Ethnic Origin and Residential Location of Immigrants in European Countries

Abstract

Segregated ethnic neighborhoods are prevalent in most contemporary European cities. Whereas patterns of segregation have been studied extensively in America, research on immigrants' segregation and residential location in Europe is relatively new. The present research utilizes data from the European Social Survey to examine patterns of locational attainment among immigrants across 13 European countries and the extent to which they are influenced by immigrants' tenure in the host country, socio-economic characteristics, preferences regarding residential location, exposure to discrimination, and ethnic and cultural origin. The analysis reveals that residential attainment varies considerably across ethnic and cultural groups: immigrants from Asia or Africa as well as Muslims are less likely to reside in neighborhoods which are perceived as inhabited by Europeans. The roles played by differential residential preferences and by perception of discrimination are also examined and evaluated.

Residential Location of Immigrants in European Societies

Introduction

Whereas social scientists have long studied residential segregation between members of the majority population and immigrants and ethnic minorities in North America, the literature on patterns of residential segregation in European societies is relatively new. This is hardly surprising. Immigrants, ex-colonials, refugees, asylum seekers and labor migrants began arriving in Europe in substantial numbers only during the second half of the twentieth century. The influx of immigrants not only changed the ethnic composition of many European countries, but also transformed the ethnic fabric of many European cities. Currently, most metropolitan centers in Western Europe are characterized by distinct segregated ethnic neighborhoods (e.g., Peach 1997, 2005; Van Kempen and Van Weesep 1997; Musterd, Ostendorf and Breebaart 1998; Musterd 2005; Malheiros and Vala 2004; Karsten et al. 2006; Logan 2006).

In the present article we seek to contribute to the literature on residential patterns of immigrants in Europe and to advance knowledge on the ways in which ethnic differences affect patterns of immigrants' residential location. We do so by systematically examining patterns of spatial attainment of immigrant groups in 13 European countries. More specifically, the research focuses on the following four questions: What are the patterns of residential location among immigrants across Europe? Second, are patterns of residential location influenced by immigrants' length of residence in the host country and socio-economic characteristics? Third, to what extent do different groups experience differential patterns of spatial integration, or do all go through a uniform pattern of spatial

integration? Fourth, do residential preferences and discrimination explain differential spatial locations across ethnic groups?

By providing answers to the questions listed above, we will be in a position to better understand the social mechanisms underlying patterns of residential location of immigrants of different ethnic origin in Europe, and to evaluate various theoretical explanations of the residential integration of immigrants. Indeed, in an era of increasing immigration to Europe, and given the rise of ethnic hostility and anti-immigrant sentiment there (i.e., Semyonov, Raijman and Gorodzeisky 2006; Pettigrew 1998), the issue of spatial segregation is of special importance not only for social scientists, but also for policymakers.

Immigration and Residential Segregation in Europe – Previous Studies

The massive flow of immigrants, labor migrants, ex-colonials and refugees to Europe throughout the last five decades has brought a variety of new ethnic groups into most European countries and has created, in turn, a variety of new ethnic communities and distinct segregated ethnic neighborhoods (Pettigrew 1998).[1] For example, English cities are populated by black Caribbean, Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi populations; German cities are inhabited by Turks and Yugoslavs; French and Belgian cities have become home to North Africans and sub-Saharan Africans; Holland has attracted Surinamese, Indonesians and Moroccans; Greek towns have become a destination for Albanians; Portugal is populated by African and Southeast Asian immigrants; and Scandinavian countries have opened their borders to many Iraqi, Iranian and Ethiopian refugees (Peach 1997, 2005; Musterd et al. 1998; Hatziprokopiou 2003; Malheiros and Vala 2004; Musterd 2005; Karsten et al. 2006; Logan 2006). Moreover, ethnic diversity

in Europe is accompanied by ethnic stratification, just as in the traditional immigrant societies of Australia, Canada, and the United States. Specifically, members of the white majority comprise the top echelons of the urban pyramid, while ethnic minorities and immigrants from less-developed countries find themselves at the bottom of the hierarchy (Heath, Rothon and Kilpi 2008).

Although comparative analysis of patterns of residential segregation in the European context is a difficult and rather complex task, several conclusions can be drawn from previous comparative studies on the issue (Musterd and Van Kempen 2009). First, European countries differ both in the composition of their ethnic populations and rates of ethnic residential segregation. For example, segregation rates in the United Kingdom, Holland and Belgium are higher than in Germany, Austria and France (Musterd 2005). Second, patterns of ethnic segregation in European cities have changed over time, but segregation rates have remained, for the most part, stable. Whereas some societies have experienced a modest increase in segregation (for example, Moroccans in Amsterdam) the dominant tendency has been leaning toward stability or decreasing levels of segregation (Musterd and Van Kempen 2009; Peach 2009). Third, residential segregation rates of the same group differ across different countries (Turks in The Hague and Frankfurt), or even across cities within the same country (e.g., Turks in Amsterdam and The Hague) ((Musterd and Van Kempen 2009). Fourth, rates of ethnic residential segregation vary from one group to another within cities.[2] For example, Moroccans and Turks in Amsterdam are more segregated than Surinamese (Musterd 2005; 2009; Logan 2006; Musterd and Van Kempen 2009), Caribbean blacks in UK cities are less segregated than either Bangladeshis or Pakistanis (Peach 1999; Musterd 2005; Johnston, Forrest and

Poulsen 2002) and Brazilians in Lisbon are less segregated than Indians (Musterd and Van Kempen 2009). Yet despite these differences, ethnic residential segregation across Europe is substantial and widespread. Moreover, as in the U.S., self-segregation tendencies are relatively stronger among the native majority population, as ethnic neighborhoods are viewed by native Europeans as the least desirable place of residence (Semyonov et al, 2007; Bolt et al. 2008).

It should be noted that state intervention in decisions regarding immigrants' residential location is much more common in European countries than in the U.S. or in Canada. In the past, public housing was offered to immigrants in specific designated areas of the city, but recently policies promoting interventions and supporting greater social mixing have been enacted in several European countries. In Germany, for example, integration of immigrants into the housing market has been fostered through housing and urban policies that are aimed at achieving desegregation by including local quotas for non-German born households in a variety of housing estates (Munch 2009). In Denmark and Finland, where there is no official dispersal program, policy documents encourage spatial distribution of refugees and immigrants through the allocation of social housing in various parts of the city (Harrison et al., 2005). Nevertheless, these policies have had no significant impact on segregation, as succinctly summarized by Bolt et al. (2010: 130): "Although a wide array of desegregation and mixing policies can be found across Europe, they are united in their failure to bring about a significant drop in the level of ethnic segregation."

Theoretical Expectations

Since theoretical formulations regarding ethnic residential segregation were developed in the context of American societies, we will develop expectations on the basis of these theoretical models, while taking into consideration the unique idiosyncratic nature of the European context. Residential segregation is a widely used indicator of racial and ethnic stratification within metropolitan areas. Evidence from prior research supports the argument that there is a conceptual link between residential segregation and locational attainment. According to the 'locational attainment' model (Alba and Logan 1991, 1992, 1993; Alba et al. 1999; Logan and Alba 1993), neighborhoods are ranked in a hierarchical order. Subsequently, individuals (households) convert socioeconomic attainment into placement in a particular area (similar to the status attainment model).

Generally speaking, several explanations have been advanced for immigrants' residential attainment (or segregation). The explanation most often used in studying immigration is cast within the classic 'assimilation' theoretical model. According to this model, residential assimilation – mobility out of ethnic neighborhoods – is viewed as an integral part of a uniform assimilation process that can be attributed to two interrelated social mechanisms: acculturation and socio-economic mobility. In other words, upon arrival, immigrants are not conversant with the local culture in the host country and often lack sufficient social and economic resources. Consequently, they enter at the bottom of the social system, take low-paying jobs and live in poor ethnic neighborhoods. With the passage of time, however, immigrants become culturally, socially and economically adapted and experience upward social and economic mobility[3] (Rumbaut 1997; Zhou 1997).

