HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

*Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2020 February 01.

Published in final edited form as:

*Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*. 2019 February ; 54(2): 181–190. doi:10.1007/s00127-018-1592-0.

# The price of admission: does moving to a low poverty neighborhood increase discriminatory experiences and influence mental health?

**Theresa L. Osypuk**[1], **Nicole M. Schmidt**[2], **Rebecca D. Kehm**[3], **Eric J. Tchetgen Tchetgen**[4], and **M. Maria Glymour**[5]

[1]University of Minnesota School of Public Health, Division of Epidemiology and Community Health, West Bank Office Building, Suite 300, 1300 S. Second Street, Minneapolis, MN 55454 USA

[2]University of Minnesota, Minnesota Population Center, Minneapolis, MN

[3]Columbia University, Mailman School of Public Health, Department of Epidemiology, New York, NY

[4]University of Pennsylvania, Wharton School of Business, Statistics Department, Philadelphia, PA

[5]University of California San Francisco, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, San Francisco, CA

## Abstract

**Purpose:** The Moving to Opportunity (MTO) study is typically interpreted as a trial of changes in neighborhood poverty. However, the program may have also increased exposure to housing discrimination. Few prior studies have tested whether interpersonal and institutional forms of discrimination may have offsetting effects on mental health, particularly using intervention designs.

**Methods:** We evaluated the effects of MTO, which randomized public housing residents in 5 cities to rental vouchers, or to in-place controls (N=4248, 1997–2002), on neighborhood poverty (% of residents in poverty) and encounters with housing discrimination. Using instrumental variable analysis (IV), we derived two-stage least squares IV estimates of effects of neighborhood poverty and housing discrimination on adult psychological distress and major depressive disorder (MDD).

**Results:** Randomization to voucher group versus control simultaneously decreased neighborhood % poverty and increased exposure to housing discrimination. Higher neighborhood % poverty was associated with increased psychological distress ($B_{IV}$ =0.36, 95% Confidence Interval (CI): 0.03,0.69) and MDD ($B_{IV}$ =0.12, 95%CI: −0.005,0.25). Effects of housing discrimination on

Corresponding Author. tosypuk@umn.edu, (p) 612-625-8279. Author Contributions: Dr. Osypuk conceived the hypotheses, obtained the data, conducted the majority of the data analysis, and wrote the majority of the manuscript. Dr. Glymour aided in writing the paper. Drs. Glymour and Tchetgen Tchetgen advised on the statistical analysis and interpretation of findings, in addition to editing the methods. Dr. Schmidt and Dr. Kehm analyzed the data, created tables, and edited the manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT:
On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

mental health were harmful, but imprecise (distress $B_{IV}$ =1.58, 95%CI: −0.83,3.99; MDD $B_{IV}$ =0.57, 95%CI: −0.43,1.56). Because neighborhood poverty and housing discrimination had offsetting effects, omitting either mechanism from the IV model substantially biased the estimated effect of the other towards the null.

**Conclusions:** Neighborhood poverty mediated MTO treatment on adult mental health, suggesting that greater neighborhood poverty contributes to mental health problems. Yet housing discrimination-mental health findings were inconclusive. Effects of neighborhood poverty on health may be underestimated when failing to account for discrimination.

## Keywords

discrimination; housing; neighborhood poverty; psychological distress; randomized controlled trial

The US is highly segregated along racial and socioeconomic lines, [1] and such segregation is thought to be a central cause of enduring social and health inequalities. [2,3] However, efforts to reduce segregation may inadvertently increase encounters with interpersonal discrimination. A geography of opportunity perspective highlights the interrelationship among interpersonal racism, discrimination, and racial segregation, as contributing to an enduring “spatial racism.” Discrimination behavior by white individuals in housing transactions excludes minorities from benefiting in housing markets [4–6] (e.g. housing discrimination). Black individuals living in lower proportion black neighborhoods encounter more discrimination than those living in higher proportion black neighborhoods [7] and such discrimination erodes mental health. [8,9] Since minority racial composition and racial segregation are strongly positively associated with neighborhood poverty, [10] defined as the percent of residents in a census tract living below the poverty line, the benefits of moving to lower poverty neighborhoods (and therefore to lower proportion black areas) on mental health may be offset by an increase in discrimination and its adverse effect on mental health. However interpersonal and structural forms of discrimination are rarely modeled simultaneously for their effects on health. [6]

Although evidence comes predominately from observational studies of discrimination or neighborhood context on mental health, [9,11,12] estimates may be biased by unmeasured confounders, particularly mobility-related selection, which has been deemed the most serious threat to causal inference in neighborhood studies. [13] To overcome such issues, we use the Moving To Opportunity (MTO) trial, a social experiment that randomized a Section 8 affordable housing rental subsidy to volunteer low-income families living in public housing. These families used the voucher to subsidize rent in private market apartments located in lower poverty neighborhoods than the public housing developments. [14]

Figure 1 illustrates our hypothesized causal model, in which randomly-assigned MTO treatment may affect mental health via either neighborhood poverty or housing discrimination, and both of these associations with mental health are potentially confounded by unobserved variables (“C”). In causal structures such as Figure 1, instrumental variable (IV) estimates can be derived for the effects of both mediators on the outcome, by using multiple IVs. [15] The MTO study, because of its randomized treatment, offers a rare opportunity to leverage an exogenous factor that affected neighborhood mobility,

neighborhood poverty, housing discrimination, and mental health. In this manuscript, we use these associations along with instrumental variable analysis to test our primary hypotheses of whether neighborhood poverty and housing discrimination both have causal effects on two adult mental health measures.

