorder, or it may be that foreign-born households' perceptions of crime are different than those of native-born households.

Turning to the question of how race/ethnicity structures the patterns of residential outcomes experienced by households within central cities and suburbs, the results in Panels A and B reveal two general findings. First, there are significant racial/ethnic differences in neighborhood outcomes, but the kind of clear cut racial/ethnic hierarchy predicted by the place stratification model does not emerge. Second, suburban residence does not appear to attenuate the racial/ethnic differences; in some cases, differences are larger in suburbs than in central cities, offering initial support for hypotheses derived from the place stratification model.

Relative to native-born whites, native-born blacks have significantly lower quality neighborhood conditions in *both* central cities and suburbs. For example, among central-city dwellers, native-born blacks are at least twice as likely as native-born whites to report the presence of trash or junk, abandoned buildings, and buildings with bars on windows. Although the absolute levels of neighborhood problems for native-born blacks are lower in suburbs than in cities, the racial differences remain statistically significant and often as large (except for abandoned buildings).

Being black, however, is not consistently disadvantageous, contrary to hypotheses derived under the place stratification model. Foreign-born blacks are not necessarily worse off in their neighborhood outcomes as native-born whites. Panel A reveals that foreign-born blacks in central cities are significantly disadvantaged, relative to whites, on three out of the five neighborhood outcomes – presence of abandoned buildings, buildings with bars on windows, and crime – while on the other two outcomes (trash or junk and open spaces) no significant differences emerge. However, in suburbs, foreign-born blacks are significantly disadvantaged relative to native-born whites only with respect to living near buildings with barred windows; no significant differences are observed for the other four characteristics (see Panel B). Thus, it appears that once foreign-born blacks gain access to the suburbs, they are able to settle in neighborhoods that are largely equal in quality to those in which native-born whites live, a finding more consistent with the tenets of the spatial assimilation model.

Hispanics, on the other hand, are more consistently disadvantaged in their neighborhood outcomes, regardless of nativity status or residential location. Within central cities *and* suburbs, native- and foreign-born Hispanics are significantly more likely than native-born whites to report trash or junk, abandoned buildings, and buildings with bars on windows in their neighborhoods. Foreign-born Hispanics in central cities and all Hispanics in suburbs are significantly less likely than native-born whites to report that their neighborhoods contain open green spaces, while only native-born Hispanics in suburbs are more likely than native-born whites to report the presence of crime.

What is notable about Hispanics' neighborhood characteristics is that in some cases, they are worse than those of native-born blacks. For example, foreign-born Hispanics in both central cities and suburbs are more likely to live near buildings with barred windows and less likely to live near open green spaces than are native-born blacks. As mentioned above, such patterns undermine the notion of the existence of a racial/hierarchy in which blacks fall at the bottom.

For Asians, significant differences in neighborhood outcomes emerge relative to native-born whites, but the differences are sometimes more favorable for Asians than for whites. For example, while foreign-born Asians (regardless of location) and native-born Asians in suburbs are significantly less likely than native-born whites to report the presence of open green spaces in their neighborhoods, native-born Asians in central cities are actually significantly *more* likely than whites to live near such spaces. Also contrary to expectations is the finding that Asians in suburbs are significantly less likely than their native-born white counterparts to report seeing trash or junk in their neighborhoods; for Asians in central cities, no significant differences exist. Similarly, foreign-born Asians in suburbs are significantly less likely than native-born whites to have abandoned buildings in their neighborhoods; no difference exists for Asians in central cities or native-born Asians in suburbs. The final, unexpected finding for Asians is that foreign-born Asians in central cities and suburbs are significantly *less* likely to report crime in their neighborhoods than are native-born whites; no difference exists for native-born Asians. The only finding that is in the expected direction is that all Asians, regardless of nativity status and residential location, are significantly more likely than native-born whites to live in neighborhoods with buildings that have bars on their windows.

Taken together, the results from Table 1 reveal that race/ethnicity is important in predicting households neighborhood outcomes and probably more so than nativity status. However, the results do not exactly conform to expectations generated under the place stratification model. In general, native-born whites occupy some of the best neighborhoods, but often foreign-born whites, Asians,

and foreign-born blacks reside in equally good, if not better, areas. Hispanics and native-born blacks seem to occupy the worst residential areas, and it is even the case that foreign-born Hispanics live in neighborhoods of lower quality than those in which native-born blacks live.[6] What is consistent with hypotheses derived under the place stratification model is that the disadvantages for Hispanics and native-born blacks are as salient in suburbs as in central cities. Thus, suburbanization seems to be less of an "equalizer" with respect to the quality of residential locations as has been thought, at least for these groups. Multivariate analyses, however, are needed to confirm these results.

Theory suggests that the differences we see in neighborhood outcomes for central-city and suburban residents may reflect group differences in key social and economic characteristics. Table 2 presents these data for central-city dwellers (Panel A) and suburbanites (Panel B). As in Table 1, two sets of significance tests are presented. The first set evaluates nativity-status differences within racial/ethnic groups, and the second evaluates differences using native-born whites as the common reference group.

<Table 2 about here>

Beginning with central-city dwellers, although native-born whites tend to be the most advantaged in terms of neighborhood conditions, they do not consistently exhibit advantage with respect to the social and economic factors that the spatial assimilation model argues leads to superior neighborhood conditions. For example, while native-born white households tend to have the oldest heads and to be the least likely to contain other adults, they are among the most likely to be headed by non-married householders. Similarly, while nearly 66 percent of native-born white householders have at least some college, Asian householders, regardless of nativity status, are as

[6]In this analysis the findings for the social disorder variables are more consistent. In comparisons of native- and foreign-born blacks, Hispanics, and Asians to native-born whites (12 sets in total for central cities and suburbs), only 2 – for foreign-born Asians – had a difference in crime in the opposite direction of the other social disorder variables.

likely or significantly more likely to have attended or graduated from college. Moreover, native-born Asian and foreign-born black households report statistically similar levels of public assistance receipt as do native-born white households. However, native-born whites are the least likely to be renters, a factor that probably weighs fairly heavily in determining their neighborhood quality. Thus, the absence of a clear social and economic advantage for native-born whites, in the face of a fairly clear advantage in terms of neighborhood outcomes, signals additional support for the ideas underlying the place stratification framework.