Upward socio-economic mobility is also manifested in terms of residential mobility – out and away from the ethnic community, first, into ethnically mixed neighborhoods, and later into affluent and prestigious districts of the metropolis (Massey and Mullen 1984; Massey 1985; Alba and Nee 2003; South, Crowder and Chavez 2005). From this perspective, ethnic enclaves are viewed as transitional neighborhoods to be left behind once an immigrant has achieved sufficient social, cultural and economic resources.[4]

Recently a growing number of scholars have begun pointing to divergent patterns of ethnic spatial assimilation across ethnic groups (Portes and Zhou 1993; Zhou 1997, 1999; Iseland and Nelson 2008). While some groups face an abundance of opportunities, others suffer from multiple disadvantages, including discrimination and insufficient social and economic resources. As a result, groups "experience either traditional assimilation and upward mobility, downward mobility by unsuccessfully competing in the mainstream economy, or upward mobility by living and working in ethnically homogeneous immigrant communities" (Jensen and Chitose, 1996: 83).

Racial and ethnic inequality can also be examined through the lens of place stratification theory, which focuses on the roles of preferences,[5] prejudice and discrimination (both individual and institutional) in curbing residential options for minorities (Charles 2003; Massey 1985). The theory posits that the host group places individuals into racial groups based on perceived phenotypic or physiognomic similarity. Racial and ethnic groups undergo different experiences, depending on their place within this racial and ethnic hierarchy. Moreover, real estate agents' and residential zoning laws' stereotypes and discrimination produce a segmented housing market that obstructs the

ability of Blacks, for example, to achieve residential parity with Whites (Farley et al. 1994; Yinger 1995).

Although there is no evidence that members of ethnic minorities object to having members of the majority group as neighbors, it is possible that some immigrants actually prefer to live in an ethnic neighborhood. The ethnic neighborhood may provide members of the minority population with shelter from discrimination and with ample advantages not available elsewhere. For example, ethnic communities may provide easy access to social networks, a base for social and economic support, daily use of the language, proximity to religious services, availability of ethnic food stores, and access to ethnic organizations and to cultural centers (Peach and Smith 1981; Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993). In parallel to the economic advantages provided by ethnic economic enclaves, ethnic communities can provide members of the minority population with shelter from discrimination and with support, opportunities and services not available in other places (Wilson and Portes 1980; Burgers et al. 1997).

This logic leads us to the following theoretical expectations: We expect residence in an ethnic neighborhood to be less pronounced among second-generation immigrants, that is, to decrease with the passage of time in the host country. We also expect residence in an ethnic neighborhood to decrease with immigrants' income and education. However, we expect patterns of locational attainment to be influenced by both preferences for residential location and by exposure to discrimination, and hence to vary across groups. Therefore, we expect residential preferences and exposure to discrimination to mediate the relations between immigrants' ethnic and cultural origin and their type of neighborhood. While these three expectations are not mutually exclusive or

contradictory, each underscores differential mechanisms that can drive processes of ethnic segregation and spatial assimilation. In what follows, we will examine these expectations in the context of European societies.

Data and Variables

Data for our analysis were obtained from the European Social Survey (ESS) conducted in 2002 in 22 European countries.[6] Face-to-face interviews were conducted with nationally representative samples (age 15 and above) and include socio-demographic and economic characteristics of respondents, plus a variety of questions on attitudes toward foreign populations residing in Europe. The current research was restricted to respondents who either were born outside the country or who have at least one parent that was born outside the country. It was further restricted to countries with at least 75 sampled cases. This procedure yielded 3,825 respondents in the following 13 European countries: Belgium, Austria, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Luxemburg, France, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Spain, Greece and Switzerland.[7] The list of countries and the size of the sampled cases are provided in Table 1.

The dependent variable – perceived ethnic composition of the neighborhood – was measured by a self-reported definition of the ethnic composition of one's neighborhood of residence. Respondents were asked to answer to the following question: "How would you describe the area where you currently live[8]? An area where almost nobody is of a different race or ethnic group from most [country] people [hereafter all-European neighborhoods]; some people are of a different race or ethnic group from most [country] people [hereafter mixed neighborhoods], or many people were of a different race or ethnic group" [hereafter ethnic neighborhoods].[9]

The socio-demographic characteristics of immigrants that are used in the analysis

as the major predictors of perceived ethnic composition of the neighborhood include: ethnic origin (based on continent of origin,[10] distinguishing once a coarse distinction between European and non-European origin, and once a more refined distinction among four categories: Europe, Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean), religion (Muslims=1) and generation (first generation=1), years since migration (for the first generation only). In addition, the following variables were included for the purpose of control: household income per capita (in Euros, divided into 12 categories), education (in formal years), employment status (distinguishing among two dummy categories: employed and other), age (in years), marital status (married=1), type of locality (rural=1), and gender (men=1),

Residential preferences and perception of discrimination are used in the analysis as intervening variables between immigrants' ethnic and cultural origin and perceived residential location. Residential preference is defined by the distinction between respondents who view an area where many people are of a different race or ethnic group from most (country) people as the most desirable place of residence, and those with opposing views on this issue. This classification provides, perhaps, the most conservative distinction between those who prefer living in ethnic neighborhoods and others.

Perception of discrimination (as a proxy for subjective sense of discrimination) is defined by the distinction between those who claim that they are members of a disadvantaged minority group and are also aware of discrimination against their group members (on the basis of either race, ethnicity, religion, nationality or culture) and those who do not sense any such discrimination against members of their group. For detailed definitions, wordings, coding and measures of the variables and their marginal

distribution, see Table A in the Appendix.

Analysis and Findings

Descriptive Overview

Before providing a systematic and detailed analysis of modes of residential attainment among immigrants, and before examining the ways in which spatial attainment is shaped and determined across populations and across countries, it seems important to provide a descriptive overview of the distribution of immigrants' characteristics across three types of neighborhoods and of the distribution of neighborhood composition across countries. Therefore, in this section we present two tables for a descriptive overview. In Table 1 we present percentage distributions of immigrants by three types of neighborhoods (according to the perceived ethnic composition of the neighborhood) across the 13 countries included in the study (to examine cross-country variations in patterns of ethnic residential attainment). In Table 2 we display mean characteristics of immigrants by the three types of neighborhood of residence (to examine whether immigrants who reside in all-native-European neighborhoods differ in their attributes from immigrants who dwell in ethnically mixed and ethnic neighborhoods).

Table 1 and Table 2 about here

The data displayed in Table 1 reveal that, on average, about one quarter of all immigrants reported residence in ethnic communities (where most residents are immigrants); over half reported living in ethnically mixed neighborhoods (where some of the residents are immigrants); and slightly under a quarter (23 percent) reported dwelling in communities inhabited almost exclusively by native Europeans (almost no

immigrants). There is, however, some cross-country variation in patterns of residential attainment. Residence in ethnic neighborhoods is most pronounced in France (where almost 40 percent of immigrants report residence in ethnic communities) and least evident in Luxembourg, Denmark, Norway and Sweden (where under 14 percent of immigrants reside in ethnic neighborhoods). A considerable number of immigrants reported residence in ethnically mixed communities. For example, approximately 73 percent of the immigrants in Greece and over half of the immigrants in Germany, Spain, Switzerland and the UK reported dwelling in mixed neighborhoods.