## METHODS

### Data

The Moving to Opportunity (MTO) for Fair Housing Demonstration Project was initiated by the US Department of Housing & Urban Development [16] in 5 cities: Boston, Baltimore, Chicago, Los Angeles, New York. Eligible families had children under 18 years old and lived in public housing or project-based assisted housing in high-poverty census tracts (over 40% poverty). Public Housing Authorities contacted eligible households; interested household heads applied and were placed on a waiting list. Applicants were drawn from waiting lists for intake, given an explanation of the program, signed enrollment agreements and informed consent forms, completed the baseline survey, and were evaluated for eligibility before random assignment. 5301 families volunteered, and 4610 families were eligible and randomly assigned.[14]

**Assessment.—**Surveys among household heads were conducted at baseline (1994–1998) and at the interim evaluation (2001–2002, 4–7 years after random assignment). Most interviews were conducted in-person via computer-assisted personal interviewing technology.[17,14] We focus on adult household heads (n=4248) randomized through 12/31/1997 in the MTO Tier 1 Restricted Access Data (90% effective response).[14] Our institutions' Institutional Review Boards approved this study.

### Measures

**Treatment Assignment.—**Special software randomly assigned eligible MTO families to one of three conditions. The "regular Section 8" treatment group was offered a Section 8 housing voucher to move from public housing to a qualified, subsidized private market rental apartment in any neighborhood within 90 days (after which time the voucher offer expired). The "low-poverty-neighborhood" treatment group was also offered this Section 8 housing voucher, but the voucher was redeemable only for apartments in neighborhoods where <10% of Tract households were impoverished. Low poverty neighborhood families also were offered housing counseling services to aid relocation. Finally, an untreated control group received no further assistance but could remain in public housing.[17] Treatment was modeled in 3 contrast-coded categories, as randomized, with controls as the referent.

**Treatment adherence.—**In sensitivity analyses we defined treatment adherence as *using* either offered experimental voucher (modeled separately) to lease an apartment within 90 days.[18,14] By definition, no experimental voucher was available to the control group so there was full compliance among controls. Approximately half of families randomly assigned either offer of an experimental voucher took-up the offer and moved using the voucher within 90 days.

**Mental Health (outcomes).—**Past-month psychological distress was measured at interim in 2002, by the Kessler-6 (K6) scale, a valid, reliable broad-gauged screen for nonspecific psychological distress.[19] It includes 5-item Likert responses, ranging from all of the time to none of the time, for 6 items: so sad nothing could cheer you up; nervous; restless or fidgety; hopeless; everything was an effort; worthless. We scored distress by calculating a mean across items (Cronbach's alpha = .86, mean (SD) = 1.96(.95)). Dimensional measures tap different constructs than diagnostic measures, so we conducted sensitivity analyses using *past-year major depressive disorder* (MDD) as a secondary diagnostic outcome (also measured in 2002). MDD was measured using the Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short Form (CIDI-SF), a short scale assessing major depressive episodes with high accuracy.[20]

*Neighborhood poverty* was defined as the proportion of census tract residents living under the poverty line from Census data, linked to the census tract of residence of the family's address history from baseline through 2002. We interpolated each percent poverty value linearly between 1990 and 2000 in the residential history, with values 2001–2002 interpolated to 2000 values. We then calculated the average tract poverty across the residential history (baseline to 2002) for these analyses. In IV analyses, we modeled poverty such that a one-unit change reflects a 30 percent-point change in poverty, since this is the average change in poverty experienced by low poverty neighborhood group members immediately after moving with the voucher (i.e., the poverty change targeted by MTO).

*Housing discrimination* was reported at the 2002 interim evaluation by the adult household head based on a two-part question. Part 1 asked "Since [year of random assignment] have you gone in person to rent a house or apartment you thought was available and been told by a landlord, real estate agent, or manager you could not rent it?" Those answering yes to Part 1 were asked Part 2: "For the most recent time this happened, what was the main reason they gave for not renting the house or apartment to you?" Respondents were considered to have encountered housing discrimination if they reported any of these explanations: "don't rent to section 8"; "don't rent to people from public housing"; "don't rent to people with children or with too many children"; "don't rent to White/Black/Hispanic/Asian people." Although it was not explicitly noted on the survey and respondents may not have been aware, denying housing due to race/ethnicity or the presence of children is illegal per federal law, and 4 of the 5 MTO cities prohibit discrimination based on the source of rental income (e.g., Section 8). Six percent of the sample reported such housing discrimination.

**Covariates.—**Covariate adjustment in experimental designs is not strictly necessary for internal validity; however, it often improves efficiency without compromising type-1 error.[21] Therefore, we adjusted for pre-randomization covariates, including demographic, socioeconomic, and housing preference variables (see Table 1 for details). Covariate adjustment had little effect on results.

## Analytic Approach.

To assess the consistency of our hypothesized causal structure (Figure 1) with the MTO data, we first estimated the association between random assignment and experiences of housing

discrimination and neighborhood percent poverty. [22] In table notes, we also report F-tests from the first-stage of the IV models to evaluate the strength of the instruments. [23] We use intention-to-treat (ITT) linear regression models, although logistic regression-based estimates of the effect of randomization on binary outcomes produced qualitatively similar findings. We then used 2-stage least squares (2SLS) instrumental variable (IV) models estimated using Stata's ivreg2, as discussed for experimental designs [24,15,25,26] to estimate the joint effects of housing discrimination and neighborhood poverty on mental health.