The relative absence of nativity-status differences in many neighborhood conditions and the finding of a number of superior conditions among immigrants may stem from the generally superior characteristics of immigrant households. For example, foreign-born black households are significantly less likely to be headed by non-married households, more likely to be headed by a college educated individual, and less likely to receive public assistance than their native-born counterparts. Headship by a non-married individual is also less prevalent among foreign- than native-born Asian and Hispanic households, although levels of college completion are lower among the foreign born of these groups (yet the levels of college attendance and completion among foreign-born Asian householders are very high). In addition, foreign-born Hispanics are significantly less likely to receive public assistance than their native-born counterparts. However, the tendency of foreign-born households to reside in lower quality neighborhoods may at least partially stem from the greater tendency on the part of these households to live in rental housing.

Turning to suburbanites (Panel B), again we find that despite fairly consistent advantages in neighborhood conditions, native-born white households do not consistently exhibit a parallel advantage in social and economic characteristics. Like central-city residents, however, native-born white suburbanites are least likely to live in rental housing, a factor that may contribute to their general edge in terms of neighborhood conditions. As was also seen among central-city dwellers, minority immigrant households in suburbs tend to be better off on a number of dimensions than

their native-born counterparts. This is particularly interesting in light of the fact that the spatial assimilation model suggests that such nativity-status differences would be reduced in suburban locations.

Predicting Neighborhood Conditions Among Central-City and Suburban Residents

How do nativity status/year of arrival and race/ethnicity affect the neighborhood conditions of central-city and suburban residents, controlling for relevant household social and economic characteristics? Table 3 addresses this question by presenting the results of logistic regression models predicting our five neighborhood conditions by residential location. Because our main interest is in the effect of nativity-status and race/ethnicity, we discuss these coefficients first and then examine the background characteristics. Our examination of these results begins by focusing on nativity-status differences in the neighborhood conditions within racial/ethnic groups. Our interest here is to determine whether the foreign-born advantage that was evident in the bivariate results persists in the face of controls, and whether any of the foreign-born disadvantage that was observed is attenuated in suburbs. In order to examine nativity-status differences within racial/ethnic groups, we re-ran models 1 through 10 using native-born blacks, Hispanics, and Asians as the reference groups instead of native-born whites (results are not shown but are available from the authors). If the coefficients for foreign-born blacks, Hispanics, and Asians were significantly different from their native-born counterparts, we shaded the cells corresponding to those coefficients.[7] The differences between foreign- and native-born whites are denoted by the usual symbols for significance because in the models presented in Table 3, the reference group is native-born whites.

As in the bivariate analysis, the results in Table 3 for whites are largely inconsistent with hypotheses derived under the spatial assimilation model. Among central city dwellers (columns 1 -

[7]For each model, by subtracting the foreign-born coefficients from the native-born coefficient within each racial/ethnic group, one can determine the direction of the nativity status.

5), recent white immigrants are significantly *less* likely than native-born whites to report the presence of abandoned buildings in their neighborhoods. Similarly, all foreign-born whites, regardless of year of entry, are significantly less likely than their native-born counterparts to report crime. No nativity-status differences emerge for the remaining neighborhood conditions. Within suburbs, the results for abandoned buildings and crime parallel those within central cities, although foreign-born whites who entered the United States before 1980 are as likely as native-born whites to report crime in their neighborhoods (see columns 8 and 10). Two additional findings in the suburban analysis are notable. Foreign-born whites in suburbs are significantly less likely than native-born whites to report the presence of open green spaces near their housing units. In addition, foreign-born whites who arrived before 1980 are significantly more likely to report living near buildings with bars on the windows. While these findings are more consistent with the immigrant disadvantage expected under the spatial assimilation model, they undermine the notion that suburban residence attenuates nativity-status differences in neighborhood conditions.

With respect to blacks, the results in Table 3 are similar to those found in the bivariate analysis, revealing the advantages in neighborhood outcomes experienced by foreign-born blacks. Among central-city dwellers, foreign-bom blacks who entered the United States since 1980 are significantly *less* likely than native-born blacks to report living in neighborhoods with trash or junk, abandoned buildings, buildings with bars on windows, and crime, contrary to expectations derived under the spatial assimilation model. Within suburbs, however, the nativity-status differences for abandoned buildings and buildings with bars on windows lose significance, while recently arrived foreign-born blacks retain a significant advantage relative to native-born blacks in terms of trash, crime, and living near open space.

What is interesting about the findings for blacks is that the nativity-status differences exist primarily between more recently-arrived foreign-born blacks and their native-born counterparts. Only in one instance is there a nativity-status difference for foreign-born blacks who entered the

United States less recently (see column 3). It could be the case that foreign-born blacks who have been in the United States for a longer period of time lose their uniquely, distinctive advantage over native-born blacks in terms of their residential location. Such a pattern may reflect a strengthening of discriminatory barriers should foreign-born blacks progressively lose their ethnic distinctiveness over time (cf. Waters 1999). However, such a hypothesis has more typically been advanced in regard to generational differences (Rosenbaum and Friedman 2004; Waters 1999).

With respect to Hispanics, the results provide at most only weak support for expectations derived under the spatial assimilation model, as was the case in the bivariate analysis. On the one hand, foreign-born Hispanics are significantly less likely to report living near open spaces and are significantly more likely to report living near buildings with barred windows than native-born Hispanics in central cities and suburbs, despite the prediction that suburban location should attenuate nativity-status differences.[8] However, on the other hand, the findings that recently arrived foreign-born Hispanics in central cities and all foreign-born Hispanics in suburbs are significantly *less* likely than native-born Hispanics to report crime in their neighborhoods, and that recently-arrived foreign-born Hispanics in suburbs are significantly *less* likely to report trash or junk and abandoned buildings stand in contradiction to expectations based on the spatial assimilation model.

Compared to the other three racial/ethnic groups, fewer nativity-status differences exist for Asians, as was seen in the bivariate analysis. In support of hypotheses derived under the spatial assimilation model, it is evident that foreign-born Asians who arrived since 1980 and live in central cities are significantly less likely than native-born Asians to report living near open green spaces, and the nativity-status difference disappears among suburban Asians. Contrary to expectations, however, recently-arrived foreign-born Asians in suburbs are significantly *less* likely than their native-born counterparts to report the presence of crime in their neighborhoods.

