Spatial Assimilation of Ethnic Immigrants in European Societies

Introduction

Ethnic minorities and the majority population rarely share residential space. The two groups tend to live in different neighborhoods and to cluster in different communities. That is, whereas immigrants and ethnic minorities tend to live in the inner-city poor neighborhoods and in the slum, members of the majority population are more likely to reside in the prestigious and affluent neighborhoods of the metropolis and in suburban communities. Since ethnic spatial segregation implies differential access to economic opportunities, quality of life, schooling, social services, medical facilities and cultural amenities (e.g., LaViest 1993; Polednak 1993; Peterson and Krivo 1993; Hart et al. 1998; Collins and Williams 1999, Massey and Denton, 1993) segregation is often viewed as one of the most important barriers to social and economic equality and as a major obstacle to social integration. Indeed, ethnic residential segregation has long been considered as a major structural feature of the stratification system and as one of the main manifestations of urban inequality

Whereas patterns of ethnic residential segregation and spatial assimilation have been studied extensively and for quite long time in the North American context, the body of research on ethnic residential segregation and spatial assimilation in European societies is relatively new. This is hardly surprising. Immigration to European countries is a new phenomenon hence, a new field of research. Immigrants, ex-colonials, refugees, asylum seekers and labor migrants had begun arriving in Europe in substantial numbers only during the second half of the previous 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. Musterd et al 1998; Musterd 2005; Logan 2006; Mahheiros and Vala 2004; Karsten et al 2006; Peach 1997, 2005; Van Kempen and Van Weesep, 1997).

The present article seeks to contribute to the literature on ethnic residential segregation and to further advance knowledge on spatial assimilation of ethnic immigrants in Europe. It does so by utilizing data obtained from the 2002 European Social Survey and by systematically examining, for the first time, patterns of spatial assimilation of ethnic immigrants in 13 European countries. It focuses on the following five questions: First, whether and to what extent ethnic immigrants are spatially segregated across Europe. Second, whether patterns of residential segregation and trajectories of spatial assimilation are influenced by immigrants' tenure in the host country, socio-economic characteristics and immigrants' ethnic and cultural origin. Third, whether and to what extent different groups experience differential patterns of spatial assimilation (i.e. 'segmented assimilation') or all go through a uniform pattern of spatial assimilation. Fourth, whether residential preferences and discrimination explain differential patterns of spatial assimilation across ethnic groups?

By providing answers to the questions listed above, we will we be in a position to better understand the social mechanisms underlying persistence and change in patterns of ethnic spatial segregation in Europe and to evaluate alternative theoretical explanations of residential assimilation. In addition, the findings will enable us to discuss the potential impact of ethnic residential segregation and modes of spatial assimilation on inter-ethnic relations in European societies. Indeed, in an era when immigrants are making Europe

their home in ever-increasing numbers and when ethnic hostility and anti-immigrant sentiment are on the rise (i.e. Semyonov et al, 2006, Pettigrew 1998), the issue of spatial segregation is of special importance not only for social scientists but also for policymakers.

Theoretical considerations

Spatial segregation and residential preferences

The ever-growing literature on ethnic residential segregation in North American cities has resulted in a series of uniform general conclusions: First, rates of ethnic residential segregation in most cities are substantial. Second, despite meaningful legal, social, and economic gains that racial and ethnic minorities have experienced in recent decades, residential segregation in the United States has persisted and hardly declined over the years. Third, rates of residential segregation vary across ethnic groups; it is very high, even extreme between blacks and whites, somewhat lower, yet substantial, between whites and Hispanics as well as between whites and Asians (Krivo and Kaufman 1999; Denton 1994, Massey and Denton, 1989; Farley and Frey 1994; Denton and Massey 1988; Clark 1992, 2002; Denton, 1994).

Three major complementary explanations have been advanced in the sociological literature for understanding emergence, development and persistence of ethnic residential segregation. Although the three alternative explanations are not contradictory or mutually exclusive, each offers a somewhat different perspective and each emphasizes a different mechanism underlying emergence and persistence of spatial segregation. Generally speaking, the three major sources to which ethnic residential segregation is attributed are:

differential economic resources, discrimination, and differential preferences for residential location.

The economic explanation attributes spatial segregation to ethnic-linked differential economic resources. Immigrants and ethnic minorities often lack sufficient economic resources to purchase housing in affluent and prestigious communities; places that are predominantly and traditionally inhabited by whites. Although this straightforward and quite reasonable explanation had been refuted by several researchers (Clark 1986; Galster 1988), it cannot be readily dismissed. Recent studies have provided somewhat mixed evidence regarding the role that economic resources play in producing ethnic residential segregation (e.g. Massey and Fischer 1999; Darden and Kamel 2000; Alba et al. 2000; St. John and Clymer 1999; Krivo and Kaufman 1999). They suggest that differential levels of economic means could be responsible, at least in part, for ethnic residential segregation.

Notwithstanding the impact of differential economic resources, ethnic residential segregation is also driven by whites' residential preferences and by persistent discriminatory practices in the housing market. First, it was widely demonstrated that most whites in the US are reluctant to live in places inhabited by blacks, and to a lesser extent, in places where Hispanics and Asians reside (e.g. Krysan 2002; Krysan and Farley 2002; Farley et al 1994; Charles 2000, 2006; Clark 1991, 1992, 2002; see Semyonov et al, 2007 for similar preference in Europe)[1]. Second, it was repeatedly argued that discrimination against nonwhites in the US housing market had made their access to housing more difficult and more restricted and that their mortgage applications are more likely to be denied than those of comparable whites (e.g. Turner et al. 2002; Yinger 1995;

Ross and Yinger 2002; Goering and Wienk 1996; Munnell et al. 1996; Turner and Wienk 1993; Dedman 1988, 1989; Jackson 1994; Carr and Megbolugbe 1993, Horton and Cooper 1986). Consequently, nonwhites' search process in the housing market is not only more limited but also more unpleasant. Indeed, discriminatory practices used by members of the majority population to deny ethnic and racial minorities (mostly blacks) from equal access to quality residence in predominantly white neighborhoods have long been viewed as one of the major sources of racial spatial segregation in American society.