Typical IV analyses use 2SLS, in which an endogenous variable ($\hat{E}$) , assumed to fully mediate the effect of the instrument on the outcome, is the dependent variable in a linear regression model estimated for the first stage:

$$\hat{E} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\ Treatment\_Arm) + \beta_k(\ Other\_Covariates) \quad (1)$$

The predicted value of the endogenous variable is then used as an independent variable in the second stage, to predict psychological distress (Y):

$$Y = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1(\hat{E}) + \gamma_k(\ Other\_Covariates) + \varepsilon \quad (2)$$

If the effects of the endogenous variables on the outcome are homogeneous for all individuals in the population, the 2SLS coefficient provides a consistent estimate of the Population Average Treatment Effect. [27] When homogeneous treatment effects seem implausible, the monotonicity assumption is commonly invoked to equate the 2SLS estimate with the Local Average Treatment Effect. [28] In the current setting, monotonicity is harder to define precisely because there are two endogenous variables, one of which is continuous. A third option, which we adopt here, is to assume that the average effect of each endogenous variable does not vary by levels of the unmeasured confounders. In other words, there may be unmeasured factors that influence both neighborhood poverty and psychological distress, but we assume that the *average causal effect* of neighborhood poverty on distress is similar regardless of the value of such confounders. With this assumption, we can interpret the 2SLS coefficients as the effect of each endogenous variable on the outcome *at the level of the endogenous variable actually experienced by the participant.*

To identify two endogenous variables, we require at least two IVs, and additional IVs are needed to implement over-identification tests to assess the validity of the IV assumptions. We created additional instruments by interacting the two MTO voucher treatment groups with pre-random assignment baseline disability, defined as household head report of anyone in the household with a disability. We chose disability using empirical criteria consistent with prior research [15] since it satisfied the assumptions required for creating multiple instruments using baseline variables interacted with treatment. To confirm the validity of these treatment interactions as instruments, there must be no interaction between the baseline variable used as a 2nd instrument (e.g., disability) and the endogenous variables (neighborhood poverty and discrimination) on mental health [15] (homogeneity test), which

we confirmed empirically. One advantage of over-identification of the IV equation is to facilitate evaluation of the validity of the instruments, as recommended in previous research, [29,30] by testing for an association between the instruments and the second-stage error term, reported as the Hansen J statistic or the Sargan–Hansen test. [15,31,22] As reported in the Table 4 notes, we failed to find empirical evidence against the null. Results were comparable when using the original treatment groups as instruments (Appendix eTable 1).

We hypothesize that both neighborhood poverty and housing discrimination mediate the MTO experimental effects on mental health, and, furthermore, they may have countervailing effects. Therefore, we included both endogenous variables simultaneously in our final models. However, we also estimate separate IV models for each hypothesized endogenous variable, recognizing that under our hypothesized causal structure, these IV estimates are potentially biased because of exclusion restriction violations via the other (omitted) endogenous variable. We present these models because most studies of discrimination or neighborhood model do not consider (or model) the other for its association with mental health;[6] but doing so may yield biased results.

We evaluated how sensitive our results for MDD (a binary variable) were to the application of linear models (2SLS) using G-estimation, [32] which does not rely on correct specification of the outcome from linear regression, but only on randomization of the instrument. Results were almost identical (Appendix eTable 2) with few predicted probabilities of MDD reported outside the 0–1 range (Appendix eTable 3), so we present conventional 2SLS models.

We conducted a number of sensitivity models to test potential violations of IV assumptions, as guided by prior literature. [30,22,29] To help rule out the possibility that neighborhood characteristics aside from percent poverty and encounters with discrimination might create pathways linking treatment group and mental health (i.e., violations of the exclusion restriction), we replaced neighborhood poverty with an indicator for treatment adherence (i.e., whether treatment group families complied and used the housing voucher, a.k.a. “leaseup”) to block other back-door paths. Leaseup is a mediator further upstream in the causal model than any neighborhood characteristic, so we hypothesize it would capture all neighborhood effects together. Results using leaseup in place of neighborhood poverty (both including discrimination) generated estimates in the same direction for housing discrimination, and negative estimates for leaseup (as expected, because leaseup is associated with lower % poverty) (see Appendix eTable 4). This provides some evidence that the exclusion criteria with respect to neighborhood quality variables is satisfied. We also conclude that neighborhood poverty is a proxy for the entire leaseup effect, as the so-called ‘active treatment’ within the MTO treatment. We then tested associations between our multiple instruments and baseline variables; as expected, our randomized instruments exhibited no associations with baseline variables (Appendix eTable 5).

All analyses were conducted in STATA 11.0 using robust standard errors,[31] and weighted to account for random assignment ratio changes and attrition.[18]

## RESULTS

Table 1 presents the MTO sample descriptives at baseline across the 3 treatment groups. There were no associations between any baseline variable and treatment group assignment.

### ITT Results.

The ITT results (Table 2) demonstrate that random assignment to the low neighborhood poverty housing voucher group led to lower adult psychological distress (B= −0.09 95% Confidence Interval (CI)= −0.18 to −0.01) and to marginally lower past-year MDD (B= −0.03, CI −0.06 to 0.00) compared to controls in public housing. Assignment to the regular Section 8 Treatment group was not associated with distress or MDD.

Random assignment to either housing voucher treatment led to *higher* housing discrimination in the treatment groups compared to controls (Low Poverty B= 0.04 CI:0.02 to 0.05; Section 8 B=0.06 CI= 0.04 to 0.09). Random assignment to either treatment group also led to *lower* % neighborhood poverty vs. controls (Low Poverty treatment: B= −12.3, CI= −13.6 to −11.0; Section 8 treatment: B= −10.1 CI= −11.4 to −8.9). There was imperfect adherence to the treatment; 59% of the Section 8 group, and 48% of the Low Poverty group, used the voucher to lease an apartment. MTO treatment group participants who reported housing discrimination also exhibited higher leaseup rates (Appendix Figure 1).