---

[8]No nativity-status differences exist for foreign-born Hispanics in central cities who have been in the United States since before 1980 in open green spaces and for recently-arrived, foreign-born Hispanics in suburbs for buildings with bars on windows.

Taken together, the analysis of nativity-status differences in neighborhood conditions within racial/ethnic groups reveals weaker support for hypotheses generated under the spatial assimilation model than was expected. Many foreign-born households are significantly more likely than their native-born counterparts to have *better*, rather than worse, neighborhood conditions. In addition, suburban residence does not necessarily attenuate nativity-status differences. The question we now explore is how race/ethnicity shapes neighborhood outcomes, controlling for relevant social and economic characteristics.

As was the case in the bivariate analysis, it appears that race/ethnicity is more important than nativity status in predicting neighborhood conditions. Significant racial/ethnic differences exist in neighborhood conditions, although the exact racial/ethnic hierarchy predicted by the place stratification model does not emerge. It is also the case that suburban residence does little to attenuate racial/ethnic differences in these neighborhood outcomes.

The most striking finding is that native-born blacks experience significantly worse neighborhood conditions than do native-born whites in both central cities and suburbs, even after controlling for the relevant social and economic characteristics. This is suggestive of the existence of a dual housing market in which native-born blacks are relegated to housing in lower quality neighborhoods even when they possess the same socioeconomic attributes as whites. However, as was the case in the bivariate analysis, foreign-born blacks are often not in the same position as native-born blacks in the hierarchy of neighborhoods within the metropolis. For example, in central cities, recently arrived foreign-born blacks are significantly *less* likely than native-born whites to report having trash or junk in their neighborhoods, and in suburbs, black immigrants are significantly *less* likely to report crime. In several instances, no differences emerge between foreign-born blacks and native-born whites (see columns 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8).

The only results that are consistent with hypotheses derived under the place stratification model are those for buildings with barred windows and for open green spaces in suburbs. In central

cities and suburbs, foreign-born blacks who entered the United States before 1980 are significantly more likely than native-born whites to report the proximity of buildings with bars on windows, while in suburbs, recently arrived foreign-born blacks are more likely to report these conditions. Likewise, in suburbs, foreign-born blacks who entered before 1980 are significantly less likely than native-born whites to report having open green spaces within a half a block of their housing units, but in central cities no such difference was evident.

The results for Hispanics are more consistent with expectations generated under the place stratification model. Native-born Hispanics live in neighborhoods of significantly lower quality than those in which native-born whites reside, especially in suburbs. For example, within suburbs, they are significantly less likely to report living near open green spaces, and are significantly more likely to report crime in their neighborhoods; within central cities, however, these differences are not statistically significant. Foreign-born Hispanics are also significantly more disadvantaged than native-born whites in their neighborhood conditions, regardless of residential location, except with respect to the presence of crime, and in suburbs, abandoned buildings. As was the case in the bivariate analysis, foreign-born Hispanics are significantly less likely than native-born whites to report crime in their neighborhoods (except for the immigrants who entered before 1980 in central cities), and in suburbs, and they are just as likely as native-born whites to report physical disorder, in the form of abandoned buildings.

Among all of the groups, Asians are clearly in the best position with respect to neighborhood conditions, relative to native-born whites. There are only two neighborhood conditions for which native-born Asians are disadvantaged. In central cities, they are significantly more likely than native-born whites to report living near buildings with barred windows, and in suburbs they are less likely to report the presence of open green spaces. However, native-born Asians in suburbs are significantly *less* likely than native-born whites to report the presence of trash or junk and

abandoned buildings in their neighborhoods.[9]

Continuing the Asian advantage, foreign-born Asians in suburbs are significantly less likely than native-born whites to have trash or junk in their neighborhoods, and recently-arrived foreign-born Asians are significantly less likely to report crime. However, the Asian advantage is not evident on all outcomes. In central cities, recently arrived foreign-born Asians are significantly less likely than native-born whites to report living near open green spaces, and this difference extends to all foreign-born Asians in suburban areas. Finally, relative to native-born whites, all foreign-born Asians, regardless of location, are more likely to report living near buildings with bars on their windows.

All told, then, the results in Table 3 reveal the persisting effect of race/ethnicity in predicting neighborhood conditions, in both central cities and suburbs. However, as was the case in the bivariate analysis, the findings here do not adhere exactly to the racial/ethnic hierarchy hypothesized under the place stratification model, even after controlling for relevant social and economic characteristics. In general, native-born whites occupy a superior position in the housing market, but they are often joined in this position by foreign-born whites, Asians, and foreign-born blacks. Native-born blacks also do not necessarily experience the worst neighborhood conditions, as foreign- and native-born Hispanics often exhibit the greatest disadvantage. What is consistent with predictions under the place stratification model is the fact that the disadvantages faced by Hispanics and native-born blacks exist in both central cities and suburbs. In fact, for native-born Hispanics, these neighborhood disadvantages appear to be more plentiful in suburbs.

Effects of Background Characteristics

With regard to the effect of demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, we find support for the basic tenets of the spatial assimilation model. Specifically, households that are headed by

[9]Actually, for the abandoned buildings outcome both native- and foreign-born Asians are advantaged, relative to native-born whites (see footnote 1 in Table 3).

householders who are older and more educated, do not receive public assistance, and rent their housing typically live in lower quality neighborhoods. Households with more income and that are not headed by single householders also live in significantly better neighborhoods. For the most part, the predictors of neighborhood outcomes do not vary between households in central cities and suburbs, and generally conform to the expectations of the spatial assimilation model.

The effects of region are somewhat inconsistent. For the most part, households in central cities in the North are significantly more likely than those in the West to live in lower quality neighborhoods; however, in suburbs the opposite is true. Regardless of residential location, Southerners are typically more likely than Westerners to live in better neighborhoods. In the Midwest, households in central cities are significantly more likely than those in the West to report living in neighborhoods with abandoned buildings. At the same time, however, these households are significantly more likely to report living near open green spaces and less likely to report the presence of buildings with bars on windows than their Western counterparts. In suburbs, Midwestern households are at a significant advantage in four of the five neighborhood conditions relative to households in the West.