In Table 2 we display the mean values of the attributes of the three immigrant sub-populations distinguished by the ethnic composition of their neighborhood (i.e., ethnic neighborhoods, ethnically mixed neighborhoods, all-native-European neighborhoods). The data reveal that immigrants who reside in ethnic neighborhoods and in ethnically mixed neighborhoods differ considerably in their characteristics from immigrants who dwell in European neighborhoods (where almost all residents are native Europeans). More specifically, immigrants who dwell in ethnic neighborhoods are more likely to be Muslim, first generation, and of African origin. For example, about one third of immigrants who reside in ethnic neighborhoods belong to the Muslim faith, in comparison to 7 percent of immigrants residing in all-European neighborhoods. Likewise, immigrants who live in ethnic neighborhoods are more likely to be younger, unemployed, and to define their income as insufficient. They are also more likely to prefer residence in ethnic neighborhoods than others and more likely to be aware of discrimination experienced by members of their group. Surprisingly, however, the

educational level of immigrants does not vary systematically across the three types of neighborhoods.

Determinants of Residential Location – Country-Specific Analysis

The first question the analysis seeks to address is whether and to what extent immigrants in Europe reside in ethnic neighborhoods on the basis of their characteristics. More specifically, the analysis examines, first, whether first-generation immigrants are more likely to reside in ethnic neighborhoods; second, whether non-Europeans and immigrants belonging to the Muslim religious conviction are more likely to reside in ethnic neighborhoods; and third, whether the tendency to reside in mixed and all-European neighborhoods increases with immigrants' economic resources.

We start the analysis by estimating for each country a series of three ordered-logit regression equations[11] under the premise that residential attainment is structurally ordered: away from ethnic neighborhoods into European neighborhoods via mixed neighborhoods, capturing an ordinal process of spatial integration (ethnic neighborhoods at the bottom, European at the top, and mixed in-between). Because the number of sampled immigrants in each of the countries is relatively small (ranging from 77 in Spain to 776 in Luxembourg), we estimated three country-specific equations, each including only two variables. In the first equation, perceived ethnic composition of the neighborhood is taken as a function of first versus second generation plus household income. In the second equation, 'generation' is replaced by a two-category ethnic origin variable (European versus non-European origin), and in the third equation ethnic origin is replaced by religious conviction (Muslim versus non-Muslim). Income is used in all three equations as a control variable representing the socio-economic status of the household.

Table 3 displays the estimated coefficients of the three regression equations predicting (perceived) ethnic composition of the neighborhood for each of the countries. The coefficients provide a rather rough and schematic examination of classic and segmented assimilation hypotheses. The findings, however, reveal substantial similarities across countries in the determination of perceived residential location. More specifically, the coefficients derived from equation 1 suggest that residence in an ethnic neighborhood is likely to decline with level of income. The effect of income is negative in all countries (except Greece), although it is significantly associated with residential location only in Austria, Germany, Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland and the UK. The data in equation 1 also reveal that residence in an ethnic neighborhood is more prevalent among first-generation immigrants than among second-generation immigrants. In most countries the effect of generation is positive and significant (except for Denmark, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Spain, Netherlands and Norway, where the effect is positive but not statistically significant; in Belgium the effect is negative and not significant).

Table 3 about here

The results presented in equation 2 reveal that in most countries the effect of ethnic origin (European versus non European) on the perceived ethnic composition of neighborhood is negative and statistically significant (except for Luxembourg, Norway, Spain and Switzerland, where the effect is also negative but not statistically significant). This finding implies that in most European countries immigrants from countries within Europe (as compared to non-European immigrants) are less likely to reside in ethnic neighborhoods. The only exception is Greece, where the odds of residing in an all-European neighborhood are higher for non-Europeans (b=0.411).[12]

The coefficients derived from equation 3 show that the odds of residing in an ethnic neighborhood are likely to be more pronounced among Muslims (as compared to non-Muslims). In most countries the effect of religious denomination on ethnic composition of neighborhood is positive and statistically significant (except for Greece and Norway, where the effect is not significant).

Figure 1 about here

Figure 1 graphically illustrates the findings presented in Table 3. To this end we display the coefficients yielded by the three equations in Table 3 in a graphic manner. The coefficients for first generation (versus second generation) were taken from the first equation, the coefficients for Europeans (versus non-Europeans) were taken from the second equation, and the coefficients for Muslims (versus non-Muslims) were taken from the third equation. These coefficients serve as the respective indicators of the relative odds of first-generation versus second-generation immigrants (first bar), of European immigrants versus non-Europeans (second bar), and of Muslim immigrants versus non-Muslims (third bar) of reporting residence in a non-ethnic neighborhood (net of income). The figure reveals, indeed, that despite some country-specific differences, the general patterns of locational attainment seem to be quite uniform across the countries. The likelihood of residing in ethnic neighborhoods tends to be higher among first-generation immigrants, among immigrants of non-European origin, and among immigrants belonging to the Muslim faith, even after taking into consideration the economic status of the immigrants. Thus, in the analysis that follows we evaluate the ways in which immigrants' characteristics are associated with residential location using a pooled data set for all thirteen countries with a more detailed and refined set of variables.

Pooled Data Analysis

The pooled data enable us to estimate in a more detailed, careful and systematic manner the effects of ethnicity, religious affiliation, time in the host society and a series of socio-demographic attributes (not included in the country-specific analysis) on residential location. In all equations, perceived ethnic composition of the neighborhood is estimated as a function of individuals' social, economic and demographic attributes, while controlling for country of residence.[13]

In equation 1, we let perceived ethnic composition of neighborhood be a function of immigrants' length of residence in the country (first- versus second-generation immigrants) plus years since migration to test the hypothesis that the tendency to reside in an ethnic neighborhood is likely to decrease due to 'acculturation'. In equation 2 we add to the predictors a series of variables representing socio-demographic characteristics of immigrants (including education and income), to examine the hypothesis that the tendency to live in an all-European neighborhood is likely to increase with upward socio-economic mobility. In equation 3, we include a series of dummy variables representing continent of origin (using more detailed categories than in the previous analysis) and religion of the immigrants, to examine the hypothesis that different ethnic and cultural groups go through a process of 'segmented assimilation'. That is, we examine whether different ethnic and cultural groups experience divergent patterns of residential attainment. All equations are estimated while controlling for cross-country variation (by including a set of dummy variables representing countries of residence). The results of the analysis are presented in columns 1, 2 and 3 of Table 4.

Table 4 about here

The results of equation 1 lend firm support to the 'acculturation hypothesis'. The data reveal that, as compared to second-generation immigrants, first-generation immigrants are more likely to reside in ethnic neighborhoods (b=1.057). Likewise, residence in ethnic neighborhoods tends to decrease with the passage of time in the host country (b=-0.037). The effect of 'years since migration' on the ethnic composition of neighborhood of residence is negative and statistically significant in all equations. It is important to note that the impact of 'generation' and 'years since migration' remains statistically significant even after controlling for socio-demographic characteristics (equation 2) and ethnic origin and religious affiliation of the immigrants (equation 3). These findings suggest that net of economic and social resources and net of cultural origins, as years go by in their host country, immigrants tend to leave ethnic neighborhoods and move into European ones.

The negative and significant coefficients for income in equations 2 and 3 provide firm support for the argument that immigrants tend to translate their economic resources into residential location. The negative coefficient implies that immigrants that perceive their income as sufficient are less likely to live in ethnic neighborhoods. The impact of education on residential attainment, however, is less consistent. The data also suggest that net of years in the host country and net of socioeconomic characteristics, the odds of residing in an ethnic neighborhood are lower in rural places and among elder immigrants.