## IV Results.

The F-test diagnostic from the first-stage IV estimation (see Table 3 notes) vastly exceeds recommended thresholds for neighborhood poverty, demonstrating that MTO treatment and interactions provide strong instruments for neighborhood poverty. The instruments are weaker for discrimination, but still produce F-tests at approximately the recommended threshold.[23]

In 2$^{nd}$ stage IV estimation, higher neighborhood poverty (e.g. a 30 percent-point increase) was associated with higher psychological distress (B=0.36 CI=0.03 to 0.69) and marginally higher MDD (B=0.12, CI: −0.005 to 0.25) as hypothesized (Table 3). Although higher housing discrimination was associated with worse mental health, confidence intervals were wide (distress B= 1.58, CI: −0.83 to 3.99; MDD B=0.57, CI −0.43 to 1.56).

When housing discrimination was modeled as the sole endogenous variable (i.e., without adjusting for neighborhood poverty), the IV estimates of the effect of discrimination on mental health had the opposite signs as in models accounting for the mechanism via neighborhood poverty. Similarly, when neighborhood poverty was modeled as the sole endogenous variable (i.e., without adjusting for discrimination), the effect of neighborhood poverty was underestimated by half, although in the same direction as when it was simultaneously modeled with discrimination (Table 4) (Distress B= 0.18, CI: −0.01 to 0.38; MDD B=0.06, CI: −0.01 to 0.14).

## DISCUSSION

Using data from a randomized experiment, our results suggest that mental health effects of the voucher may have been simultaneously mediated by beneficial effects of moves to lower poverty neighborhoods, and adverse effects of encountering housing discrimination during efforts to locate private market apartments. Although point estimates for the effect of discrimination were large, the estimates were imprecise. Estimated effects of low poverty neighborhoods on mental health are substantially larger when accounting for encounters with discrimination.

Until recently, analyses of MTO data have defined leaseup as the relevant mediator of MTO treatment effects on health, [14,18] although recent studies have tested whether other variables, such as housing quality, mediate MTO treatment on health effects. [33–35] Our analysis suggests that focusing exclusively on lease-up may be misleading; it is important to integrate other constructs, like discrimination and neighborhood quality, into evaluations of MTO effects on adult mental health.

There are several forms of racism, and they may operate independently or jointly to influence health. For example, institutional racism is the “differential access to goods, services, or opportunities of society by race,” [36] (p. 1212) while interpersonal or personally-mediated racism is defined as “prejudice and discrimination where prejudice means differential assumptions about the abilities, motives, and intentions of others according to their race, and discrimination means differential actions towards others according to their race,” intentional or not.[36] (pp. 1212–3) We tested these two forms of discrimination as mediators of the effects of MTO on adult mental health: institutional racism, measured as tract percent poverty, and interpersonal racism, measured as subjective housing discrimination. Operationalizing both interpersonal and institutional forms of discrimination is rarely done in the health literature [6]. We document that in a directly randomized setting that low-income minorities who seek private market housing using a housing voucher are systematically exposed to more illegal housing discrimination. Institutional and interpersonal racism are conceptually related, but it is important to distinguish between them because the very activities necessary to reduce exposure to institutional racism may lead to increases in exposure to interpersonal racism.

Although the public health literature privileges interpersonal discrimination over institutional discrimination, [6,37] our results, and the larger social determinants of mental health literature,[38,39] suggest that structural context (neighborhood environment) is an important contributor to mental health problems. However, our results for the consequences of interpersonal discrimination on mental health were inconclusive; the association estimated from our IV models is in the same (harmful) direction as the literature (when simultaneously modeling neighborhood poverty as a mediator, although the coefficient was reversed when we did not), but the effect estimates are imprecise. We used a conservative definition of discrimination based on the real estate manager informing the victim that s/he had denied a housing request based on illegal reasons. Only 6% of respondents reported they were provided a reason for housing denial that was illegal and discriminatory. Presumably, most real estate managers would be sufficiently sophisticated to lie about their motivations

rather than report an illegal activity to the victim of that action; indeed, 18% of the sample reported discrimination for any reason, regardless of legality. We therefore expect the measure we used captures only a fraction of all housing discrimination. Further, we are not addressing encounters with discrimination in any setting other than housing.[9] But the same in-group/out-group dynamics that increase housing discrimination may trigger discriminatory encounters in many other domains in a new neighborhood.[7] Thus, we are not able to evaluate conclusively whether housing discrimination is causally associated with mental health.

The finding that the experiment caused an increase in reported housing discrimination within the MTO study, linked with prior evidence that discrimination affects mental health[8,9,40] calls for an important reinterpretation of MTO-based IV analyses that focus only on the beneficial effects of the new neighborhoods. For example, adjusting for housing discrimination in IV models doubled the estimated causal effect of neighborhood poverty on both mental health variables. Therefore, neighborhood health effects may be severely underestimated if subjective discrimination is disregarded.[6] Indeed, our results here show that MTO households with children, who were 97% racial minorities, experienced initially higher housing discrimination when they searched for housing in lower-poverty neighborhoods, even though they ultimately ended up in better neighborhoods by moving out of high-poverty areas, suggesting these two factors exert countervailing causal effects on health. Therefore, by ignoring racism processes when estimating neighborhood effects, or by ignoring institutional racism when modeling interpersonal racism, we may be misestimating how racism and/or neighborhoods contribute to health disparities. A better understanding of how neighborhoods and place contribute to health disparities may emerge by integrating institutional with interpersonal racism in health research.