Discussion

The goals of this paper were essentially threefold. One objective was to evaluate the nature of nativity-status differences in neighborhood conditions, by asking whether such differences exist across all racial/ethnic groups and whether such differences were consistent in direction for all groups. A second and related objective was to evaluate the relative importance of race/ethnicity and nativity status by comparing the neighborhood outcomes of the foreign- and native-born contingents of each group to native-born whites in particular. But our final, and overarching, objective was to evaluate whether nativity-status and racial/ethnic differences were similar among households in central cities and suburbs. While spatial assimilation theory suggests that differences should

diminish or disappear among suburbanites, place stratification theory argues that foreign-born households, and especially those of African and Hispanic ancestry, should experience the least desirable housing outcomes, regardless of residential location.

In the bivariate and multivariate analyses, we found that many foreign-born households often reside in significantly *better* neighborhoods than do their native-born counterparts. Moreover, when the nativity-status differences were in the direction predicted by the spatial assimilation model, suburban residence did not necessarily attenuate these differences. With respect to the effect of race/ethnicity, we find that it is generally a more consistent predictor than nativity status of households' neighborhood conditions. Our analyses revealed a definite racial/ethnic pattern of access to advantageous neighborhood environments, but not the clear cut hierarchy found in previous research (Rosenbaum et al. 1999; Rosenbaum and Friedman 2001). Whites, Asians, and foreign-born blacks generally live in the best quality neighborhoods, and Hispanics and native-born blacks have the worst neighborhood conditions. A very important finding was the fact that this pattern of access was not "equalized" in suburban locations, consistent with expectations derived under the place stratification model but against the notion that suburbs symbolize the land of opportunity and equal access.

These findings have a number of implications for both theory and public policy. As with other recent research (Alba et al. 2000a; Logan et al. 2002), our results make clear that the spatial assimilation model, in its current form, may be less salient in explaining the residential outcomes of immigrants and minorities than it was before the 1990s. As Logan et al. (2002: 321) put it, "this is not a time, if ever there were a time, for a one-pattern-fits-all theory of residential location." This could be the case because many immigrant newcomers are moving directly to suburbs, which had not previously been the case (Friedman et al. 2003; Singer et al. 2001), and because during the past two decades, many immigrants have moved to metropolitan areas that had not previously contained significant foreign-born populations and therefore do not have the traditional immigrant enclaves

that long-standing immigrant destinations such as New York and Chicago have (Singer et al. 2001; Singer 2004).

These macro-level trends in immigrant settlement patterns have at least two implications for immigrants' neighborhood-level outcomes. For one, it is likely that immigrants living in suburbs will not necessarily reside in better neighborhoods than do native-born residents – contrary to predictions under the spatial assimilation model – because they may be residing in newly-established immigrant enclaves in suburbs. Logan et al. (2002) suggest poorer immigrants are probably particularly likely to live in such areas. Our results are somewhat consistent with this idea. We found that in suburbs, foreign-born Hispanics are significantly less likely to report having open spaces near their housing units and are significantly more likely to report living near buildings with bars on windows than their native-born counterparts. Perhaps the fact that nativity-status differences persist within suburbs is reflective of the existence of immigrant enclaves.

On the other hand, because the United States continues to attract highly-skilled and extremely well-educated immigrants, these macro-level settlement patterns may actually translate into better neighborhood outcomes for immigrants as compared to their native-born counterparts. Logan et al. (2002) suggest that such immigrants may choose to form their own ethnic neighborhoods to preserve their cultural background. Although they have the means to spatially assimilate, they prefer to live in such homogeneous, residential environments. Our results allude to the existence of such neighborhoods. In particular, foreign-born blacks appear to fit this pattern. In both central cities and suburbs, we found that they experience significantly better neighborhood outcomes than their native-born counterparts, and at the same time, reside in neighborhoods of at least equal quality as those in which native-born whites reside.

Our results also clearly indicate that the spatial assimilation model does not predict the neighborhood conditions of Hispanics and native-born blacks as well as it does the conditions experienced by whites and Asians, suggesting solid support for the basic tenets of the place

stratification model. Our results strengthen the conclusions reached in other work (e.g., Alba and Logan 1991, 1993; Logan and Alba 1993; Rosenbaum et al. 1999; Rosenbaum and Friedman 2001, 2004) by indicating that the effect of race/ethnicity clearly carries over into suburbs. Although our analyses cannot pinpoint the precise mechanisms underlying these patterns, it is likely that continuing racial discrimination in the housing market and mortgage-lending industry constrains the residential choices of affected households. Results from the 2002 Housing Discrimination Study support this observation, with both blacks and Hispanics being discriminated against more frequently than similarly situated whites in both the rental and sales submarkets (Turner et al. 2002). Whites' avoidance of minorities also likely plays a part in supporting the discriminatory framework that exists among institutional actors within the housing market (Charles 2000; Farley et al. 1994).

Besides being unable to isolate the causes of the patterns we find, our analysis suffers from other limitations. For example, it would have been useful to have measures of the poverty rate (and the changes therein) for neighborhoods. In some instances we found that foreign-born households were significantly more likely than their native-born counterparts or native-born whites to report living near buildings with bars on windows, but at the same time either foreign-born households were less likely to report the presence of crime in their neighborhoods or no other differences emerged on the other indicators of social disorder. It could be the case that such immigrants are living in neighborhoods that are gentrifying or revitalizing (cf. Winnick 1990), but without knowing the economic status of the neighborhood, it is hard to draw that conclusion.

A final limitation of our analysis is that we were unable to identify specific metropolitan areas and examine the neighborhood conditions of nativity-status and racial/ethnic groups within such areas. Therefore, we could be overstating the effects of some individual-level characteristics, including our key variables, in predicting the neighborhood conditions of households. In order to truly add more depth to current theories explaining nativity-status and racial/ethnic differences in locational attainment, it is necessary to examine neighborhood conditions, by residential location, in

areas that have been long-standing immigrant destinations and in areas that have recently emerged as major destinations (e.g., Washington, DC, Atlanta, Dallas-Ft. Worth).