The findings yielded by equation 3 suggest that different ethnic and cultural subgroups experience divergent patterns of residential attainment, even after taking into consideration the differences among groups in length of residence in the host country and

in socioeconomic characteristics. More specifically, residence in ethnic neighborhoods is significantly more pronounced among Muslim immigrants and among immigrants from Asia and Africa, as indicated by the positive and significant coefficient for Muslim, Asian and African. For example, the relative odds for Asian immigrants of residing in an ethnic neighborhood are 1.7 times higher as compared to European immigrants.

Sensitivity Analysis

In order to further examine and reevaluate the uniform pattern of the associations between ethnic origin and residential location, as well as between religious affiliation and residential location across Europe, we performed an additional sensitivity analysis in which we estimated country-specific relative odds for non-European (versus European) immigrants and for Muslim (versus non-Muslim) immigrants of residing, respectively, in an ethnic and in a native-European neighborhood.[14] The results of this analysis (presented in the Appendix, Table B) are consistent with the findings presented previously in Table 3; they provide additional and firm support for the argument that patterns of locational attainment linked to ethnicity or religion among immigrants are quite uniform across the European countries included in the analysis.

In all countries, without exception, Muslims have higher odds than comparable non-Muslims of dwelling in an ethnic neighborhood and lower odds of residing in a native-European neighborhood. Likewise, in all countries, with the exception only of Greece (see explanation in Footnote 11); non-European immigrants have higher odds of residing in an ethnic neighborhood and lower odds of residing in a native-European place than comparable European immigrants. This observation was reconfirmed when we re-estimated ordered-logit regression equations that also included, respectively, interaction

terms between country of residence and ethnic origin and between country of residence and religious conviction (not presented). Only in the United Kingdom and in France, the tendency of Muslim immigrants to reside in ethnic neighborhoods was significantly lower than in other European countries. As already noted (in Footnote 12), neither the percentage of non-European immigrants nor the percentage of Muslims residing in the country were found to exert a significant effect on patterns of residential attainment in bi-level (HLM) ordered-logit regression equations.

Role of Residential Preferences and Perception Discrimination

At the outset of this paper we suggested that differential preferences for residential location and discrimination may produce divergent patterns of residential attainment across subgroups. We argued that some groups of immigrants may actually prefer living in ethnic enclaves rather than in all-European neighborhoods, either because ethnic neighborhoods provide them with support systems, social networks, and easy access to ethnic organizations and cultural and religious facilities, or because ethnic neighborhoods shelter them from discrimination. Indeed, as immigrants or members of ethnic minorities experience difficulties in finding proper housing in all-European neighborhoods (due to prejudice and discrimination), they may look for a home in an ethnic neighborhood.

Since preferences and discrimination are not fully independent from one another,[15] and since both can affect patterns of residential attainment, we display in Table 4 (columns 4-6) a series of ordered-logit regression equations that include among the predictors of locational attainment indicators of residential preferences and perceived discrimination. More specifically, in equation 1 we let perceived ethnic composition of the neighborhood be a function of immigrants' characteristics plus residential

preferences; in equation 2 we replace preferences with perception of discrimination; and in equation 3 we include both preferences and perception of discrimination among the predictors of perceived ethnic composition of neighborhoods. These equations enable us to estimate the net effect of both preferences and discrimination on residential attainment and, hence, to examine the extent to which residential preferences and perception of discrimination mediate the relations between immigrants' characteristics and the perceived ethnic composition of a given neighborhood.[16]

Although residential preferences cannot be fully converted into actual places of residence, the data displayed in columns 4-6 show a strong impact of both residential preference and perceived discrimination on residential location. For example, the positive and highly significant coefficient (b = 1.155) for residential preference indicates that the odds of residing in an ethnic neighborhood are 3.17 times higher among immigrants who view ethnic neighborhoods as the most desirable place of residence than among other immigrants. Likewise, the positive and significant impact of perceived discrimination (b=0.565) indicates that those exposed to discrimination are more likely to live in ethnic neighborhoods. The effects of residential preferences and of discrimination hardly change when both are included among the predictors of residential location.

Net of preferences and net of exposure to discrimination, however, the analysis reveals that first-generation immigrants are more likely to dwell in ethnic communities than second-generation immigrants and that immigrants with higher income are less likely to live in ethnic neighborhoods. The analysis also reveals that married persons, the elderly, and persons living in rural communities are less likely to live in ethnic neighborhoods. Perhaps, the elderly and families gravitate toward neighborhoods

inhabited by a large proportion of Europeans because such communities provide better services for both children and adults. The greater tendency of immigrants who live and work in rural places to reside in European neighborhoods may reflect the scarcity of ethnic neighborhoods in rural areas.

The findings regarding differentiation linked to ethnicity suggest that in the case of immigrants from African countries, exposure to discrimination (rather than residential preferences) accounts for their residential location. As made evident by the coefficients for African origin in models 4-6, the effect of African origin remains stable after controlling for residential preference, but it becomes statistically insignificant after controlling for exposure to discrimination. Apparently, the residence of African immigrants in ethnic neighborhoods can be explained by the discrimination they face, but not by their residential preferences.

In the case of immigrants from Asian countries, residential preferences and exposure to discrimination do not fully mediate the relations between immigrants' characteristics and residential location. Net of residential preferences and net of exposure to discrimination, Asians are less likely to reside in all-European neighborhoods than other immigrants (the effect of Asian origin remains positive and statistically significant in all equations). Moreover, after controlling for residential preferences in model 4, the effect of Asian origin becomes substantially higher (b=0.523 in model 3 and b=0.604 in model 4). This evidence suggests that the tendency to live in ethnic neighborhoods among immigrants from Asian countries is higher than expected on the basis of their preferences for residential location.

Finally, the type of residential location among Muslims can be attributed to both residential preferences and exposure to discrimination. When both preferences for residential location and exposure to discrimination are included in equation 6, the significant effect of the Muslim religion in equations 4 and 5 is reduced to statistical insignificance. Apparently, Muslim immigrants tend to reside in ethnic neighborhoods partly because they prefer residence in ethnic communities and partly because they experience discrimination.

Conclusions and Discussion

The major goal of the present research has been to examine patterns and modes of residential attainment among first- and second-generation immigrants across 13 European countries. The data reveal that, on average, about one quarter of immigrants (both first- and second-generation) live in ethnic neighborhoods; over half reside in ethnically mixed neighborhoods; and slightly under one quarter dwell in homogenous all-European communities. There is, however, some cross-country variation in levels of reported residential segregation.

The findings further reveal that with the passage of time in their host country, immigrants tend to move out of ethnic enclaves and into European neighborhoods. Consistent with expectations, the findings show that net of immigrants' socio-economic characteristics and net of their cultural and ethnic origin, second-generation immigrants are less likely to reside in ethnic neighborhoods than first-generation immigrants. Apparently, over the years, as part of an acculturation process, immigrants become more spatially integrated. The data also support the thesis that immigrants tend to translate economic resources (i.e., income) into residential location. Other things being equal,

immigrants with high income are less likely to reside in ethnic neighborhoods and more likely to dwell in places inhabited by Europeans.

Notwithstanding the impact of acculturation and economic mobility on residential attainment, the analysis demonstrates that net of time spent in the host country and net of immigrants' socio-economic attributes, ethnic origin and immigrants' religion play major roles in affecting locational attainment. More specifically, immigrants from Asian and African countries as compared to immigrants from Europe or to Latin American and Caribbean immigrants are more likely to reside in ethnic neighborhoods and less likely to reside in all-European neighborhoods. Likewise, immigrants belonging to the Muslim faith are more likely to dwell in ethnic neighborhoods than immigrants belonging to other religious denominations.