Our results from this MTO experiment align with other evidence that minorities report *higher* interpersonal racism if they live in nonblack (vs. Black) neighborhoods,[7] and findings in MTO that the older cohort of adolescent boys who moved to new neighborhoods encountered additional police attention.[41,42] These results suggest that predominantly-Black neighborhoods shield minorities from the negative health effects of interpersonal discrimination. One act of housing discrimination excludes a household from a certain housing unit, but at the population level, such discrimination prolongs the time and expense involved in a housing search. Housing discrimination is also pinpointed as a major cause of asymmetric racial housing settlement, such as persistently high racial segregation.[1,43]

## Limitations.

Just as our findings provide an important caveat in the interpretation of previous MTO analyses, our results rest on our hypothesized causal structure, which entails only two endogenous variables linking MTO random assignment to mental health. In fact, a bundle of changes were induced by the MTO treatment, and there may be important endogenous variables that we have not considered.[44] We cannot rule out that interpersonal housing discrimination acts through neighborhood environment (indirect effects). Such a causal model is not implausible; minorities may initially experience subjective discrimination when they seek to rent an apartment in low poverty or in white neighborhoods, but the structural

effects of the new neighborhood, once attained, may outweigh the adverse effects of the housing discrimination that they encounter.[6]

Even though it was retrospective, housing discrimination was assessed in 2002, at the same time as the mental health outcomes. Therefore, the temporal sequence of discrimination preceding mental health may not have been strictly maintained. We also captured a multidimensional measure of housing discrimination based not only on race, but also on family structure and source of income. These different forms of discrimination may operate differently, but we do not have power to break them out separately. The majority of housing discrimination presumably is not described as such to the target, but rather occurs covertly, for example, when a housing applicant is falsely told the unit is already rented. Although such discrimination is detectable statistically with audit studies,[45] the design of MTO (based on self-report encounters of housing discrimination) could not detect whether this occurred. Similar measures of self-reported retrospective encounters with discrimination in housing searches have been used by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (e.g., in the Fair Housing Survey [46] although our measure of housing discrimination may have low sensitivity.

## Conclusion

Our results add to a small but increasing body of rigorous evidence that social and economic policies influence health.[47] Section 8 policy, now called the Housing Choice Voucher program, is the primary federal affordable housing policy, used by over 2 million low-income households in America.[48] The treatment delivered in the Housing Choice Voucher program corresponds closely with the treatment delivered in the Section 8 arm of the MTO experiment, and MTO therefore provides a unique opportunity to understand why and how voucher programs may affect mental health. We find evidence that the program may have beneficial effects on mental health by offering opportunities to live in lower poverty communities, but these benefits may be offset by increasing encounters with discrimination. It is important to incorporate multidimensional forms of discrimination and racism into health research, including processes occurring in housing market transactions, to draw attention to the fundamental structure of racism and discrimination for perpetuating racial health disparities.

## Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

## Acknowledgements/Financial Support:

This work was supported by National Institutes of Health grants R21HD066312 and R21 AA024530 (Dr. Osypuk, PI). The authors gratefully acknowledge support from the Minnesota Population Center (P2C HD041023) funded through a grant from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute for Child Health and Human Development (NICHD). Neither NIH or the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) had any role in the analysis or the preparation of this manuscript. HUD reviewed the manuscript to ensure respondent confidentiality was maintained in the presentation of results. The funders did not have any role in the conduct of the study or in the preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript.

## Abbreviations:

| | |
|---|---|
| **2SLS** | Two-Stage Least Squares |
| **CI** | Confidence Interval |
| **ITT** | Intent-to-Treat |
| **IV** | Instrumental Variable |
| **MDD** | Major Depressive Disorder |
| **MTO** | Moving to Opportunity |

## REFERENCES


1. Logan JR, Stults BJ (2011) The Persistence of Segregation in the Metropolis: New Findings from the 2010 Census http://www.s4.brown.edu/us2010/Data/Report/report2.pdf. Census Brief prepared for Project US2010. http://www.s4.brown.edu/us2010. Brown University, Providence, RI
2. Williams DR, Collins C (2001) Racial Residential Segregation: A Fundamental Cause of Racial Disparities in Health. Public Health Reports 116 (5):404–416 [PubMed: 12042604]
3. Acevedo-Garcia D, Lochner KA, Osypuk TL, Subramanian SV (2003) Future Directions in Residential Segregation and Health Research: A Multilevel Approach. Am J Public Health 93 (2): 215–221 [PubMed: 12554572]
4. powell ja (2005) Dreaming of a Self Beyond Whiteness and Isolation. Journal of Law & Policy 18 (13):13–45
5. Collins CA, Williams DR (1999) Segregation and Mortality: The Deadly Effects of Racism?. Sociological Forum 14 (3):495–523
6. Osypuk TL, Acevedo-Garcia D (2010) Beyond Individual Neighborhoods: A Geography of Opportunity Perspective for Understanding Racial/Ethnic Health Disparities. Health & Place 16 (6): 1113–1123 [PubMed: 20705500]
7. Hunt M, Wise LA, Jipguep M-C, Cozier YC, Rosenberg L (2007) Neighborhood racial composition and perceptions of racial discrimination: evidence from the black women's health study. Social Psychology Quarterly 70 (3):272–289
8. Lewis TT, Cogburn CD, Williams DR (2015) Self-Reported Experiences of Discrimination and Health: Scientific Advances, Ongoing Controversies, and Emerging Issues. Annual Review of Clinical Psychology 11 (1):407–440. doi:10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032814-112728
9. Williams DR, Mohammed SA (2009) Discrimination and racial disparities in health: evidence and needed research. J Behav Med 32:20–47 [PubMed: 19030981]
10. Osypuk TL, Galea S, McArdle N, Acevedo-Garcia D (2009) Quantifying Separate and Unequal: Racial-Ethnic Distributions of Neighborhood Poverty in Metropolitan America. Urban Aff Rev 45 (1):25–65
11. Oakes JM, Andrade KE, Biyoow IM, Cowan LT (2015) Twenty Years of Neighborhood Effect Research: An Assessment. Curr Epidemiol Rep 2:80–87 [PubMed: 28133588]
12. Mair C, Diez Roux AV, Galea S (2008) Are neighbourhood characteristics associated with depressive symptoms? A review of evidence. J Epidemiol Community Health 62 (11):940–946. doi:10.1136/jech.2007.066605 [PubMed: 18775943]
13. Sampson RJ, Morenoff JD, Gannon-Rowley T (2002) Assessing "Neighborhood Effects": Social Processes and New Directions in Research. Annu Rev Sociol 28:443–478
14. Orr L, Feins JD, Jacob R, Beecroft E, Sanbonmatsu L, Katz LF, Liebman JB, Kling JR (2003) Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing Demonstration Program: Interim Impacts Evaluation. US Dept of HUD, Washington, DC