Residential mobility and spatial assimilation

Despite persisting patterns of ethnic residential segregation scholars have repeatedly argued that segregation is not a stable-static phenomenon. Subsequently social scientists have formulated several theoretical models to explain change in patterns of ethnic residential segregation and modes of spatial assimilation. The explanation most often used by students of segregation to explain spatial integration of immigrants is cast within the classic 'assimilation' theoretical model. The logic embodied in the model leads us to expect a decline in residential segregation and an increase in spatial assimilation as part of a general process of adaptation and acculturation of ethnic immigrants into the mainstream of the host society's culture, values and way of life (Park 1950; Warner and Strole 1945; Gordon 1964).

In other words, according to the human ecological model, ethnic immigrants are not conversant with the local culture upon arrival and they 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, sociality and economically adopted and experience

upward social and economic mobility (Rumbaut 1997; Zhou 1997a). 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 Mullan 1984; Massey 1985; Alba and Nee 2003; South, Crowder and Chavez 2005). From this perspective ethnic enclaves are viewed only as transitional neighborhoods to be left behind once an immigrant had achieved sufficient social, cultural and economic resources[2].

Residential assimilation -- mobility out of the ethnic neighborhood -- is viewed, thus, as an integral part of a uniform and rather complex assimilation process that can be attributed to two interrelated social mechanisms: acculturation and socio-economic mobility. According to this logic, we can arrive at the following two expectations: first, due to acculturation spatial assimilation would increase with passage of time and with each successive generation of immigrants; second, due to socio-economic mobility spatial assimilation of immigrants is likely to increase with their social and economic resources (i.e. education and income)[3].

Recently a growing number of scholars have begun pointing toward divergent patterns of ethnic spatial assimilation across ethnic groups (Portes and Zhou 1993, Zhou 1997, 1999; White et al 2005; Iseland and Nelson 2008). According to the 'segmented assimilation' model, the host society offers different ethnic groups with uneven possibilities. While some groups may face abundance of opportunities others may suffer from multiple disadvantages including discrimination and insufficient social and economic resources. As a result, different 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).

The logic embodied in the segmented assimilation model implies that net of differences in attributes, different ethnic and cultural groups would experience differential patterns of residential mobility, hence, differential modes of spatial assimilation (Farely and Alba, 2002; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001). Indeed, observed differences in 'residential experience' between Asians and Hispanics as well as between racial groups can be easily explained when cast within the framework of the 'segmented assimilation model' (e.g., Bean and Tienda 1987; Portes and Truelove 1987; Logan and Alba 1993; South, Crowder and Chavez 2005; Alba and Logan 1993; Iceland and Nelson 2008).

As noted, residential preferences and discrimination can also influence patterns of segregation and spatial assimilation. Although preferences of the majority population and preferences of ethnic minorities are often incompatible, both play a role in shaping patterns of ethnic segregation and modes of spatial assimilation (Bobo and Zubrinsky, 1996; Charles 2001; Farley et al 1994; Krysan and Farley 2002). To date, the overwhelming majority of studies on residential preferences whether in the US or in Europe, have focused on preferences of the majority population (demonstrating that whites are reluctant to share residential space with minority group populations). Yet, researchers have consistently demonstrated that preferences vary across racial and ethnic groups, hence, producing divergent patterns of residential mobility (Clark 1992; Robinson 1981; Krysan and Farley 2002).

Furthermore, 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 than in an ethnically mixed community. 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 food stores, access to ethnic organizations and to cultural centers (Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993; Peach and Smith 1981). Similar to the economic advantages provided by ethnic economic enclaves ethnic communities can provide members of the minority population with both shelter from discrimination and with support, opportunities and services not available in other places (Burgers et al. 1997, Wilson and Portes 1981). Thus, in the following analysis we entertain the hypothesis that differential residential preferences and exposure to discrimination may also drive patterns of residential segregation and modes of spatial assimilation.

Ethnic immigrants and residential segregation in Europe

The massive flow of immigrants, labor migrants, ex-colonials and refugees to Europe throughout the last five decades have 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)[4]. For example, English cities are populated by black Caribbean, Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi populations; German cities are inhabited by Turks and Yugoslavs; France and Belgium cities had become home to North Africans and sub-Sahara Africans; Holland had attracted

Surinamese, Indonesians and Moroccans; Greek towns had become a destination for Albanians; Portugal is populated by African and South-East Asian immigrants; and Scandinavian countries had opened their borders to many Iraqi, Iranian and Ethiopian refugees ((Musterd et al 1998; Musterd 2005; Logan 2006; Mahheiros and Vala 2004; Karsten et al 2006; Peach 1997,2005, Hatziprokopiou 2003).

Countries not only differ in the composition of their ethnic populations but also in rates of ethnic residential segregation. For example, segregation rates in the United Kingdom, Holland and Belgium are higher than segregation rates in Germany, Austria and France (Musterd 2005). Rates of ethnic residential segregation also vary from one group to another. For example, Moroccans and Turks in Amsterdam are more segregated than Surinamese (Logan 2006, Musterd 2005) and Caribbean blacks in UK cities are less segregated than either Bangladeshi or Pakistani (Peach 1999; Musterd 2005). Yet, despite these differences ethnic residential segregation across Europe is substantial, wide-spread and, for the most part, growing, and like in the US, ethnic neighborhoods are viewed by Europeans as the least desirable place of residence (Semyonov et al, 2008).

The literature discussed at the outset of this article suggests that differential rates of spatial assimilation can be attributed to differential economic and social resources that immigrant groups posses, on the one hand, and to discrimination they face, on the other hand. Nevertheless, one cannot dismiss the possibility that some immigrant groups may actually prefer living in ethnic neighborhoods due to cultural preferences regardless of discrimination. For example, in a series of studies Peach (1996, 1997, 1998) contends that cultural orientation and traditional values among ethnic minorities belonging to the Muslim conviction may play a role in affecting residential preferences. More specifically,

Pakistani and Bangladeshi in the UK are more segregated (perhaps prefer to be more segregated) than others (e.g. Indians) because they are more traditional and prefer to seclude their families (especially their women and children) from participation in the public sphere outside the ethnic community. Following this logic we expect patterns of residential segregation and differential modes of ethnic spatial assimilation across European countries to be driven not only by immigrants' social and economic resources but also by differential preferences for residential location as well as by discrimination.