In regard to public policy, our findings suggest that policies targeted at racial/ethnic minorities will be useful in improving minorities' access to better quality neighborhoods. These initiatives include efforts by the government to enforce federal, state, and local laws against racial/ethnic discrimination in housing. In addition to enforcement, attention needs to be given toward educating the public about fair housing, particularly that directed at Hispanics whose population growth has occurred mostly in the post 1960s civil rights era. Investment in minority communities, such as that promoted by the Community Reinvestment Act, is also critical in reducing the differences that exist in the neighborhood conditions between minorities and whites. A final strategy, indirectly related to race, is to promote metropolitan-level policies that curb suburban sprawl. It has been shown that racial/ethnic inequality is growing in areas that have experienced significant levels of suburban sprawl in the past few decades because whites and the nonpoor are able to move further away from minorities and the poor within suburbs (Jargowsky 2002; Squires 2002). Clearly, both people- and place-based policies need to be utilized to their fullest extent in order to minimize the disadvantages in locational attainment faced by Hispanics and native-born blacks, relative to whites, to maximize the well-being of future generations.

References

Adelman, Robert M. 2004. "Neighborhood Opportunities, Race, and Class: The Black Middle Class and Residential Segregation." *City and Community* 3(1): 43-63.

Adelman, Robert, M., Hui-shien Tsao, Stewart E. Tolnay, and Kyle D. Crowder. 2001. "Neighborhood Disadvantage among Racial and Ethnic Groups: Residential Location in 1970 and 1980." *The Sociological Quarterly* 42(4): 603-632.

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.

Alba, Richard D., John R. Logan, and Brian J. Stults. 2000a. "The Changing Neighborhood Contexts of the Immigrant Metropolis." *Social Forces* 79(2): 587-621.

Alba, Richard D., John R. Logan, and Brian J. Stults. 2000b. "How Segregated are Middle-Class African Americans?" *Social Problems* 47(4):543-558.

Alba, Richard D., John R. Logan, Brian J. Stults, Gilbert Marzan, and Wenquan Zhang. 1999. "Immigrant Groups in the Suburbs: A Reexamination of Suburbanization and Spatial Assimilation." *American Sociological Review* 64(3):446-460.

Allen, James P. and Eugene Turner. 2003. "Immigrant Enclaves in Central Cities and Suburbs." Presented at the annual meeting of the Association of American Geographers

Charles, Camille Zubrinsky. 2000. "Neighborhood Racial-Composition Preferences: Evidence from a Multiethnic Metropolis." Social Problems 47:379-407.

Crowder, Kyle D. 1999. "Residential Segregation of West Indians in the New York/New Jersey Metropolitan Area: The Roles of Race/Ethnicity." *International Migration Review* 33(1): 79-113.

Drew, Rachel Bogardus. 2002. "New Americans, New Homeowners: The Role and Relevance of Foreign-Born First-Time Homebuyers in the U.S. Housing Market." Working paper N02-2. Cambridge, MA: Joint Center for Housing Studies, Harvard University.

Farley, Reynolds, Tara Jackson, Keith Reeves, Charlotte Steeh, and Maria Krysan. 1994. "Stereotypes and Segregation: Neighborhoods in the Detroit Area." American Journal of Sociology 100:750-780.

Fong, Eric and Kumiko Shibuya. 2000. "Suburbanization and Home Ownership: The Spatial Assimilation Process in U.S. Metropolitan Areas." *Sociological Perspectives* 43(1): 137-157.

Freeman, Lance. 2002. "Does Spatial Assimilation Work for Black Immigrants in the U.S.?" *Urban Studies* 39(11):

Friedman, Samantha, Marie Price, Audrey Singer, and Ivan Cheung. 2003. "Race and the Residential Location of Recent Immigrants: The Case of Washington, DC." Presented at the annual meeting of the Association of American Geographers and under review as a chapter in the book, Immigration and Metropolitan Transformation in the United States, edited by Kavita Pandit and Steve Holloway.

Friedman, Samantha and Emily Rosenbaum. 2004. "Nativity-Status Differences in Access to Quality Housing: Does Home Ownership Bring Greater Parity? " *Housing Policy Debate.* In press.

Iceland, John, Daniel H. Weinberg, and Erika Steinmetz. 2002. U.S. Census Bureau, Series CENSR-3, *Racial and Ethnic Residential Segregation in the United States: 1980-2000.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Jargowsky, Paul A. 2002. "Sprawl, Concentration of Poverty, and Urban Inequality." Chapter 3, pp. 39-72 in *Urban Sprawl: Causes, Consequences, & Policy Responses*, edited by Gregory D. Squires. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.

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. 1996a. "Making a Place in the Metropolis: Locational Attainment in Cities and Suburbs." *Demography* 33(4): 443-453.

Logan, John R., Richard D. Alba, and Shu-Yin Leung. 1996b. "Minority Access to White Suburbs: A Multiregional Comparison." *Social Forces* 74(3): 851-881.

Logan, John R., Richard D. Alba, and Wenquan Zhang. 2002. "Immigrant Enclaves and Ethnic Communities in New York and Los Angeles." *American Sociological Review* 67(2): 299-322.

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, Douglas S. and Nancy Denton. 1988. "Suburbanization and Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas." *American Journal of Sociology* 94: 592-626.

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

Myers, Dowell and Seong Woo Lee. 1996. "Immigration Cohorts and Residential Overcrowding in Southern California." *Demography* 33(1):51-65.

Rosenbaum, Emily, Samantha Friedman, Michael H. Schill, and Hielke Buddelmeyer. 1999. "Nativity Differences in Neighborhood Quality Among New York City Households." *Housing Policy Debate* 10(3): 625-658.

Rosenbaum, Emily and Samantha Friedman. 2001. "Differences in the Locational Attainment of Immigrant and Native-born Households with Children in New York City." *Demography* 38(3): 337-348.

Rosenbaum, Emily and Samantha Friedman. 2004. *Slicing the Apple: How Generations of Blacks and Immigrants are Faring in New York's Housing Market*. Book manuscript under consideration at the Russell Sage Foundation.

Singer, Audrey, Samantha Friedman, Ivan Cheung, and Marie Price. 2001. "The World in a Zip Code: Greater Washington, D.C. as a New Region of Immigration." The Survey Series of the Center on Urban & Metropolitan Policy. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Singer, Audrey. 2004. "The Rise of New Immigrant Gateways." The Survey Series of the Center on Urban & Metropolitan Policy. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Squires, Gregory D. 2002. "Urban Sprawl and the Uneven Development of Metropolitan America." Chapter 1, pp. 1-22 in *Urban Sprawl: Causes, Consequences, & Policy Responses*, edited by Gregory D. Squires. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.