15. Gennetian LA, Bos JM, Morris PA (2002) Using Instrumental Variables Analysis to Learn More from Social Policy Experiments MDRC Working Papers on Research Methodology. Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, New York, NY
16. US Department of Housing & Urban Development (1996) Expanding Housing Choices For HUD-Assisted Families: Moving to Opportunity. First Biennial Report to Congress, Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing Demonstration Program.
17. Goering J, Kraft J, Feins J, McInnis D, Holin MJ, Elhassan H (1999) Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing Demonstration Program: Current Status and Initial Findings US Department of Housing & Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, Washington, DC
18. Kling JR, Liebman JB, Katz LF (2007) Experimental analysis of neighborhood effects. Econometrica 75 (1):83–119
19. Kessler R, Andrews G, Colpe L, Hiripi E, Mroczek D, Normand S, Walters E, Zaslavsky A (2002) Short screening scales to monitor population prevalences and trends in non-specific psychological distress. Psychological Medicine 32 (06):959976
20. Kessler RC, Andrews G, Mroczek D, Ustun B, Wittchen H-U (1998) The World Health Organization Composite International Diagnostic Interview short-form (CIDI-SF). International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research 7 (4):171–185
21. Rosenblum M, Van Der Laan MJ (2009) Using Regression Models to Analyze Randomized Trials: Asymptotically Valid Hypothesis Tests Despite Incorrectly Specified Models. Biometrics 65 (3): 937–945 [PubMed: 19210739]
22. Davies NM, Smith GD, Windmeijer F, Martin RM (2013) Issues in the Reporting and Conduct of Instrumental Variable Studies: A Systematic Review. Epidemiology 24 (3):363–369. doi:10.1097/EDE.0b013e31828abafb [PubMed: 23532055]
23. Staiger D, Stock JH (1997) Instrumental Variables Regression with Weak Instruments. Econometrica 65 (3):557–586. doi:10.2307/2171753
24. Glymour MM (2006) Natural experiments and instrumental variable analyses in social epidemiology In: Oakes JM, Kaufman JS (eds) Social Epidemiology. JosseyBass, San Francisco, pp 429–460
25. Morris PA, Gennetian LA, Duncan GJ (2005) Effects of Welfare and Employment Policies on Young Children: New Findings on Policy Experiments Conducted in the Early 1990s. Social Policy Report, Volume XIX, Number II.
26. Bang H, Davis CE (2007) On estimating treatment effects under non-compliance in randomized clinical trials: are intent-to-treat or instrumental variables analyses perfect solutions? Statistics in Medicine 26 (5):954–964. doi:10.1002/sim.2663 [PubMed: 16900559]
27. Hernán MA, Robins JM (2006) Instruments for causal inference - An epidemiologist's dream? Epidemiology 17 (4):360–372 [PubMed: 16755261]
28. Angrist JD, Imbens GW, Rubin DB (1996) Identification of causal effects using instrumental variables. Journal of the American Statistical Association 91 (434):444455
29. Glymour MM, Tchetgen Tchetgen EJ, Robins JM (2012) Credible Mendelian Randomization Studies: Approaches for Evaluating the Instrumental Variable Assumptions. American Journal of Epidemiology 175 (4):332–339. doi:10.1093/aje/kwr323 [PubMed: 22247045]
30. Swanson SA, Hernán MA (2013) Commentary: How to Report Instrumental Variable Analyses (Suggestions Welcome). Epidemiology 24 (3):370–374. doi:10.1097/EDE.0b013e31828d0590 [PubMed: 23549180]
31. Baum CF, Schaffer ME, Stillman S (2007) Enhanced routines for instrumental variables/generalized method of moments estimation and testing. Stata Journal 7 (4):465–506
32. Robins JM (1994) Correcting for non-compliance in randomized trials using structural nested mean models. Communications in Statistics 23:2379–2412
33. Nguyen QC, Osypuk TL, Schmidt NM, Glymour MM, Tchetgen Tchetgen EJ (2015) Practical Guidance for Conducting Mediation Analysis with Multiple Mediators using Inverse Odds Ratio Weighting. American Journal of Epidemiology 181 (5):349–356 [PubMed: 25693776]
34. Schmidt NM, Osypuk TL (2015) Why did a randomized program of housing mobility cause changes in the mental health of adolescents? The mediating role of substance use, social networks,

and family mental health in the Moving to Opportunity Study. Paper presented at the Population Association of American 2015 Conference Paper, San Diego, CA. ,