On the basis of the literature we arrive at the following three hypotheses: First, according to the 'acculturation hypothesis' we expect spatial assimilation (residence outside an ethnic neighborhood) to be more pronounced among second generation immigrants and to increase with passage of time in the host country. Second, according to 'social and economic mobility hypothesis' we expect spatial assimilation to increase with income and with education of the immigrants. Third, according to the 'segmented assimilation hypothesis' we expect modes of spatial assimilation to vary across ethnic and cultural groups. Specifically, we expect spatial assimilation to be influenced by differential preferences for residential location and by differential perceptions of discrimination. Therefore, we expect residential preferences and discrimination to mediate the relations between immigrants' ethnic and cultural origins and spatial assimilation. Indeed, while these three hypotheses are not mutually exclusive or contradictory each underscores differential mechanisms that can drive processes of spatial assimilation.

Data and Variables

Data for our analysis were obtained from the European Social Survey (ESS) conducted in 2002 in 22 European countries. Face-to-face interviews were conducted

with nationally representative samples (age 15 and older) 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 that were born either outside the country or that at least one of the parents was born outside the country. It was further restricted to countries with at least 75 sampled cases. This procedure had 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. [5] The list of countries and the size of the sampled cases are provided in Table 1.

The dependent variable – residential segregation – 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? An area where almost nobody is of a different race or ethnic group from most [country] people (hereafter all native-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).

The socio-demographic characteristics of respondents that are used in the analysis as predictors of residential segregation include: household income per capita (in 12 categories in Euro), 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), gender (men=1), generation (first generation=1), years spent in the country (in years, for the first generation only), continent of origin

(distinguishing among four dummy categories: Europe, Africa, Asia, Latin America and Caribbean) and religion (Muslims=1).

Residential preferences and perception of discrimination are used in the analysis as intervening variables between immigrants' ethnic and cultural origin and residential segregation. 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 others. This classification provides, perhaps, the most conservative distinction between those who prefer living in ethnic neighborhoods and others. Perception of discrimination (as a proxy of subjective sense of discrimination) is defined by the distinction between those who claim that they are members of a disadvantaged minority group and that 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 such discrimination against members of their group. For detailed definitions, wordings, coding and measures of the variables and their marginal distribution see Table A of the Appendix.

Analysis and Findings

Descriptive Overview

Before providing a systematic and detailed analysis of modes of spatial assimilation and residential segregation among immigrants and before examining the ways through which spatial assimilation 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

neighborhoods composition across countries. Therefore, in this section we present two tables for a descriptive overview. In the first table (Table 1) we present percent distributions of immigrants by three types of neighborhoods (according to the ethnic composition of the neighborhood) across the 13 countries included in the study (to examine cross-country variations in patterns of ethnic residential segregation). In the second table (Table 2) we display mean characteristics of immigrants by the three types of neighborhood of residence (to examine whether immigrants that reside in all native-European neighborhoods differ in their attributes from immigrants who dwell in ethnically mixed and in 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 ethnic immigrants); and slightly under a quarter (23%) reported dwelling in communities inhabited almost exclusively by native Europeans (almost no immigrants). There is, however, some cross-country variation in patterns of residential segregation. Residential segregation is most pronounced in France (where almost 40% of immigrants report residence in ethnic communities) and least evident in Luxembourg, Denmark, Norway and Sweden (where under14% of immigrants reside in ethnic neighborhoods). A considerable numbers of immigrants reported residence in ethnically mixed communities. For example, approximately 73% of the immigrants in Greece dwell in mixed neighborhoods and over half of the immigrants in Germany, Spain, Switzerland and the UK live in ethnically mixed neighborhoods.

In Table 2 we display 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 that reside in ethnic neighborhoods and in ethnically mixed neighborhoods differ considerably in their characteristics from immigrants that dwell in European neighborhoods (where almost all residents are native Europeans). More specifically, immigrants that dwell in ethnic neighborhoods are more likely to be of the Muslim conviction, first generation, and of African origin. For example, about one third of immigrants that reside in ethnic neighborhoods belong to Muslim faith in comparison to 7% that reside in all European neighborhoods. Likewise, immigrants that live in ethnic neighborhoods are more likely to be younger and unemployed and their income tends to be lower than that of other immigrants. They also more likely to prefer residence in ethnic neighborhoods than others and are 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 spatial assimilation

The first question the analysis seeks to address is whether and to what extent residential segregation is influenced by immigrants' characteristics. More specifically, the analysis examines first, whether segregation and spatial assimilation of immigrants is influenced by tenure in the country (i.e. first versus second generation and years in the host country); second, whether spatial assimilation tends to increase with immigrants' social and economic resources; and third, whether immigrants of different ethnic and cultural origin

experience differential modes of spatial assimilation. Since countries differ not only in rates of spatial segregation but also in characteristics of their immigrant populations we estimate a series of ordered-logit regression equations predicting likelihood of residence in ethnic neighborhoods[6] (as opposed to residence in mixed and in all Europeans neighborhoods) as a function of individual's social, economic and demographic attributes while controlling for country of residence[7].

Three equations are estimated. In equation 1 we let the ethnic composition of neighborhood of residence (as a proxy of spatial assimilation) be a function of immigrant tenure (first versus second generation immigrants) plus years since migration to test the hypothesis that segregation 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 spatial assimilation is likely to increase with social and economic mobility. In equation 3 we include a series of dummy variables representing ethnic origin and Muslim conviction 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 spatial assimilation. In equation 3a we compared non-European immigrants to Europeans and in equation 3b we compare sub-groups of non-European immigrants to Europeans. 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 3a and 3b of Table 3.

Table 3 about here

The results presented by equation 1 lend firm support to the 'acculturation hypothesis'. The data reveal that when compared to first generation immigrants, second generation immigrants are less likely to reside in ethnic neighborhoods and more likely to live in all-European neighborhoods (b=1.057). Likewise, residence in ethnic neighborhoods tends to decrease with passage of time in the host country. The effect of 'years since migration' on ethnic composition of neighborhood of residence is negative and statistically significant (b= - 0.037) in equation 1. It is important to note that the impact of 'generation' and 'years since migration' remain 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, thus, that, net of economic and social resources and net of cultural origins, with the passage of time immigrants are likely to go through a process of acculturation and to become spatially assimilated. We must conclude, therefore, that with the passage of time immigrants are likely to move out of the ethnic enclaves and into all-European places.