South, Scott J. and Kyle Crowder. 1997a. "Residential Mobility between Cities and Suburbs: Race, Suburbanization, and Back-to-the-City Moves." Demography 343:525-538.

South, Scott J. and Kyle Crowder. 1997b. "Escaping Distressed Neighborhoods: Individual, Community, and Metropolitan Influences." American Journal of Sociology 102:1040-1084.

South, Scott J. and Kyle D. Crowder. 1998. "Leaving the 'hood: Residential Mobility between Black, White, and Integrated Neighborhoods." American Sociological Review 63:17-26.

South, Scott J. and Glenn D. Deane. 1993. "Race and Residential Mobility: Individual Determinants and Structural Constraints." Social Forces 72:147-67.

Turner, Margery Austin, Stephen L. Ross, George C. Galster, and John Yinger. 2002. *Discrimination in Metropolitan Housing Markets: National Results from Phase I HDS 2000*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1993. *1990 Census of Population and Housing: Supplementary Reports – Metropolitan Areas Defined by the Office of Management and Budget, June 30, 1993*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2002a. Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) – Sample Data. "PCT63H. Place of Birth by Citizenship Status (Hispanic or Latino)" (accessed: 2 May 2003).

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2002b. Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) – Sample Data. "P21. Place of Birth by Citizenship Status – Universe: Total population." (accessed: 30 November 2002).

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2002c. Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) – Sample Data. "PCT63I. Place of Birth by Citizenship Status (White Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino)" (accessed: 2 May 2003).

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2002d. Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) – Sample Data. "P7. Hispanic or Latino by Race (Total Population)" (accessed: 10 May 2003).

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2003. *2000 Census of Population and Housing, Summary File 1*. Generated by Samantha Friedman using American Factfinder <http://factfinder.census.gov> (25 September 2003).

Waters, Mary. 1999. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Winnick, Louis. 1990. *New People in Old Neighborhoods*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Yinger, John. 1995. *Closed Doors, Opportunities Lost: The Continuing Costs of Housing Discrimination*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Table 1. Neighborhood Characteristics of Foreign- and Native-Born Households by Race/Ethnicity and Residential Location in Metropolitan America, 2001 (Weighted)

Characteristic	Panel A. Central City Dwellers							
	Native born				Foreign born			
	NH Whites	NH Blacks	Hispanics	Asians	NH Whites	NH Blacks	Hispanics	Asians
Reference person reports within ½ block of housing unit:								
Trash or junk	11.00	22.56**	17.66**	15.34	9.67	12.48	20.11**	12.61
Open spaces	25.64	23.38*	25.55	32.28	23.43	22.41	18.83**	20.54*
Abandoned buildings	4.56	18.73**	8.12**	7.61	3.40	7.58	8.40**	3.80
Buildings with bars on windows	12.09	27.81**	22.53**	24.59**	18.53**	24.60**	29.53**	20.23**
Reference person reports in neighborhood:								
Crime is present	23.37	38.02**	23.56	23.99	15.45**	32.02**	22.94	19.28
N	6212	2268	870	122	413	177	839	392

**p 0.01; *p 0.05; p 0.10 -- indicates difference between native-born whites and the group is significant; shading indicates a significant difference of at least p 0.10 between native- and foreign-born blacks, Hispanics, or Asians.

Table 1 (cont'd). Neighborhood Characteristics of Foreign- and Native-Born Households by Race/Ethnicity and Residential Location in Metropolitan America, 2001 (Weighted)

Characteristic	Panel B. Suburbanites							
	Native born				Foreign born			
	NH Whites	NH Blacks	Hispanics	Asians	NH Whites	NH Blacks	Hispanics	Asians
Reference person reports within ½ block of housing unit:								
Trash or junk	5.62	10.98**	10.57**	1.40*	4.78	5.12	9.74**	1.33**
Open spaces	41.20	30.57**	33.22**	28.74**	29.14**	34.62	24.96**	30.19**
Abandoned buildings	2.46	5.24**	5.31**	0.94	0.98*	4.40	3.71*	0.00**
Buildings with bars on windows	2.56	9.93**	11.42**	4.69	3.75	11.15**	17.34**	6.20**
Reference person reports in neighborhood:								
Crime is present	10.58	17.01**	16.85**	9.74	9.60	5.97	9.55	6.10**
N	14786	1482	790	195	635	100	768	444

**p 0.01; *p 0.05; p 0.10 -- indicates difference between native-born whites and the group is significant; shading indicates a significant difference of at least p 0.10 between native- and foreign-born blacks, Hispanics, or Asians.

Table 2. Household Characteristics of Foreign- and Native-Born Households by Race/Ethnicity and Residential Location in Metropolitan America, 2001 (Weighted)

Characteristic	Panel A. Central City Dwellers							
	Native born				Foreign born			
	NH Whites	NH Blacks	Hispanics	Asians	NH Whites	NH Blacks	Hispanics	Asians
Household characteristics								
Age	48.44	44.97**	42.59**	34.46**	52.79**	40.16**	41.56**	41.60**
Non-married household	56.03	72.52**	53.36	62.70	49.74*	60.27	43.50**	34.51**
Presence of:								
Children under 18	27.18	45.23**	48.51**	28.46	24.48	47.70**	63.41**	43.00**
Others in the household beyond the nuclear family	20.17	27.23**	28.19**	30.88**	25.88**	33.18**	43.77**	44.83**
Renter household	37.56	59.84**	57.45**	63.54**	44.35**	75.42**	66.56**	55.72**
Education								
Less than high school	11.47	27.00**	32.05**	14.47	17.71**	23.64**	57.20**	15.94**
High school degree	22.57	30.64**	26.05*	10.76**	25.31	25.08	20.47	20.43
College and more	65.97	42.36**	41.90**	74.77*	56.98**	51.28**	22.33**	63.63
Total household income (median)[1]	46,650	26,000	30,375	49,000	36,000	29,570	30,000	44,001
Receiving public assistance	3.78	12.90**	10.80**	6.28	6.36**	4.47	7.37**	8.45**
Region of housing unit								
North	16.49	20.46**	24.22**	12.08	44.07**	60.43**	18.13	26.59**
South	31.07	44.06**	38.86**	16.13**	14.67**	24.77	30.60	10.00**
Midwest	25.86	26.28	8.08**	8.17**	13.02**	7.32**	7.30**	11.95**
West	26.58	9.20**	28.84	63.62**	28.24	7.48**	43.96**	51.46**
N	6212	2268	870	122	413	177	839	392

**p 0.01; *p 0.05; p 0.10 -- indicates difference between native-born whites and the group is significant; shading indicates a significant difference of at least p 0.10 between native- and foreign-born blacks, Hispanics, or Asians.