35. Schmidt NM, Lincoln AK, Nguyen QC, Acevedo-Garcia D, Osypuk TL (2014) Examining mediators of housing mobility on adolescent asthma: Results from a housing voucher experiment. Social Science & Medicine 107 (0):136–144. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.02.020 [PubMed: 24607675]
36. Jones CP (2000) Levels of racism: a theoretic framework and a gardener's tale. American Journal of Public Health 90 (8):1212–1215 [PubMed: 10936998]
37. Acevedo-Garcia D, Rosenfeld LE, Hardy E, McArdle N, Osypuk TL (2013) Future Directions in Research on Institutional and Interpersonal Discrimination and Child Health. American Journal of Public Health 103 (10):1754–1763. doi:doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2012.300986 http://refhub.elsevier.com/S0398-7620(13)002186/sbref0285 [PubMed: 23409880]
38. World Health Organization (2014) Social Determinants of Mental Health.. Geneva Switzerland
39. Walker L, Verins I, Moodie R, Webster K (2005) Responding to the social and economic determinants of mental health In: Herrman H, Saxena S, Moodie R (eds) Promoting Mental Health: concepts, emerging evidence, practice. World Health Organization, Geneva,
40. Kessler RC, Mickelson KD, Williams DR (1999) The Prevalence, Distribution, and Mental Health Correlates of Perceived Discrimination in the United States. Journal of Health and Social Behavior 40 (3):208–230 [PubMed: 10513145]
41. Clampet-Lundquist S, Edin K, Kling JR, Duncan GJ (2011) Moving Teenagers Out of High-Risk Neighborhoods: How Girls Fare Better than Boys. American Journal of Sociology 116 (4):1154–1189. doi:10.1086/657352
42. Sciandra M, Sanbonmatsu L, Duncan GJ, Gennetian LA, Katz LF, Kessler RC, Kling JR, Ludwig J (2013) Long-term effects of the Moving to Opportunity residential mobility experiment on crime and delinquency. Journal of Experimental Criminology 9 (4):451–489. doi:10.1007/s11292-013-9189-9
43. Yinger J (1995) Closed Doors, Opportunities Lost: The Continuing Costs of Housing Discrimination. Russell Sage Foundation, New York
44. Sampson RJ (2008) Moving to Inequality: Neighborhood Effects and Experiments Meet Social Structure. American Journal of Sociology 114 (1):189–231
45. Turner MA, Santos R, Levy DK, Wissoker D, Aranda C, Pitingolo R (2013) Housing Discrimination against Racial and Ethnic Minorities 2012. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, https://www.huduser.gov/portal//Publications/pdf/HUD-514_HDS2012.pdf, Washington, DC
46. Abravanel MD, Davis M, Company I (2006) Do We Know More Now? Trends in Public Knowledge, Support, and Use of Fair Housing Law. US Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research,,
47. Osypuk TL, Joshi P, Geronimo K, Acevedo-Garcia D (2014) Do Social and Economic Policies Influence Health? A Review. Curr Epidemiol Rep 1 (3):149–164. doi:10.1007/s40471-014-0013-5 [PubMed: 25984439]
48. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (2015) United States Fact Sheet: Federal Rental Assistance. National and State Housing Data Fact Sheets. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities,, Washington, DC




**Figure 1.**
Causal Diagram.

**Table 1.**

Moving to Opportunity Adults, Baseline Variables (Measured 1994 to 1997), Overall and by Treatment Group.

| | | | Means by Treatment Group | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Construct** | **Variable** | **Overall** | **Low Poverty Neighborhood Section 8** | **Geographically Unrestricted Section 8** | **Controls** | ***P* value** |
| Total in Interim Survey, 2002 | N | 3526 | 1453 | 993 | 1080 | |
| Age | Years | 33.5 | 33.4 | 33.7 | 33.3 | 0.618 |
| Gender, % | Female | 98.5% | 99.0% | 98.1% | 98.2% | 0.123 |
| Race/Ethnicity, % | African American | 63.8% | 64.4% | 63.4% | 63.4% | 0.865 |
| | Hispanic ethnicity, any race | 28.9% | 28.0% | 30.0% | 29.1% | 0.657 |
| | White | 2.7% | 2.9% | 2.5% | 2.8% | 0.914 |
| | Other race | 3.8% | 3.6% | 3.8% | 4.2% | 0.107 |
| | Missing race | 0.7% | 1.1% | 0.2% | 0.6% | 0.809 |
| Site, % | Baltimore | 15.0% | 15.0% | 14.8% | 15.2% | 0.978 |
| | Boston | 21.7% | 21.7% | 22.2% | 21.4% | 0.932 |
| | Chicago | 22.7% | 23.2% | 22.9% | 22.0% | 0.826 |
| | Los Angeles | 15.6% | 15.6% | 15.0% | 16.3% | 0.704 |
| | New York | 24.9% | 24.6% | 25.1% | 25.1% | 0.959 |
| Household size | 2 people | 21.5% | 22.8% | 20.7% | 20.5% | 0.425 |
| | 3 people | 30.9% | 30.3% | 30.5% | 32.0% | 0.687 |
| | 4 people | 22.7% | 23.1% | 22.6% | 22.4% | 0.917 |
| | ≥ 5 people | 24.8% | 23.7% | 26.1% | 25.1% | 0.483 |
| Family structure, % | Never married No teens (age 13–17) in | 62.1% | 61.9% | 62.2% | 62.2% | 0.993 |
| | home | 60.8% | 59.2% | 61.2% | 62.5% | 0.327 |
| Socioeconomic position, % | Employed | 26.7% | 28.6% | 25.4% | 25.2% | 0.082 |
| | On AFDC (welfare) | 74.5% | 74.0% | 74.7% | 75.1% | 0.878 |
| Education, % | High school diploma | 37.3% | 38.8% | 37.9% | 34.6% | 0.137 |
| | GED | 17.9% | 16.8% | 17.9% | 19.2% | 0.423 |
| | In school<br>Household member with | 15.7% | 16.0% | 15.6% | 15.5% | 0.628 |
| Household Characteristics, % | disability<br>Household member | 16.4% | 16.3% | 16.7% | 16.2% | 0.895 |

| Construct | Variable | Overall | Means by Treatment Group: Low Poverty Neighborhood Section 8 | Means by Treatment Group: Geographically Unrestricted Section 8 | Means by Treatment Group: Controls | *P* value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | victimized in past 6 months Moved > 3 times in past 5 | 41.9% | 42.0% | 42.6% | 41.2% | 0.851 |
| Neighborhood/mobility variables, % | years Very dissatisfied with | 9.1% | 8.0% | 9.0% | 10.6% | 0.258 |
| | neighborhood Streets near home very | 46.4% | 46.2% | 46.9% | 46.3% | 0.983 |
| | unsafe at night | 48.8% | 48.3% | 49.1% | 49.2% | 0.951 |
| | Very sure would find a new apartment in different part of the city | 45.7% | 44.8% | 48.1% | 44.6% | 0.372 |

AFDC, Aid to Families with Dependent Children; GED, general equivalency diploma.