Equation 2 provides support for the argument that spatial assimilation tends to increase through social and economic mobility of immigrants. The negative and significant coefficients of income (b = - 0.019) and of education (b = - 0.022) lend support to the mobility hypothesis. The two negative coefficients imply that immigrants with higher income and with higher education are less likely to live in ethnic neighborhoods and more likely to live in all-European neighborhoods. Apparently, socio-economic mobility is translated into residential mobility – out and away from ethnic neighborhoods and into European neighborhoods. The data in equation 2 also suggest that net of years in the host country and net of socio-economic characteristics, odds for

residence in ethnic neighborhoods tend to decrease with age and is less evident among immigrants in rural communities.

Although the findings reported by equation 3 provide support for the 'acculturation' and the 'mobility' hypotheses, they also provide support to the 'segmented assimilation' hypothesis. The data suggest that different ethnic and cultural subgroups do experience divergent patterns of spatial assimilation even after considering differences among groups in tenure in the host country and in socioeconomic characteristics, with European immigrants less likely than others to reside in ethnic neighborhoods. More specifically, equations 3a and 3b reveal that ethnic residential segregation is more pronounced among first generation immigrants and is likely to decline with the passage of time, and that segregation tends to decrease with income level of immigrants but not with educational level. Nevertheless, the coefficient b =.219 in equation 3a for non-European origin indicates that, net of tenure in the host country and net of socio-demographic attributes, immigrants of European origin are 1.24 times less likely to reside in ethnic neighborhoods than non-European immigrants. Equation 3b suggests that other things being equal, residential segregation is more pronounced among Asian and African immigrants and among Muslims. The coefficients b = .270 and b = .446 for Africans and Asians, respectively, indicate that relative odds of immigrants from Asian or African countries, respectively, are 1.3 and 1.5 times greater to be spatially segregated as compared to immigrants from European countries. Spatial segregation among Latin and Caribbean immigrants, however, does not differ significantly from the segregation among European immigrants. The coefficient b = .387 for Muslims indicates that Muslims' odds

to be spatially integrated are almost 1.5 times lower than immigrants of other religious convictions.

It is important to note that patterns of ethnic-linked or religious-linked spatial segregation among immigrants are quite uniform across countries. This observation becomes apparent by the data displayed in Appendix Table B where we list country-specific relative odds of non-European [versus European] immigrants and of Muslims [versus non-Muslim] immigrants to reside, respectively, in an ethnic and in a native-European neighborhood[8]. In all countries, without exception, Muslims have higher odds than comparable non-Muslims to dwell in an ethnic neighborhood and lower odds to reside in native-European neighborhood. Likewise, in all countries, with only one exception [Greece][9] non-European immigrants have higher odds to reside in an ethnic neighborhood and lower odds to reside 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 and ethnic origin and between country and religious conviction. Only in the United Kingdom and in France spatial segregation among Muslim immigrants was significantly lower than in other European countries. As already noted [in Footnote 7] neither percent non-European immigrants nor percent Muslims residing in the country were found to exert significant effect on patterns of residential segregation in bi-level [HLM] ordered-logit regression equations.

The 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 spatial assimilation. We

argued that some 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 as well as because ethnic neighborhoods shelter them from discrimination. Indeed, when members of ethnic minorities experience difficulties in finding proper housing in all-European neighborhoods due to prejudice and discrimination they may look for home in the ethnic neighborhood.

Since preferences and discrimination are not fully independent from each other[10] and since both can affect patterns of spatial assimilation, we display in columns 4-6 of Table 3 a series of ordered-logit regression equations in which we include among the predictors of spatial segregation an indicator of residential preferences and an indicator of perceived discrimination. More specifically, in equation 4 we let ethnic composition of the neighborhood (as an indicator of spatial assimilation) be a function of immigrants' characteristics plus residential preferences; in equation 5 we replace preferences with perception of discrimination; and in equation 6 we include both preferences and perception of discrimination among the predictors of spatial segregation. These equations enable us to estimate the net effect of both preferences and discrimination on segregation and to examine the extent to which residential preferences and perception of discrimination mediate the relations between immigrants' characteristics and their spatial assimilation. In equations 4a, 5a and 6a we include a dummy variable distinguishing between European and non-European immigrants and in equations 4a, 5a and 6 we replace the dichotomous variable with a series of dummy variables distinguishing among several non-European ethnic sub-groups of immigrants.

Although residential preferences cannot be fully converted into actual place of residence, the data displayed in equation 4a and 4b show a strong impact of residential preference on residential location. For example, the positive and highly significant coefficient (b = 1.112) for residential preference in equation 4b indicates that odds for residence in an ethnic neighborhood are 3 times higher among immigrants who view ethnic neighborhoods as the most desirable place of residence than among other immigrants. Net of preferences, however, the analysis reveals that first generation immigrants are more likely to dwell in ethnic communities than second generation immigrants (providing support for the acculturation hypothesis) and that immigrants with higher income are less likely to live in ethnic neighborhoods (providing some support to the economic mobility hypothesis). The analysis also reveals that married persons, older people, and persons living in rural communities are less likely to live in ethnic neighborhoods. Perhaps, older persons and families gravitate toward neighborhoods inhabited by large proportion of Europeans because such communities provide better services for both children and adults. The greater spatial integration of immigrants who live and work in rural places into European neighborhoods may reflect constraints associated with the scarcity of ethnic neighborhoods in rural areas.

The findings displayed by equations 4a and 4b demonstrate that residential preferences only partially mediate the relations between immigrants' characteristics and patterns of ethnic residential segregation. In fact, when considering the findings that Asian and Latin and Caribbean immigrants are more likely than European immigrants to view all-European neighborhoods as the most desirable place of residence[11], it becomes evident that residential preferences matter only a little in affecting patterns of spatial

assimilation. More specifically, the insignificant coefficients for Latin and Caribbean origin (in both equation 3b and equation 4b) suggest that South-Americans' segregation does not differ from that of European immigrants regardless of residential preferences; the positive coefficient for Asians (and to some extent Africans) in equation 4b (especially when compared to the coefficient in equation 3) suggests that residential segregation among Asian immigrants is actually higher than that expected on basis of their preferences for residential location.