Curiously, despite substantial differences across the European countries included in the study in their social, political and economic structure, welfare policy, housing policy and immigrant integration policy (e.g., Musterd 2005; Phillips 2010; Bolt et al. 2010), the patterns of residential location that we observed in this study are quite uniform across the countries. Non-European immigrants and Muslim immigrants are more likely than others to reside in ethnic neighborhoods. Apparently, the findings yielded by this research are consistent with the conclusion reached by Bolt et al. (2010) that residential segregation on the basis of ethnic origin and religious conviction in Europe is quite substantial despite a variety of social policies directed at immigrants' spatial and social integration.

According to Phillips (2007), ethnic residential concentration can be interpreted in a variety of ways. On the one hand, it may be taken as a sign of community strength and

strongly bonding social capital. On the other hand, it may indicate exclusion and the emergence of "parallel societies" within Europe and be an expression of 'self segregation' and of reluctance toward social and cultural integration (see Phillips 2007). One of the plausible explanations for the higher likelihood of residence in ethnic neighborhoods among non-European and Muslim immigrants than among other immigrants may lie in cross-group variations in residential preferences and in the discrimination they experience in the host country. It was previously suggested that immigrants may prefer residence in an ethnic neighborhood, because it may provide them with shelter from discrimination as well as with proximity to religious services, easy access to social networks, availability of ethnic organization and food stores, and opportunities for daily use of the language. The data lend some support to this argument, suggesting that both preferences and perception of discrimination affect residential location. Immigrants who view ethnic neighborhoods as the most desirable place of residence and immigrants who claim that their group members are discriminated against are more likely to dwell in ethnic neighborhoods.

The findings presented in this paper reveal that neither preferences nor perception of discrimination can fully account for the residential location among Asian immigrants. However, residential preferences and exposure to discrimination explain much of the residential attainment among Africans and Muslims. It should be noted that a minority's preference to reside in ethnic neighborhoods can also be driven by discrimination (whether real or perceived). Therefore, preference among immigrants for residence in an ethnic neighborhood may be viewed as"lack of choice" rather than "choice" (Van Ham and Manley 2009).

We are aware, of course, of the limitations associated with self-reported – perceived – ethnic composition of neighborhood (rather than actual measures of ethnic composition) and with the broad and coarse categories of ethnic origin used in this research. It is our hope, however, that the findings reported here will stimulate and motivate social scientists to utilize more detailed and refined data when studying the social and spatial integration of immigrants within and across European societies. Indeed, in an era when both immigration and anti-foreigner sentiment are simultaneously growing, the implications of ethnic residential concentration for the social organization of European cities and for the future of ethnic relations in European societies should be further studied and evaluated.

FOOTNOTES

1. The definition of ethnic minorities in European societies is a complex matter. Ethnic and racial minorities have arrived in Europe as guest workers, labor migrants, ex-colonials, refugees, asylum seekers and immigrants. They have come from a variety of countries of origin to different destinations, mostly due to historical circumstances. The legal and civilian status of ethnic and immigrant groups also varies considerably across countries. Yet, despite all these differences, all are viewed as non-European ethnic minorities and as members of an 'out-group' population.
2. Detailed and illuminating information regarding rates of residential segregation of specific ethnic groups in specific cities is provided by Musterd (2005). For example, the segregation index (IS) for Turks in The Hague is 52 and in Frankfurt 19; for Turks in Amsterdam it is 42, and in the Hague 52. In Amsterdam the index for Moroccans and Turks is 42 and the index for Surinamese is 33. In Birmingham the index for Bangladeshis is 68, for Pakistanis 66, and for Caribbean Blacks 42.
3. It is important to note that assimilation is a complex and only partially interlocking set of processes. For example, in his classic work, Gordon (1964) isolated seven forms of assimilation: cultural (acculturation), structural, marital, identificational, attitude receptional, behavioral receptional, and civic. Later, Williams and Ortega (1990) reduced this seven-dimensional model to three main dimensions: acculturation, structural assimilation, and behavioral-receptional assimilation. While some of these dimensions (especially structural assimilation)

are strongly interrelated, others are only weakly linked. Moreover, it was shown that there is more than just one conception of the process and outcome of assimilation. Gordon (1964) described these conceptions as Anglo-Conformity, Melting Pot and Cultural Pluralism. While both Anglo-Conformity and Melting Pot predicted the disappearance of the immigrant group as communal identity and the absorption of later arrivals into the existing social structure, Cultural Pluralism emphasized the legitimization of the preservation of sub-national communal life and cultural differences.

4. It is important to note that this pattern of residential mobility seems to fit the experience of many of the European immigrant groups (e.g., Jews and Italians) in the U.S., whose second generations were able to move to wealthy suburban areas of cities over time. However, this pattern was not observed in the case of African-Americans.
5. Although researchers have questioned and debated whether preferences matter (Clark 1986; Galster 1986; Fossett 2006), whose preferences matter (Patterson 1997; Thernstrom and Thernstrom 1997) and what mechanisms *underlie* those preferences (Harris 1999, 2001; Clark 1982, 1991, 2002; Krysan and Farley 2002; Charles 2000; Farley et al. 1994), most agree that residential preferences shape patterns of ethnic spatial segregation.
6. The European Social Survey (ESS) was initiated and seed-funded by the European Science Foundation, the body representing almost all of Europe's main national academic funding agencies. The ESS was carefully designed for optimal international comparability of the data, using state-of-the-art methodology. Much

attention was paid to the translation of the questionnaire, and random sampling techniques were used in all countries (Schneider 2008). For detailed information on the European Social Survey, see Jowell (2003). Although there are four rounds of ESS data, questions about the ethnic composition of current and of ideal neighborhood were asked only in the first round (ESS 2002).

7. The weight we use takes into account the proportion of different groups in the country and each country's proportion of the population in Europe.
8. We are aware that the dependent variable used here – perceived ethnic composition of neighborhood – differs from conventional measures of residential segregation. It is based on self-reported data regarding the ethnic composition of current neighborhoods; as such, it measures the *perceived* rather than actual ethnic composition of the neighborhood. Indeed, the perception of ethnic composition of the "area where you currently live" and the boundaries of the area may vary across individuals and across countries. Yet, we believe that this measure (the only one available in the dataset and the only one that facilitates cross-national comparisons) is a good measured proxy of the theoretical concept.
9. Lahav (2004) and others have suggested that non-European residents are more noticeable and more visible than European immigrants (due to phenotype, dress code, etc). Thus, their growing presence in a locality is more likely to evoke a sense of threat than that of other immigrants. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that Europeans refer to non-European ethnic minorities when responding to questionnaire items on immigrants and ethnic minorities.

10. The categories of 'ethnic origin' are rather broad and based on continent of origin. It is important to note that within continents there are differences based on the specific country of origin, as well as cultural and religious differences within each of the four major categories of ethnic groups. However, the dataset lacks detailed information about these diversities and the number of sampled cases in the dataset limits us to these major categories. It is our hope that future researchers may utilize more detailed information on ethnic origin than was available to us in the present study.
11. The ordinal logit model (or proportional odds model) allows us to capture the interrelationships among categories of ordered categorical outcomes (e.g., all-European neighborhood, mixed neighborhood and ethnic neighborhood) with a single set of coefficients. This model estimates the effect of a unit increase of the independent variables on the log odds of having higher as opposite to lower value on the dependent variable (e.g., ethnic neighborhood as opposed to mixed and all-European neighborhood).
12. We believe that in Greece, the lower odds for European immigrants of residing in an 'all-native-European' neighborhood and their higher odds of residing in an 'ethnic' neighborhood stem from the fact that the overwhelming majority of European immigrants in Greece are of Albanian origin. This distinct group is visible and likely to concentrate in distinct ethnic neighborhoods more than other immigrants.
13. We also estimated a two-level hierarchical model (HLM) of ordinal logistic equations (individuals as the first-level variables nested in countries as the

second-level variables). Since we had only 13 degrees of freedom at the second level, the models were not being statistically robust, we preferred to use dummy variables representing countries to control for cross-country variations. It should be noted that the effects of the percentage of non-Europeans, percentage of Muslims and GDP at the country level were not significant in all equations and the effects of the individual-level variables, for the most part and with only a few exceptions, were similar to those reported here. The results of the estimated HLM equations are available from the authors upon request.