Notes: All variables range between 0 and 1 except baseline age (17–87), so means represent proportions. Analysis weighted for varying treatment random assignment ratios across time and for attrition. Missing baseline covariate data were imputed to site-specific means. *P* value for test of treatment group differences calculated from Wald Chi-squared tests outputted from logistic regression for dichotomous baseline characteristics. F tests were used with linear regression for continuous variables. The null hypothesis is that none of the treatment group proportions or means differ.

**Table 2.**

Intent to Treat Estimates of Random Assignment Effects on Psychological Distress, Major Depressive Disorder, Subjective Housing Discrimination, and Neighborhood Poverty in the Moving to Opportunity Experiment.

| | ITT: Low-Poverty Neighborhood Voucher Treatment Group vs. Controls | | | ITT: Section 8 Voucher Treatment Group vs. Controls | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Outcome** | **B** | **LCI** | **UCI** | **B** | **LCI** | **UCI** |
| Distress | −0.09 | −0.18 | −0.01 | −0.03 | −0.13 | 0.07 |
| Major Depression | −0.03 | −0.06 | 0.00 | −0.01 | −0.05 | 0.03 |
| Subjective Housing Discrimination | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.09 |
| Average Tract % Poverty | −12.30 | −13.60 | −11.00 | −10.11 | −11.35 | −8.88 |

NOTES: Models are weighted but unadjusted for covariates. Average tract percent poverty represents the average neighborhood poverty across 1994–2002 (from 90 days after baseline through 2002) based on linearly interpolated tract measures from 1990 and 2000 census data, modeled as a 0–1 variable. N=3,526 for distress, housing discrimination, and tract % poverty models; 3,520 for MDD models.

**Table 3.**

Instrumental Variable Analysis, Second Stage Results, Modeling Two Endogenous Mediators Simultaneously, for Effects on Adult Mental Health, in the Moving to Opportunity Experiment.

| | Psychological Distress | | | Major Depressive Disorder | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **B** | **LCI** | **UCI** | **B** | **LCI** | **UCI** |
| Subjective Housing Discrimination | 1.58 | −0.83 | 3.99 | 0.57 | −0.43 | 1.56 |
| Average Tract % Poverty | 0.36 | 0.03 | 0.69 | 0.12 | −0.005 | 0.25 |

NOTES: Distress models weighted and adjusted for baseline age, race, site, employment, welfare, education, in school status, disability, victimization, prior moves, neighborhood dissatisfaction, confidence in finding a new neighborhood, teens in household, household size, and marital status. MDD models weighted and adjusted for baseline race, site, welfare, in school status, disability, victimization, neighborhood dissatisfaction, confidence in finding a new neighborhood, and neighborhood safety at night. Average tract percent poverty represents the average neighborhood poverty across 1994–2002 (from 90 days after baseline through 2002) based on linearly interpolated tract measures from 1990 and 2000 census data. Neighborhood poverty modeled such that a one-unit change reflects a 30 percent point change in poverty. Two random assignment groups and treatment interactions with baseline household disability used as instruments. First stage F-tests results for distress: housing discrimination 10.07 (p<.001); tract poverty 103.89 (p<.001). First stage F-tests results for MDD: housing discrimination 9.53 (p<.001); tract poverty 102.26 (p<.001). N=3,526 for distress models; 3,520 for MDD models. Hansen J statistic = 0.734, chi-sq p-value = 0.69 for distress; = 0.971, chi-sq p-value 0.62 for MDD.

**Table 4.**

Instrumental Variable Analysis, Second Stage Results, Modeling One Endogenous Mediator at a Time, for Effects on Adult Mental Health, in the Moving to Opportunity Experiment.

| | Psychological Distress | | | Major Depressive Disorder | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **B** | **LCI** | **UCI** | **B** | **LCI** | **UCI** |
| Subjective Housing Discrimination | −0.33 | −1.76 | 1.09 | −0.09 | −0.70 | 0.52 |
| Average Tract % Poverty | 0.18 | −0.01 | 0.38 | 0.06 | −0.01 | 0.14 |

NOTES: Distress models weighted and adjusted for baseline age, race, site, employment, welfare, education, in school status, disability, victimization, prior moves, neighborhood dissatisfaction, confidence in finding a new neighborhood, teens in household, household size, and marital status. MDD models weighted and adjusted for baseline race, site, welfare, in school status, disability, victimization, neighborhood dissatisfaction, confidence in finding a new neighborhood, and neighborhood safety at night. Average tract percent poverty represents the average neighborhood poverty across 1994–2002 (from 90 days after baseline through 2002) based on linearly interpolated tract measures from 1990 and 2000 census data. Neighborhood poverty modeled such that a one-unit change reflects a 30 percent point change in poverty. Two random assignment groups and treatment interactions with baseline household disability used as instruments. First stage F-tests results for distress: housing discrimination 10.07 ($p<.001$); tract poverty 103.89 ($p<.001$). First stage F-tests results for MDD: housing discrimination 9.53 ($p<.001$); tract poverty 102.26 ($p<.001$). N=3,526 for distress; 3,520 for MDD models.