In the case of Muslims, however, residential preferences seem to matter. The reduction in the size of the coefficient for Muslims from b= .520 in equation 3a to .377 in equation 4a and from b=.387 in equation 3b to b =.258 in equation 4b suggest that part of the high levels of residential segregation among Muslims can be attributed to their preference to live in ethnic neighborhoods. Indeed, greater desirability among Muslim immigrants to reside in ethnic neighborhoods can explain, at lease in part, their higher levels of residential segregation and lower levels of spatial assimilation across European countries.

Perception of discrimination against one's group (as a proxy of 'the discrimination experience') in equation 5 exerts a significant and positive effect on spatial segregation, suggesting that awareness of discrimination is likely to increase odds for residence in ethnic neighborhoods (b=. 486 in eq 5a and b= .549 in eq 5b). Whereas perception of discrimination explains the higher levels of spatial segregation among African immigrants (the coefficient for African origin in equation 5b becomes statistically insignificant) it cannot fully explain segregation among either Asians or Muslims (the coefficients for both Asians and Muslims in equations 5a and 5b remain positive and

significant). By contrast, when subjective discrimination is taken into consideration, the coefficient for Latin and Caribbean becomes negative and statistically significant (b = -.419) implying that, other things being equal, spatial segregation among Latin and Caribbean immigrants is considerably lower than that of European immigrants.

Equations 6a and 6b include both discrimination and preferences among the predictors of spatial segregation. Consistent with expectations and previous findings, the findings indicate that immigrants that are aware of discrimination against members of their group and immigrants who view ethnic neighborhoods as the most desirable place of residence are more likely to reside in ethnic neighborhoods. For example, the effects of both variables in equation 6b are positive and highly significant (b = 1.083 for preferences and b = .493 for discrimination). It should be noted that the inclusion of both preferences and discrimination in equation 6 hardly alter the impact of immigrants' social attributes (e.g. generation, age, income and rural area) on spatial segregation. However, preferences and perception of discrimination seem to exert significant effects on patterns of ethnic segregation. Specifically, when both variables are included in equation 6b neither the coefficient for African origin nor the coefficient for Latin and Caribbean origin nor the coefficient for the Muslim religion remains significant. Apparently, patterns of segregation among these immigrant groups can be largely attributed both to perception of discrimination and to residential preferences. Discrimination and preferences, however, cannot explain the high level of spatial segregation among immigrants from Asian countries. Other things being equal, the odds Asian immigrants to reside in segregated ethnic neighborhoods are much higher than that those of all other immigrant groups.

Conclusions and Discussion

The major goal of the present research was to examine patterns of spatial segregation and modes of assimilation among ethnic 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. For example, while in Luxemburg and in the Scandinavian countries less than 15 percents of immigrants reside in ethnic neighborhoods, in France almost 40 percent of the immigrants reported residence in ethnic neighborhoods.

The findings lend support to the 'acculturation hypothesis', according to which immigrants are likely to go through a process of acculturation throughout the years. That is, with the passage of time in the new country, immigrants acquire the host country's cultural values and way of life and become socially, economically and culturally integrated. The acculturation process is also manifested in patterns of residential mobility – out of the 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. Likewise, residential segregation tends to decline with passage of time in the host country. Apparently, over the years, as part of an acculturation process, immigrants become more spatially assimilated.

The data also support the thesis that immigrants tend to translate economic resources (i.e. income) into residential mobility. 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. Put differently, the higher the income of immigrants the lower their relative odds to live in an ethnic neighborhood and the higher their odds to reside in European neighborhoods. Apparently, immigrants who acquire sufficient economic resources are likely to convert these resources to residential mobility -- out of the poor ethnic neighborhoods and into more prestigious and affluent all-European neighborhoods. Indeed, the findings displayed by our analysis reaffirm the long standing argument that residential mobility and spatial assimilation among immigrants, whether in the US or in Europe, is influenced by two interrelated-intertwining social mechanisms: acculturation and economic mobility.

Notwithstanding the impact of acculturation and economic mobility on residential mobility, the analysis reveals considerable variation in rates of segregation and spatial assimilation across ethnic and cultural groups. Consistent with expectations derived from the 'segmented assimilation' model, the findings reveal that net of tenure in the host country and net of immigrants' socio-economic attributes, ethnic origin and religious affiliation of the immigrants play major roles in affecting rate of residential segregation and modes of spatial assimilation. More specifically, immigrants from Asian and African countries as compared to immigrants from Europe or Latin and Caribbean immigrants are more likely to reside in ethnic neighborhoods and less likely to become spatially integrated. Likewise, immigrants belonging to the Muslim faith are more likely to dwell in ethnic neighborhoods than immigrants belonging to other religious denominations.

One of the plausible explanations for the divergent patterns of residential assimilation across ethnic and cultural groups may lie in cross-group variations in residential preferences and in the discrimination they experience in the host country. It was previously suggested that ethnic and cultural immigrants may prefer residence in an ethnic neighborhood, because seclusion in ethnic neighborhoods shelters them from the influence of European culture and lifestyle (Peach 1997) and 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.

Following this logic we examined whether and to what extent differential patterns of spatial segregation can be attributed to differential preferences for residential location and to perception of discrimination. The data reveal that both preferences and perception of discrimination affect spatial segregation. 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. Nevertheless, neither preferences by itself nor discrimination by itself fully intervenes between immigrants' ethnic and cultural origin and patterns of spatial assimilation. The findings suggest that preferences matter very little for actual residential location of Asian and African immigrants and that discrimination accounts only for the spatial segregation of African immigrants but does not fully account for the high level of segregation among Asians or Muslims. However, when taken together, discrimination and preferences account for all the differences in level of spatial segregation between European, African, and Latin and Caribbean immigrants as well as between Muslims and

others but not between Asian and all other immigrants. The spatial segregation reported by immigrants from Asian countries is significantly higher than expected on basis of their, socio-economic characteristics, preferences for residential location and perception of discrimination.