[1]Significance tests are not conducted for this variable.

Table 2 (cont'd). Household Characteristics of Foreign- and Native-Born Households by Race/Ethnicity and Residential Location in Metropolitan America, 2001 (Weighted)

Characteristic	Panel B. Suburbanites							
	Native born				Foreign born			
	NH Whites	NH Blacks	Hispanics	Asians	NH Whites	NH Blacks	Hispanics	Asians
Household characteristics								
Age	50.02	45.52**	42.97**	42.00**	53.50**	44.22**	42.19**	42.63**
Non-married household	39.62	60.59**	42.71	35.95	37.12	37.10	31.00**	27.72**
Presence of:								
Children under 18	35.23	47.82**	52.60**	38.36	33.82	60.89**	62.02**	49.42**
Others in the household beyond the nuclear family	21.43	28.93**	29.00**	32.36**	23.29	33.89**	44.28**	37.51**
Renter household	20.72	43.70**	39.42**	32.67**	27.26**	44.38**	45.83**	37.92**
Education								
Less than high school	12.12	22.07**	27.91**	8.05	15.33*	12.13	52.57**	9.61**
High school degree	28.79	24.55**	24.72*	11.99**	21.49**	22.12	18.94**	13.81**
College and more	59.09	53.38**	47.37**	79.96**	63.18*	65.75	28.49**	76.58**
Total household income (median)[1]	54,000	34,000	36,000	65,000	51,000	42,000	35,000	66,000
Receiving public assistance	2.66	8.46**	6.57**	1.95	3.95*	1.06	4.67**	3.55
Region of housing unit								
North	24.06	12.78**	12.06**	14.01**	27.68*	31.26	8.79**	15.56**
South	32.96	60.06**	35.28	15.35**	20.69**	50.54**	38.86**	24.18**
Midwest	24.20	15.20**	8.96**	8.93**	17.38**	2.19**	4.28**	9.84**
West	18.79	11.97**	43.69**	61.71**	34.25**	16.02	48.07**	50.41**
N	14786	1482	790	195	635	100	768	444

**p 0.01; *p 0.05; p 0.10 -- indicates difference between native-born whites and the group is significant; shading indicates a significant difference of at least p 0.10 between native- and foreign-born blacks, Hispanics, or Asians.

[1]Significance tests are not conducted for this variable.

Table 3. Logistic Regression Coefficients of Models Predicting Neighborhood Conditions by Residential Location of Households, 2001 (Weighted)

	Central City Dwellers					Suburbanites				
	Trash	Open Space	Abandoned Buildings	Bars on Windows	Crime	Trash	Open Space	Abandoned Buildings	Bars on Windows	Crime
Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Nativity/Race/Ethnicity										
Native-born whites (ref.)										
Foreign-born whites										
Entered 1980 or later	-0.3717	0.0419	-0.8303†	0.2852	-0.7473**	-0.1602	-0.5630**	-1.4090†	-0.5832	-0.4913*
	(0.2377)	(0.1611)	(0.4652)	(0.1908)	(0.2039)	(0.2757)	(0.1405)	(0.7603)	(0.4781)	(0.2328)
Entered before 1980	-0.2264	-0.2678	-0.1347	0.2805	-0.4225*	-0.1769	-0.4341**	-0.5878	0.4272†	-0.0026
	(0.2489)	(0.1821)	(0.3487)	(0.1837)	(0.1914)	(0.2622)	(0.1151)	(0.4807)	(0.2462)	(0.1717)
Foreign-born blacks										
Entered 1980 or later	-0.5239†	-0.2378	0.0784	0.3179	0.1444	-0.9478	-0.0216	0.3167	1.2306**	-1.2451*
	(0.2903)	(0.2132)	(0.3446)	(0.2379)	(0.1969)	(0.7311)	(0.2485)	(0.6022)	(0.4530)	(0.6173)
Entered before 1980	0.2039	-0.4036	0.1533	1.3561**	0.3728	0.6285	-0.9427*	0.6310	2.0644**	-0.1034
	(0.3960)	(0.3758)	(0.5586)	(0.3012)	(0.3111)	(0.5996)	(0.4405)	(0.8595)	(0.4890)	(0.5949)
Foreign-born Hispanics										
Entered 1980 or later	0.3531**	-0.3768**	0.3381†	0.9254**	-0.3524**	-0.1128	-0.7872**	-0.4131	1.2975**	-0.5940**
	(0.1221)	(0.1193)	(0.1761)	(0.1127)	(0.1152)	(0.1779)	(0.1130)	(0.2905)	(0.1589)	(0.1678)
Entered before 1980	0.3365†	-0.1801	0.4696†	1.0594**	0.1528	0.4234*	-0.6792**	0.4429	1.5762**	-0.4466*
	(0.1790)	(0.1659)	(0.2460)	(0.1471)	(0.1496)	(0.1957)	(0.1370)	(0.2867)	(0.1664)	(0.2033)
Foreign-born Asians[1]										
Entered 1980 or later	-0.1596	-0.4366**	NA	0.4669**	-0.4264**	-1.6549**	-0.4249**	NA	0.3261	-1.0763**
	(0.1838)	(0.1523)		(0.1531)	(0.1525)	(0.4560)	(0.1210)		(0.2487)	(0.2490)
Entered before 1980	0.1237	-0.0657	NA	0.1964	-0.3493	-1.9324†	-0.6520**	NA	0.6672†	-0.3974
	(0.3202)	(0.2466)		(0.2713)	(0.2710)	(1.0241)	(0.2171)		(0.3689)	(0.3439)
Native-born blacks	0.6223**	-0.1226*	1.2386**	1.0837**	0.5700**	0.4027**	-0.4508**	0.4590**	1.3556**	0.3218**
	(0.0708)	(0.0622)	(0.0885)	(0.0673)	(0.0574)	(0.0962)	(0.0611)	(0.1365)	(0.1100)	(0.0783)
Native-born Hispanics	0.2601*	0.0027	0.3493*	0.6419**	-0.1185	0.2986*	-0.3185**	0.4888**	1.0673**	0.2133*
	(0.1035)	(0.0867)	(0.1456)	(0.0948)	(0.0893)	(0.1271)	(0.0794)	(0.1760)	(0.1312)	(0.1031)
Native-born Asians	0.1400	0.2609	-0.0136	0.6301**	-0.1389	-1.6367**	-0.4995**	-2.1914**	0.0129	-0.3750
	(0.2596)	(0.1990)	(0.2232)	(0.2179)	(0.2173)	(0.6136)	(0.1608)	(0.7436)	(0.3475)	(0.2463)