14. The odds ratio was computed for logistic regression (ethnic neighborhoods versus mixed and all-European) net of socio-demographic characteristics of immigrants included in the analysis (equation 3), using the probabilities (estimated by SPSS)

    of each group for residence in a specific neighborhood: $\frac{p_1/(1-p_1)}{p_2/(1-p_2)}$.

15. The data reveal that preferences for residence in an ethnic neighborhood and perception of discrimination are not strongly associated. The correlation between the two variables is only r = .086*.

16. The idea that residential preferences and sense of discrimination can also be affected by residential choices cannot be rejected. The analysis presented here, however, cannot determine the causal order of the association between preferences, discrimination and type of neighborhood. Residential preferences and discrimination are introduced to the analysis as control variables to examine the extent to which these variables may intervene between ethnic origin and ethnic composition of the neighborhood.

References

Alba Richard D. and John R. Logan .1991. "Variations on two themes: racial and ethnic patterns in the attainment of suburban residence". *Demography* 28, 431–453

Alba Richard D. and John R. Logan .1992. Analyzing locational attainments: constructing individual-level regression models using aggregate data. *Sociological Methods & Research* 20, 367–397

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, Brian Stults, Gilbert Marzan, and Wenquan Zhang .1999. "Immigrant groups in the suburbs: a reexamination of suburbanization and spatial assimilation". *American Sociological Review* 64, 446–460

Alba, Richard D. and Victor Nee 2003. *Remarking the American Mainstream*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bolt, Gideon, Deborah Phillips and Ronald Van Kempen .2010. "Housing Policy, (De)segregation and Social Mixing: An International Perspective", *Housing Studies* 25, 129-135.

Bolt, Gideon, Van Ronald Kempen and Maarten Van Ham .2008. "Minority Ethnic Groups in the Dutch Housing Market: Spatial Segregation, Relocation Dynamics and Housing Policy". *Urban Studies* 45, 1359–1384.

Farley Reynolds, Charlotte Steeh, Maria Krysan, Keith Reeves, and Tara Jackson. 1994. "Stereotypes and Segregation: Neighborhoods in the Detroit Area." *American Journal of Sociology* 100, 750-80.

Gordon, Milton. 1964. *Assimilation in American life: the role of race, religion, and national origins.* New York : Oxford University Press.

Harrison, M., Law, I. and Deborah Phillips. 2005. *Migrants, Minorities and Housing: Exclusion, Discrimination and Anti-Discrimination in 15 Member States of the European Union* (Vienna: European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia).

Heath, Anthony F., Catherine Rothon, and Elina Kilpi. 2008. "The Second Generation in Western Europe: Education, Unemployment, and Occupational Attainment". *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1142066

Iceland, John and Kyle A. Nelson. 2008. "Hispanic Segregation in Metropolitan America", *American Sociological Review* 73, 741-65

Jensen, Leif and Yoshimi Chitose. 1996. "Today's Second Generation: Evidence from the 1990 Census." Pp.82-107 in *The New Second Generation*, edited by A. Portes. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Jowell, R. and the Central Coordinating Team. 2003. European Social Survey 2002/2003. Technical Report. London, UK: Centre for Comparative Social Surveys, City University

Karsten, Sjoerd, Felix Charles, Guuske Ledoux, Wim Meijnen, Jaap Roeleveld and Erik Van Schooten. 2006. "Choosing Segregation or Integration? The Extent and

Effects of Ethnic Segregation in Dutch Cities". *Education and Urban Society* 38: 228-47.

Lahav, Galliya. 2004. *Immigration and Politics in the New Europe. Reinventing Borders* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Logan, John R. and Richard D. Alba .1993. "Locational Returns to Human Capital: Minority Access to Suburban Community Resources" *Demography* 30, 243-268.

Logan, John R. 2006. "Variations in Immigrant Incorporation in the Neighborhoods of Amsterdam." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Development* 30:485-509.

Malheiros, J. M. and Vala, F. 2004. "Immigration and City Change: The Lisbon Metropolis at the Turn of the Twentieth Century." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30, 1065-86.

Massey, Douglas S. and Brendan P. Mullan. 1984. "Processes of Hispanic and Black Spatial Assimilation". *American Journal of Sociology* 89, 836-873.

Massey, Douglas S. 1985. "Ethnic Residential Segregation: A Theoretical Synthesis and Empirical Review". *Sociology and Social Research* 69, 315-50

Musterd Sako, Wim Ostendorf. and Matthijs Breebaart. 1998. *Multi-Ethnic Metropolis: Patterns and Policies*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Musterd, Sako . 2005. "Social and Ethnic Segregation in Europe: Levels, Causes, and Effects". *Journal of Urban Affairs* 27, 331–48.

Musterd, Sako and Ronald Van Kempen. 2009. "Segregation and Housing of Minority Ethnic Groups in Western European Cities". *Journal of Economic and Social Geography* 100, 559-566

Peach, Ceri, Robinson, V. and Smith, S. 1981. *Ethnic Segregation in Cities*. Croom Helm.

Peach, Ceri. 1996. "Does Britain Have Ghettoes?" *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 21, 216-35.

_____.1997. "Post-war migration to Europe: Reflux, Influx, Refuge". *Social Science Quarterly* 78, 269-283.

_____. 1998. "South Asian and Caribbean Ethnic Minority Housing Choice in Britain". *Urban Studies* 35, 1657-1680.

_____.1999. "London and New York: Contrasts in British and American Models of Segregation." *International Journal of Population Geography* 5, 319-51.

_____.2009. "Slippery Segregation: Discovering or Manufacturing Ghettos?" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35, 1381-1395

Pettigrew, Thomas F. 1998. "Reaction toward the new Minorities of Western Europ". *Annual Review of Sociology* 24, 77-103.

Portes, Alejandro and Min Zhou. 1993."The new second generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants among post-1965 Immigrant Youth." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530, 74-96.

Portes, Alejandro and Julia Sensenbrenner. 1993. "Embeddedness and Immigration: Notes on the Social Determinants of Economic Action". *The American Journal of Sociology* 98, 1320-50.

Rumbaut, Ruben. 1997. "Introduction: Immigration and Incorporation." *Sociological Perspectives* 40, 333-338.

Semyonov, Moshe, Rebecca Raijman, and Anastasia Gorodzeiski. 2006. “The Rise of Anti-Foreigner Sentiment in European Societies, 1988-2000.” *American Sociological Review* 71, 426-49.

Semyonov, Moshe, Glikman, Anya and Krysan, Maria. 2007. “Europeans' Preference for Ethnic Residential Homogeneity: Cross-National Analysis of Response to Neighborhood Ethnic Composition”. *Social Problems* 54, 434-53.

Semyonov, Moshe and Glikman, Anya. 2009 "Ethnic Residential Segregation, Social Contacts, and Anti-Minority Attitudes in European Societies" *European Sociological Review* 25, 693-708

Schneider, Silke L. 2008. “Anti-Immigrant Attitudes in Europe: Outgroup Size and Perceived Ethnic Threat”. European Sociological Review 24: 53–67

South, S. J., Crowder, K. and Chavez, E. 2005. "Migration and Spatial Assimilation among U.S. Latinos: Classical versus Segmented Trajectories" *Demography* 42, 497-521.