The findings reported by this research reveal that, similar to immigrants in other societies, immigrants in Europe go through a process of spatial assimilation due to acculturation and economic mobility. Yet the rate of residential segregation and spatial assimilation in Europe varies considerably across ethnic and cultural groups. The rate of residential assimilation among immigrants from Asian or African countries and among Muslim immigrants is considerably lower than that of immigrants from European countries. The high rates of residential segregation and low rates of spatial assimilation among Muslims and African immigrants could be attributed to their relatively greater preference to reside in ethnic neighborhoods and to their perception of discrimination. The high rates of segregation among Asian immigrants cannot be attributed, however, either to residential preferences or to perceived discrimination.

Indeed, the persisting patterns of ethnic residential segregation may result in emergence of 'parallel societies' or 'parallel communities' within European nation states, which may have, in turn, significant implications for increasing prejudice, discrimination and ethnic conflict. Therefore, in an era when both immigration and anti-foreigner sentiment are simultaneously growing, the implications of ethnic residential segregation for the social organization of European cities and for the future of ethnic relations in European societies should be further studied and evaluated by both social scientists and policy makers.

FOOTNOTES

1. 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 2000a, 200b; Farley et al. 1994), most agree that residential preferences shape patterns of ethnic spatial segregation.
2. It is important to notice that this pattern of residential mobility seems to fit the experience of many of the European immigrant groups (e.g. Jews and Italians) whose second generations were able to move to wealthy suburban areas of cities over time. However, this pattern was not observed in the case for African-Americans.
3. Although institutional and structural changes are beyond the goals of this paper, we should note that these changes can differentially affect residential mobility of groups. In case of immigrants in Europe, state intervention can play a role if social rented housing is spatially concentrated and allocation practices favor ethnic concentrations, thereby some migrant groups, such as newly arrived refugees, may not be free to choose location of residence.
4. The definition of ethnic minorities in European societies is a complex matter. Ethnic and racial minorities have arrived to Europe as guest workers, labor migrants, ex-colonials, refugees, asylum seekers and immigrants. They arrived from a variety of countries of origin to different destinations, mostly due to historical circumstances. For example, many Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Indian

immigrants have arrived in England while many North-Africans reside in France and Belgium. Turks are highly concentrated in Germany while many Surinamese have made Netherlands their home. The legal and civilian status of ethnic and immigrant groups also vary considerably across countries. Yet, despite all these differences, all are viewed as non-European ethnic minorities and as members of an 'out-group' population.

5. The weight we use takes into account the proportion of different groups in the country and the proportion of each country's population in Europe.
6. The ordinal logit model (or proportional odds model) allows us to capture the interrelationships among 3 categories of ordered categorical outcomes (e.g. all Europeans neighborhood, mixed neighborhood and ethnic neighborhood) with a single set of coefficients. This model estimates the effect of a unit increase in an independent variables on the log odds of having higher as opposite to lower value on the dependent variable (e.g. ethnic neighborhood as opposite to mixed and all European neighborhood).
7. We also estimated 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, since the models were not statistically robust we preferred to use dummy variables representing countries to control for cross country variations. It should be noted that the effects of percent non-European, percent 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.

8. The odds ratio was computed for equation 3a using the probabilities (estimated by SPSS) of each group for residence in specific neighborhood: $\frac{p_1/(1-p_1)}{p_2/(1-p_2)}$.

9. We believe that the lower odds for European immigrants to reside in an 'all native European' neighborhoods and their higher odds to reside in an 'ethnic' neighborhoods stems from the fact that the overwhelming majority of the European immigrants in Greece are of Albanian origin. This distinct group is visible and is likely to concentrate in distinct ethnic neighborhoods more than other immigrants.

10. 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*.

11. We also estimated a series of logistic regressions predicting preferences for residence in ethnic neighborhood. The findings show that immigrants of African countries do not differ from immigrants from European countries in their residential preferences. Somewhat curiously, immigrants from Asian, Latin American and Caribbean countries, as compared to immigrants from European countries, are more likely to view all- European neighborhoods as the most desirable place of residence as they are less likely than European immigrants to consider ethnic neighborhoods as the most desirable place of residence.

References

Alba, Richard D., John R. Logan. 1993. "Minority Proximity to Whites in Suburbs: An Individual-Level Analysis of Segregation". *American Journal of Sociology* 98(6):1388-1427.

Alba, Richard D., John R. Logan and Brian Stults. 2000. "How Segregated are Middle Class African Americans?" *Social Problems* 47: 543-58.

Alba, R. and Nee, V. (2003). Remarking the American Mainstream. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bean, F.D. and M.Tienda. 1987. The Hispanic Population of the United States. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bobo, Lawrence and Camille Zhubrinsky. 1996. "Attitudes on Residential Integration: Perceived Status Differences, Mere In-Group Preference, or Racial Prejudice?" *Social Forces* 74: 883-909.

Carr J.H, Megbolugbe I.F. 1993. "The Federal Reserve Bank of Boston study on Mortgage Lending Revisited." Journal of Housing Research, 4(2): 277-313.

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

_____. 2000b. "Residential Segregation in Los Angeles." in *Prismatic Metropolis*: Inequality in Los Angeles, edited by L. Bobo, M. Oliver, J. H. Johnson Jr., and A. Valenzuela Jr.

_____. 2001. "Processes of Racial Residential Segregation." In *Urban Inequality: Evidence from Four Cities.*, edited by A. O'Connor, C. Tilly and L. Bobo. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

_____. 2006. *Won't You Be My Neighbor: Race, Class and Residence in a Prismatic Metropolis*. New York: Rassel Sage.

Clark, W. A. V. (editor). 1982. *Modeling Housing Market Search*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

_____.1986. "Residential Segregation in American Cities: A Review and Interpretation." *Population Research and Policy Review* 5: 95-127.

_____.1991. "Residential Preferences and Neighborhood Racial Segregation: A Test of the Schelling Segregation Model." *Demography* 28: 1-19.