**p 0.01; *p 0.05; p 0.10; NOTE: for the nativity/race/ethnicity coefficients, shading indicates a significant difference of at least p 0.10 between native- and foreign-born blacks, Hispanics, or Asians.

[1]For the models of abandoned buildings in the neighborhood, we do not disaggregate Asians by nativity status because in suburbs, no foreign-born Asians lived in abandoned housing. Therefore, the coefficient in these models next to the native-born Asian category references all Asians.

Table 3 (cont'd). Logistic Regression Coefficients of Models Predicting Neighborhood Conditions by Residential Location of Households, 2001(Weighted)

	Central City Dwellers					Suburbanites				
	Trash	Open Space	Abandoned Buildings	Bars on Windows	Crime	Trash	Open Space	Abandoned Buildings	Bars on Windows	Crime
Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Household characteristics										
Age	-0.0144**	-0.0055**	-0.0118**	0.0027	-0.0061**	-0.0160**	-0.0062**	-0.0167**	0.0008	-0.0049**
	(0.0019)	(0.0015)	(0.0025)	(0.0017)	(0.0015)	(0.0022)	(0.0011)	(0.0032)	(0.0027)	(0.0017)
Family structure (1=non-married)	0.0975	-0.0123	0.1911*	0.2065**	0.1604**	0.1783**	-0.2147**	-0.0023	0.0499	0.1726**
	(0.0652)	(0.0515)	(0.0876)	(0.0589)	(0.0514)	(0.0688)	(0.0343)	(0.1018)	(0.0828)	(0.0526)
Presence of:										
Children under 18	-0.1107†	0.1451**	-0.0004	-0.1208*	0.0797	0.0003	0.0272	-0.0261	-0.0851	0.0798
	(0.0648)	(0.0529)	(0.0839)	(0.0607)	(0.0523)	(0.0704)	(0.0360)	(0.1044)	(0.0874)	(0.0549)
Others in the household beyond the nuclear family	0.2074**	-0.0518	0.2625**	0.1575**	0.1616**	0.1898**	0.0397	0.1132	0.1812*	0.1812**
	(0.0622)	(0.0527)	(0.0809)	(0.0571)	(0.0508)	(0.0698)	(0.0359)	(0.1047)	(0.0823)	(0.0539)
Housing tenure (1=rent)	0.2766**	0.1599**	0.0021	0.0710	0.1943**	0.2264**	-0.1835**	0.2277*	-0.0287	0.3973**
	(0.0658)	(0.0530)	(0.0870)	(0.0598)	(0.0522)	(0.0731)	(0.0399)	(0.1082)	(0.0904)	(0.0566)
Education (ref. >= college)										
Less than high school	0.3354**	-0.3670**	0.5102**	0.0926	-0.0050	0.3040**	0.0633	0.6589**	0.2624*	0.0635
	(0.0756)	(0.0670)	(0.0977)	(0.0703)	(0.0635)	(0.0874)	(0.0471)	(0.1215)	(0.1025)	(0.0699)
High school degree	0.1624*	-0.2841**	0.4039**	-0.0174	0.0045	0.2154**	-0.0111	0.2659*	0.0830	-0.0184
	(0.0689)	(0.0564)	(0.0893)	(0.0643)	(0.0548)	(0.0715)	(0.0357)	(0.1079)	(0.0932)	(0.0557)
Total household income	-0.0149**	0.0098**	-0.0271**	0.0043	-0.0083*	-0.0299**	0.0039*	-0.0348**	-0.0169**	-0.0137**
	(0.0056)	(0.0032)	(0.0094)	(0.0040)	(0.0038)	(0.0058)	(0.0018)	(0.0094)	(0.0061)	(0.0035)
Receiving public assistance	0.5151**	0.2267*	0.4721**	0.2698**	0.3584**	0.6404**	0.4187**	0.5546**	0.4935**	0.3863**
	(0.0932)	(0.0901)	(0.1127)	(0.0926)	(0.0836)	(0.1208)	(0.0836)	(0.1719)	(0.1487)	(0.1063)
Contextual characteristics										
Region (ref. West)										
North	0.4117**	0.2149**	0.8774**	0.0239	0.1158†	-0.4934**	0.1793**	0.2115	-1.7891**	-0.6047**
	(0.0804)	(0.0675)	(0.1212)	(0.0706)	(0.0664)	(0.0966)	(0.0467)	(0.1435)	(0.1387)	(0.0717)
South	-0.1740*	0.0506	0.3144**	-0.5593**	-0.2584**	-0.2296**	0.2015**	0.1663	-1.0465**	-0.4156**
	(0.0786)	(0.0611)	(0.1198)	(0.0685)	(0.0616)	(0.0790)	(0.0426)	(0.1275)	(0.0864)	(0.0610)
Midwest	-0.0280	0.1569*	0.6789**	-0.9310**	0.0407	-0.3719**	0.2316**	0.0580	-2.1380**	-0.4682**
	(0.0856)	(0.0665)	(0.1239)	(0.0842)	(0.0656)	(0.0941)	(0.0472)	(0.1488)	(0.1656)	(0.0704)
Intercept	-1.6532**	-0.9559**	-3.1833**	-1.9623**	-1.0409**	-1.8929**	-0.1561*	-3.0526**	-2.6567**	-1.6781**
	(0.1408)	(0.1101)	(0.2024)	(0.1266)	(0.1102)	(0.1547)	(0.0774)	(0.2360)	(0.1873)	(0.1169)
N			11291					19200		

**p 0.01; *p 0.05; p 0.10