Van Ham, Maarten and David Manley. 2009. “Social Housing Allocation, Choice and Neighborhood Ethnic Mix in England”. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 24, 407–422

Van Kempen, Ronald and Jan Van Weesep. 1997. "Ethnic Residential Patterns in Dutch Cities: Backgrounds, Shifts and Consequences." *Urban Studies* 35,1813-33.

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

Wilson, Kenneth L. and Alejandro Portes. 1980. Immigrant Enclaves: An Analysis of the Labor Market Experiences of Cubans in Miami". *The American Journal of Sociology* 86, 295-319.

Williams, Allen and Suzanne Ortega. 1990. Dimensions of Ethnic Assimilation: An Empirical Appraisal of Gordon's Typology. *Social Science Quarterly* 71: 697-710.

Zhou, Min. 1997." Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation." Pp.196-211 in *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, edited by S. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz and J.DeWind. New-York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Table 1 · ***Percentage of Distribution of Immigrants in three Types of Neighborhoods of Residence (Distinguished by the Reported Ethnic Composition of Neighborhood) in 13 European Countries***

	Almost no immigrants – All-European Neighborhood	***Some immigrants – Ethnically Mixed Neighborhood***	***Many immigrants – Ethnic Neighborhood***	**N Number Sample Cases**
Country				
Austria	38.8	42.0	19.0	421
Belgium	40.4	40.8	18.8	287
Denmark	48.9	37.8	13.3	135
France	14.7	46.4	38.8	322
Germany	21.9	54.3	23.8	438
Greece	10.7	73.3	16.0	381
Luxemburg	45.3	43.3	11.3	776
Holland	34.5	47.2	18.3	260
Norway	44.8	42.5	12.7	157
Spain	25.6	53.8	20.6	77
Sweden	53.0	33.2	13.8	355
Switzerland	23.4	53.8	22.8	555
UK	23.8	51.1	25.1	305
Total	**23.3**	**50.1**	**26.6**	**3825**

Source: European Social Survey (ESS, 2002)

Table 2· ***Characteristics of Immigrants (Percentage or Mean and Standard Deviations) by three Types of Neighborhood of Residence in European Societies***

Composition of Neighborhood	***Almost no immigrants – European Neighborhood***	***Some immigrants- Mixed Neighborhood***	***Many immigrants – Ethnic Neighborhood***	***Total***
Variables				
Gender – male	44.4%	47%	47.7%	46.8%
Marital status – married	55.6%	58%	49.2%	55.2%
Age	47.15 (17.23)	43.16 (16.12)	37.87 (15.66)	42.70 (16.65)
Residence in non-urban place	41.8%	17.6%	10.4%	21.3%
Education	12.61 (4.08)	12.30 (4.23)	12.41 (4.17)	12.39 (4.17)
Subjective income (sufficient)	82.3%	69.1%	62.6%	70%
Working status – employed	50%	53.4%	48.6%	51.3%
First generation	41.3%	54.1%	54.4%	51.4%
Years spent in the country (first generation)	7.84 (10.91)	9.33 (10.87)	8.43 (10.17)	8.76 (10.71)
Religion – Muslim	7.2%	20.9%	36%	21.9%
Ethnic Origin:				
Europe	78.7%	61.1%	52.2%	59.1%
Africa	9.8%	16.7%	26.8%	16.8%
Asia	7.6%	15.2%	17.2%	15.2%
Latin America and Caribbean	3.9%	7.0%	3.9%	5.1%
Preferences for living in Ethnic neighborhood	3.5%	8.9%	23.3%	11.3%
Member of discriminated group	6.2%	13.1%	20.8%	13.6%
N	**893**	**1915**	**1016**	**3825**

Source: European Social Survey (ESS, 2002)

Table 3· ***Coefficients (S.E.) of Ordinal Logistic Regression Equations Predicting Perceived Ethnic composition of Neighborhood in 13 European Countries***[1]

Country	τ_1	τ_2	Income	Generation	European origin	Muslim
Austria	-0.450*	1.510*	-0.471*	0.805*	-	-
	(0.219)	(0.232)	(0.220)	(0.189)		
	-1.335*	0.579*	-0.545*	-	-0.563*	-
	(0.281)	(0.274)	(0.219)		(0.234)	
	-0.622*	1.300*	-0.459*	-	-	1.151*
	(0.217)	(0.228)	(0.236)			(0.322)
Belgium	-0.509*	1.347*	-0.133	-0.077	-	-
	(0.259)	(0.272)	(0.260)	(0.228)		
	-0.942*	0.949*	-0.155	-	-0.626*	-
	(0.300)	(0.301)	(0.260)		(0.252)	
	-0.225	1.764*	-0.026	-	-	1.063*
	(0.290)	(0.325)	(0.324)			(0.365)
Denmark	-0.629	1.350*	-0.905	0.526	-	-
	(0.582)	(0.591)	(0.571)	(0.332)		
	-1.458*	0.580	-0.878	-	-0.983*	-
	(0.589)	(0.577)	(0.574)		(0.346)	
	-0.312	1.699*	-0.767	-	-	1.697*
	(0.700)	(0.735)	(0.711)			(0.508)
France	-1.906*	0.281	-0.149	0.235	-	-
	(0.215)	(0.180)	(0.214)	(0.216)		
	-2.115*	0.106	-9.127	-	-0.594*	-
	(0.226)	(0.183)	(0.215)		(0.216)	
	-1.477*	0.781*	-0.079	-	-	0.973*
	(0.241)	(0.219)	(0.973)			(0.310)
Germany	-1.294*	1.319*	-0.581*	0.989*	-	-
	(0.245)	(0.247)	(0.232)	(0.195)		
	-2.504*	0.045	-0.592*	-	-0.879*	-
	(0.295)	(0.264)	(0.231)		(0.232)	
	-1.680*	0.988*	-0.628*	-	-	1.414*
	(0.287)	(0.276)	(0.285)			(0.271)
Greece	-1.966*	1.829*	0.204	0.098	-	-
	(0.219)	(0.213)	(0.237)	(0.231)		
	-1.800*	2.015*	0.322	-	0.411^	-
	(0.215)	(0.222)	(0.236)		(0.232)	
	01.955*	1.861*	0.297	-	-	0.161
	(0.192)	(0.187)	(0.242)			(0.411)
Luxembourg	-0.360	1.911*	-0.214	0.028	-	-
	(0.217)	(0.232)	(0.199)	(0.145)		
	-0.495^	1.776*	-0.212	-	-0.129	-
	(0.277)	(0.288)	(0.198)		(0.240)	
	-0.181	2.032*	-0.088	-	-	0.981*
	(0.203)	(0.225)	(0.216)			(0.431)
Netherlands	-0.880*	1.353*	-0.531^	0.381	-	-
	(0.321)	(0.329)	(0.308)	(0.239)		
	-1.513*	0.932*	-0.247	-	-1.476*	-
	(0.307)	(0.294(	(0.316)		(0.265)	
	-0.342	2.492*	-0.326	-	-	2.262*
	(0.391)	(0.464)	(0.395)			(0.389)
Norway	-0.449	1.739*	-0.651	0.513	-	-
	(0.498)	(0.519)	(0.462)	(0.325)		