_____. 1992. "Residential Preferences and Residential Choices in a Multiethnic Context." *Demography* 29: 451-66.

_____. 2002 "Ethnic Preferences and Ethnic Perceptions in Multi-Ethnic Settings." *Urban Geography* 23: 237-56.

Collins, C. and Williams, D.R.(1999). Segregation and Mortality: The Deadly Effects of Racism. *Sociological Forum,* **74**, 495-523.

Darden, J. T. and Kamel, S. (2000). Black Residential Segregation in the City and Suburbs of Detroit: Does Socioeconomic Status Matter? *Journal of Urban Affairs*, **22**, 1-13.

Denton, Nancy and Douglas Massey. 1988. "Residential Segregation of Blacks, Hispanics and Asians by Socio-Economic Status and Generation." *Social Science Quarterly* 69: 797-781.Denton Nancy A. 1994. "Are African-American Still Hypersegregated?" Pp.49-81 in *Residential Apartheid: The American Legacy* edited by R.D. Bullard, J. E. Grisby and C. Lee. Los Angeles: CAAS Publications, University of California.

Dedman, B.1988. "The color of Money". Atlanta Journal, Atlanta Journal Constitution, May 1-4

Dedman, B.1989."Blacks Turn Down for Home Loans from S&Ls Twice as often as whites. Atlanta Journal, Atlanta Journal Constitution, Jan. 22.

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

Farley, Reynolds and R. Alba. 2002. "The New Second Generation in the United States." *International Migration Review*, 36 (3): 669-701.

Galster, George C. 1986. "More than Skin Deep: The Effect of Housing Discrimination on the Extent and Pattern of Racial Residential Segregation in the United States." Pp.119-40 in *Housing Desegregation and Federal Policy*, edited by J. M. Goering. University of North Carolina Press.

Goering, John and Ron Wienk (editors). 1996. *Mortgage Lending, Racial Discrimination, and Federal Policy*. Washington: Urban Institute Press.

Gordon, M. 1964. Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hart, K.D., Kunitz, S.J., Sell, R. and Mukamel, D.B. (1998). Metropolitan Governance, Residential Segregation and Mortality among African Americans. *American Journal of Public Health*, **88**, 434-38.

Iseland, J. and Kyle A. Nelson. 2008. "Hyspanic Segregation in Metropolitan America", American Sociological Review, 73(5):741-65

Jackson W.E. 1994. Discrimination in Mortgage Lending Markets as Rational Economic Behavior: Theory, Evidence, and Public Policy. In African Americans and the New Policy Consensus: Retreat of the Liberal State, ed. ME Lashley, MN Jackson, pp.157-78. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Jensen, L. and Chitose, Y. 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.

Karsten S., Felix, C., Ledoux, G., Meijnen, W., Roeleveld, J. and Van Schooten, E. (2006). Choosing Segregation or Integration? The Extent and Effects of Ethnic Segregation in Dutch Cities. *Education and Urban Society*, **38**, 228-47.

Krivo, Lauren J. and Robert L. Kaufman. 1999. "How Low Can it Go? Declining Black-White Segregation in a Multiethnic Context." *Demography* 36: 93-109.

Krysan, Maria. 2002. "Whites Who Say They'd Flee: Who Are They, and Why Would They Leave?" *Demography* 39:675-96.

Krysan, Maria and Reynolds Farley, 2002. "The Residential Preferences of Blacks: Do They Explain Persistent Segregation?" *Social Forces* 80: 937-80.

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

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

Malheiros, Jorge M. and Francisco Vala. 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. Mullen. 1984. “Processes of Hispanic and Black Spatial Assimilation. American Journal of Sociology 89: 836-873.

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

_____. 1989. "Hypersegregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas: Black and Hispanic Segregation Along Five Dimensions.". *Demography* 26:373-.91.

_____. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Massey, Douglas S. and Mary J. Fisher. 1999. "Does Rising Income Bring Integration? New Results for Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians in 1990." *Social Science Research* 28: 316-326.

Munnell, Alicia H., Geoffrey M. B. Tootell, Lynn E. Brown and James McEneaney. 1996. “Mortgage Lending in Boston: Interpreting HMDA Data.” *American Economic Review* 86: 25-53.

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

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

Park, R.E. 1950. Race and Culture. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

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

Peach, C. 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.

_____. 1998: South Asian and Caribbean Ethnic Minority Housing Choice in Britain. *Urban Studies*, 35(10): 1657-1680.

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

_____.(2005). The Ghetto and the Ethnic Enclave pp. 31-42 in D.P. Varady (ed) *Desegregation in the City: Ghettos, Enclaves and Inequalities*, Albany, SUNY Press.

Peterson, R. D. and Krivo, L. J. (1993). Racial Segregation and Urban Black Homicide. *Social Forces*, **71**, 1001-26.

Pettigrew, T. F., (1998). Reaction toward the new Minorities of Western Europe. *Annual Review of Sociology*, **24**, 77-103.

Portes, A. and C. Truelove. 1987. "Making Sense of of Diversity: Recent Research on Hispanic Minorities in the United States." Annual Review of Sociology 13:359-85.

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, A. and Rubén G. Rumbaut, "Conclusion – The Forging of a New America: Lessons for Theory and Policy." Pp. 301-317 in R. G. Rumbaut and A. Portes, eds., Ethnicities: Children of Immigrants in America. Berkeley and New York: University of California Press and Russell Sage Foundation, 2001.

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

Ross, Stephen L. and John Yinger. 2002. *The Color of Credit: Mortgage Discrimination, Research Methodology, and Fair-Lending Enforcement*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Rumbaut, R. 1997. "Introduction: Immigration and Incorporation." *Sociological Perspectives*, 40, 3: 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, M., Glikman, A. and Krysan, M. (2007). Europeans' Preference for Ethnic Residential Homogeneity: Cross-National Analysis of Response to Neighborhood Ethnic Composition. *Social Problems*, **54**, 434-53.

Semyonov, M. and Glikman A. 2008 "Ethnic Residential Segregation, Social Contacts, and Anti-Minority Attitudes in European Societies" European Sociological Review) (in press, online version available).

South, Scott, J., Kyle Crowder and Eric Chavez. 2005. "Migration and Spatial Assimilation among U.S. Latinos: Classical versus Segmented Trajectories" *Demography* 42(3):497-521.