	-0.811^	1.353*	-0.698	-	0.022	-
	(0.458)	(0.471)	(0.467)		(0.322)	
	-0.876	1.271^	-0.959	-	-	0.007
	(0.655)	(0.667)	(0.649)			(0.510)
Spain	-1.171*	1.384*	-0.957*	0.800	-	-
	(0.573)	(0.576)	(0.480)	(0.524)		
	-1.726*	0.772^	-0.847^	-	-0.174	-
	(0.465)	(0.419)	(0.498)		(0.477)	
	-1.231*	1.526*	-0.503	-	-	1.724*
	(0.564)	(0.586)	(0.590)			(0.783)
Sweden	0.310	2.106*	-0.351	0.876*	-	-
	(0.312)	(0.333)	(0.296)	(0.215)		
	-0.856*	0.935*	-0.361	-	-0.878*	-
	(0.323)	(0.326)	(0.296)		(0.238)	
	0.152	2.178*	-0.223	-	-	1.960*
	(0.467)	(0.523)	(0.485)			(0.472)
Switzerland	-1.417*	0.994*	-0.477^	0.337*	-	-
	(0.268)	(0.263)	(0.249)	(0.167)		
	-1.842*	0.557^	-0.530*	-	-0.234	-
	(0.320)	(0.309)	(0.248)		(0.243)	
	-1.916*	0.802*	-0.695*	-	-	1.501*
	(0.300)	(0.283)	(0.302)			(0.514)
UK	-1.680*	0.652*	-0.802*	0.415^	-	-
	(0.327)	(0.313)	(0.311)	(0.221)		
	-2.231	0.167	-0.794*		-0.873*	-
	(0.329)	(0.297)	(0.313)		(0.234)	
	-1.485*	0.648^	-0.761^		-	0.582^
	(0.389)	(0.374)	(0.392)			(0.338)

***p<0.05, ^p<0.1**

Table 4· ***Coefficients (S.E.) of Ordinal Logistic and Logistic Regression Equations Predicting Ethnic composition of Neighborhood of Residence in 13 European Countries***[1]

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Individual-level variables						
First generation	1.057*	0.650*	0.560*	0.513*	0.523*	0.480*
	(0.108)	(0.118)	(0.141)	(0.142)	(0.131)	(0.142)
Years in country	-0.037*	-0.017*	-0.014*	-0.012	-0.013	-0.011
	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Gender	-	0.128*	0.071	0.052	0.049	0.033
		(0.065)	(0.080)	(0.080)	(0.080)	(0.081)
Marriage status	-	-0.043	-0.180*	-0.170*	-0.167*	-0.188*
		(0.069)	(0.084)	(0.084)	(0.084)	(0.085)
Age	-	-0.022*	-0.018*	-0.017*	-0.017*	-0.016*
		(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Education	-	-0.025*	-0.008	-0.010	-0.004	-0.007
		(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Income	-	-0.272*	-0.242*	-0.265*	-0.204*	-0.230*
		(0.078)	(0.045)	(0.196)	(0.096)	(0.097)
Employed	-	-0.073	0.077	0.150	0.046	0.065
		(0.069)	(0.084)	(0.085)	(0.085)	(0.085)
Rural	-	-1.326*	-1.104*	-1.188*	-1.082*	-1.165*
		(0.084)	(0.100)	(0.101)	(0.100)	(0.101)
Ethnic Origin[2]:						
Africa	-	-	0.273*	0.285*	0.239	0.251
			(0.133)	(0.134)	(0.134)	(0.135)
Asia	-	-	0.523*	0.604*	0.528*	0.606*
			(0.134)	(0.136)	(0.135)	(0.136)
South America and Caribbean	-	-	-0.220	-0.154	-0.373	-0.295
			(0.196)	(0.198)	(0.199)	(0.201)
Muslim	-	-	0.412*	0.284*	0.330*	0.215
			(0.123)	(0.125)	(0.124)	(0.126)
Preferences for Ethnic neighborhood	-	-	-	1.155*	-	1.128*
				(0.133)		(0.134)
Member of discriminated group – Perception of discrimination	-	-	-	-	0.565*	0.512*
					(0.120)	(0.121)
Thresholds:						
τ_1	-0.975*	-2.870*	-2.374*	-2.236*	-2.327*	-2.206*
	(0.071)	(0.178)	(0.222)	(0.224)	(0.231)	(0.223)
τ_2	-1.379*	-0.305	-0.261	-0.450*	0.325*	0.501*
	(0.073)	(0.170)	(0.215)	(0.219)	(0.225)	(0.228)
McFadden	0.040	0.090	0.103	0.117	0.107	0.120

Source: European Social Survey (ESS, 2002)

1. All equations are estimated while controlling for cross-country variation using dummy variables representing country of residence. The coefficients of the countries are not presented.
2. In equations 3, 4, 5 and 6 the omitted category is Europe

*$p<0.05$ (one-tailed tests)

Appendix A: Definition, Percentage or Mean (Standard Deviation) of the Variables Included in the Analysis

Variables	Definition	Mean (SD)
Individual-Level Variables (n = 3,825 persons)		
Gender	Men = 1	46.8%
Marital status	Married = 1	55.2%
Age	In years	42.70
Type of locality	Rural=1	21.3%
Education	In years	12.39 (4.17)
Subjective income	How would you describe your household income? Sufficient=1, 0=insufficient	70%
Employed	Economically active = 1, other =0	51.3%
Generation	First generation=1	51.4%
Years spent in the country (for first generation)	In years	8.76 (10.71)
Religion	Muslims=1, other religions=0	21.9%
Continent of origin:	Continent of respondent's origin (for first generation) or continent of respondent's parents origin (for second generation)	
	Europe=1	59.1%
	Africa=1	16.8%
	Asia=1	15.2%
	South America and Caribbean=1	5.1%
Residential preferences	Suppose you were choosing where to live. Which of the three types of area would you ideally wish to live in? An area where many people are of a different race or ethnic group from most [country] people=1	11.3%
Member of discriminated group	Based on the following variables: Would you describe yourself as being a member of a group that is discriminated against in this country? On what grounds is your group discriminated against? Immigrants who identify themselves as a member of a discriminated group on at least one of the following grounds: colour or race, ethnic group, nationality, religion or language=1	13.6%
Type of current living area:	How would you describe the area where you currently live?	
All-European neighborhood	An area where almost nobody is of a different race or ethnic group from most [country] people = 1	23.3%
Mixed neighborhood	Some people are of a different race or ethnic group from most [country] people=2	50.1%
Ethnic neighborhood	Many people are of a different race or ethnic group=3	26.6%

Appendix B· ***Relative Odds for Europeans as Compared to non-Europeans and non-Muslims as Compared to Muslims of Residing in a European and in an Ethnic Neighborhood***

	Residence in European Neighborhood		*Residence in Ethnic Neighborhood*	
	Europeans/ Non-Europeans	*Non-Muslims/ Muslims*	*Europeans/ Non-Europeans*	*Non-Muslim Muslims*
Country				
Austria	1.628	3.454	0.554	0.315
Belgium	2.827	4.132	0.332	0.280
Denmark	2.097	2.657	0.463	0.316
France	2.655	3.390	0.381	0.347
Germany	2.782	3.401	0.375	0.331
Greece	0.693	3.300	1.416	0.348
Luxemburg	1.615	2.817	0.633	0.349
Holland	2.468	3.861	0.417	0.309
Norway	2.496	4.082	0.366	0.268
Spain	2.192	1.504	0.430	0.724
Sweden	2.322	3.759	0.425	0.301
Switzerland	1.929	4.902	0.477	0.231
UK	2.056	3.311	0.439	0.325

Figure 1 ***Coefficients for First Generation (versus Second Generation), Europeans (versus non Europeans) and Muslims (versus non Muslims) Obtained from Ordered Logit Regression Equations Predicting Ethnic Composition of Neighborhood of Residence in 13 European Countries***