St. John, Craig and Robert Clymer. 1999. "Racial Residential Segregation by Level of Socioeconomic Status." *Social Science Quarterly* 81: 701-15.

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

Turner, Margery and Ron Wienk. 1993. "The Persistence of Segregation in Urban Areas: Contributing Causes." In *Housing Markets and Residential Mobility*, edited by G. Thomas Kingsley and Margery Austin Turner. Washington: The Urban Institute Press.

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.

Warner, L.W. and L. Strole. 1945.The Social systems of American Ethnic Groups.

Wilson, K.L. and Alejandro Portes. 1980. Immigrant Enclaves: An Analysis of the Labor Market Experiences of Cubans in Miami". *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 86(2): 295-319.

White, Michael. J., Ann H. Kim and Jennifer E. Glik. 2005." Mapping Social Distance: Ethnical Residential Segregation in a Multiethnic Metro." Sociological Methods

and Research 34(2): 173-203.

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.

Zhou, Min. 1999. “Coming of Age: The Current Situation of Asian American Children. Amerasia Journal 25 (1): 1-27.

Appendix A: Definition, Percent 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)
Monthly income per capita	In EURO: means of 12 categories of household income were standardized by number of persons in household. The categories were created for each country in euro.	968.88 (924.40)
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=1	50.1%
Ethnic neighborhood	Many people are of a different race or ethnic group=1	26.6%

Table 1 – The percent 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 – European Neighborhood	*Some immigrants – Ethnically Mixed Neighborhood*	*Many immigrants – Ethnic Neighborhood*	**N Number of Sampled 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 (Percent 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)
Monthly income per capita	1130.60 (1028.66)	990.00 (913.52)	805.75 (867.96)	968.88 (924.40)
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 Ethnic composition of Neighborhood of residence in 13 European countries***[1]

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3a	Model 3b	Model 4a	Model 4b	Model 5a	Model 5b	Model 6a	Model 6b
Individual-level variables										
First generation	1.057*	0.678*	0.507*	0.535*	0.446*	0.477*	0.461*	0.513*	0.406*	0.461*
	(0.108)	(0.117)	(0.138)	(0.138)	(0.139)	(0.140)	(0.138)	(0.139)	(0.140)	(0.141)
Years in country	-0.037*	-0.017*	-0.011	-0.013*	-0.009	-0.011	-0.010	-0.013	-0.008	-0.010
	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Gender	-	0.128*	0.076	0.069	0.061	0.050	0.059	0.059	0.047	0.045
		(0.065)	(0.079)	(0.079)	(0.080)	(0.080)	(0.079)	(0.080)	(0.080)	(0.080)
Marriage status	-	-0.079	-0.216*	-0.225*	-0.195*	-0.205*	-0.196*	-0.207*	-0.177*	-0.188*
		(0.069)	(0.084)	(0.084)	(0.085)	(0.085)	(0.084)	(0.084)	(0.085)	(0.085)
Age	-	-0.022*	-0.017*	-0.017*	-0.016*	-0.016*	-0.016*	-0.017*	-0.015*	-0.016*
		(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Education	-	-0.022*	-0.009	-0.008	-0.007	-0.007	-0.006	-0.004	-0.007	-0.003
		(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Income per capita*100	-	-0.019*	-0.017*	-0.024*	-0.019*	-0.024*	-0.019*	-0.018*	-0.020*	-0.018*
		(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.004)
Employed	-	-0.033	0.139	0.136	0.155	0.150	0.108	0.099	0.127	0.116
		(0.069)	(0.085)	(0.085)	(0.085)	(0.085)	(0.085)	(0.085)	(0.086)	(0.086)
Rural	-	-1.323*	-1.089*	-1.108*	-1.170*	-1.189*	-1.065*	-1.088*	-1.146*	-1.167*
		(0.084)	(0.099)	(0.100)	(0.100)	(0.101)	(0.100)	(0.100)	(0.101)	(0.101)
Ethnic Origin[2]:										
Non-European	-	-	0.219*	-	0.290*	-	0.196*	-	0.267*	-
			(0.099)		(0.100)		(0.099)		(0.100)	
Africa	-	-	-	0.270*	-	0.279*	-	0.224	-	0.229
				(0.134)		(0.136)		(0.133)		(0.134)
Asia	-	-	-	0.446*	-	0.528*	-	0.496*	-	0.569*
				(0.132)		(0.133)		(0.134)		(0.136)
South America and Caribbean	-	-	-	-0.265	-	-0.200	-	-0.419*	-	-0.343
				(0.197)		(0.198)		(0.199)		(0.201)
Muslim	-	-	0.520*	0.387*	0.377*	0.258*	0.463*	0.308*	0.333*	0.200
			(0.117)	(0.125)	(0.120)	(0.127)	(0.118)	(0.124)	(0.121)	(0.125)
Preferences for living in Ethnic neighborhood	-	-	-	-	1.113*	1.112*	-	-	1.087*	1.083*
					(0.132)	(0.132)			(0.132)	(0.133)
Member of discriminated group	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.486*	0.549*	0.432*	0.493*
							(0.117)	(0.119)	(0.118)	(0.120)
Thresholds:										
τ_1	-0.975*	-2.690*	-2.562*	-2.374*	-2.506*	-2.236*	-2.448*	-2.266*	-2.406*	-2.139*
	(0.071)	(0.172)	(0.233)	(0.222)	(0.235)	(0.224)	(0.235)	(0.223)	(0.237)	(0.226)
τ_2	-1.379*	-0.128	-0.064	-0.261	-0.171	-0.450*	0.191	0.384*	0.281	0.559*
	(0.073)	(0.164)	(0.226)	(0.215)	(0.228)	(0.219)	(0.229)	(0.218)	(0.231)	(0.221)
McFadden	0.040	0.090	0.100	0.103	0.114	0.117	0.104	0.107	0.117	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 B· ***Relative Odds of Europeans as compared to non-Europeans and non-Muslims as Compared to Muslims for ethnic composition of neighborhood***

	Residence in European Neighborhood		*Residence in Ethnic Neighborhood*	
	Europeans/ Non- Europeans	*Non-Muslims/ Muslims*	*Europeans/ Non- Europeans*	*Non-Muslims/ 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