

# The changing geography of poverty

Alexandra K. Murphy and Scott W. Allard

---

Alexandra K. Murphy is Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Michigan. Scott W. Allard is Professor at the Evans School of Public Policy and Governance, University of Washington, and an IRP affiliate.<sup>1</sup>

---

Poverty in the United States has found a new home: the suburbs. Beginning in the year 2000, for the first time in American history, the total number of poor people living in the suburbs exceeded those living in central cities in the 95 largest metropolitan areas. This growth has since continued. More than two-thirds of the increase in poverty in major metropolitan areas has taken place in their suburbs.<sup>2</sup> By 2012 the suburbs accounted for 56 percent of the poor population in these metropolitan areas, exceeding the number of urban poor by 3.5 million.<sup>3</sup> Comparable numbers of urban and suburban persons now live in extreme poverty.<sup>4</sup> Importantly, the rise of suburban poverty has not corresponded with decreases in urban poverty. Poverty rates continue to remain higher in central cities and rural areas than in suburbs. Nevertheless, suburbs in metropolitan areas across the United States are now faced with challenges once thought to be distinctly urban: poverty, joblessness, and decline.<sup>5</sup> In this article, we draw on some of the most recent research of scholars working in this field to better define suburban poverty, describe its trends, and outline several consequences for suburban safety nets. We then conclude with a brief discussion of implications for research and policy.

## What is poverty? What is a suburb? What is suburban poverty?

Before we can begin to understand how the geography of U.S. poverty is changing, we first need to pin down clear, operational definitions for the concepts of “poverty,” “suburb,” and “suburban poverty.” Poverty is commonly defined as the lack of income and resources necessary to live at standards that society considers adequate. Oftentimes we think of persons living in poverty as being unable to secure food, shelter, or other basic needs. The federal government measures poverty using a formula based on a household’s annual income and the number of persons in the household. People living below a certain income threshold, called the federal poverty line, are considered officially poor. In 2014, the federal poverty line was set at \$24,418 for a family of four in the United States.<sup>6</sup> According to this measure, in 2013, 14.5 percent of the U.S. population was considered to live in poverty.<sup>7</sup> Although there are several limitations to this definition, most researchers using census data to examine suburban poverty rely on this federal poverty measure because it is consistently gathered across time and place.

In regards to “suburb,” many Americans have strong cultural ideas of what constitutes a “suburb.” The typical image includes post-World War II tract housing built for car-owning families, cul de sacs, and shopping malls. Yet, suburbs are actually extremely heterogeneous in their demographic composition, economy, and land use patterns; most bear little resemblance to these stereotypical images. Given such diversity, perhaps it is fitting, then, that there is no formal or official definition of “suburb” in the United States. In some cases, researchers follow the standard used by the U.S. Census Bureau, which defines suburbs as municipalities with populations greater than 2,500, that are located in metropolitan statistical areas, and that are not central cities. In other cases, the definition of “suburb” that researchers use depends on the available data and the research questions being asked. For example, in Murphy and Wallace’s study of antipoverty organizational deprivation across urban and suburban areas, they define suburbs as zip codes that exist within this census definition. Zip codes are used as the unit of analysis because they are the smallest spatial unit at which the data is available.<sup>8</sup> In Allard’s work on suburban poverty and the safety net, however, he uses tract-based definitions to capture demographic change and county-level definitions of urban versus suburban because counties are a key administrative unit for most safety net programs. How researchers decide to define “suburb” typically does little to change our understanding of how the geography of poverty has changed in the last 20 years. Differences in how urban and suburban places are defined matter, however, when exploring more nuanced aspects of suburban poverty and when comparing findings across different studies.

The term “suburban poverty” is widely used to refer to poverty located in suburban areas. This broad term is useful when making distinctions between urban, suburban, and rural poverty. However, the concept masks important variations in how poverty is situated in the suburbs. Poverty may exist at the individual, neighborhood, municipal, or county level or some combination thereof. For example, poor people may live in middle class suburban neighborhoods in middle class suburban municipalities. They might also live in poor suburban neighborhoods in middle class suburban municipalities. Or they might live in poor suburban neighborhoods in poor suburban municipalities. Each of these different manifestations of poverty in the suburbs poses potentially unique policy challenges and, accordingly, will require different policy solutions. When discussing suburban poverty, then, specifying the level(s) at which it exists is important.

## Why has suburban poverty risen?

There is no single explanation for the rise of suburban poverty. Though popular narratives suggest that it is the

consequence of the foreclosure crisis or the effects of gentrifying cities, in truth, there are many factors driving the rise in suburban poverty that vary across regions, between metropolitan areas, and between suburbs within these same metro areas.<sup>9</sup> This explains, in part, why we see suburban poverty rising outside of cities that are very different from one another, from those that are economically thriving, like Houston, and growing in population, like Atlanta, to those that are struggling economically, like Las Vegas, and shrinking in population, like Detroit.<sup>10</sup>

A central factor driving the trend in rising suburban poverty is changes in the economic conditions and labor markets of metropolitan areas. Indeed, much of the rise in suburban poverty appears to be explained by downward mobility among longtime suburban residents. Some have fallen below the poverty line because of job loss or a decline in their earnings. Others are aging and finding themselves living on a reduced income. Certainly the Great Recession has contributed greatly; it hit the suburbs more directly than any prior recession in the United States.<sup>11</sup>

One of the biggest factors driving the rise in the number of poor persons and poverty rates in suburbs is simply processes of urbanization and the growth of population living in suburban places. Even if poverty rates remain constant, growth in the suburban population will naturally lead to increases in the number of poor persons in suburbs.<sup>12</sup>

The migration of people into and out of the suburbs has also contributed to the rise of poverty in these places. Suburban job growth in the latter portion of the 20th century, along with the promise of safer communities and stronger schools, drew low-income urban residents to the suburbs in pursuit of better opportunity.<sup>13</sup> More recently, more affluent persons have begun to move back into newly (re)developed urban areas in cities like New York, Miami, Seattle, and Chicago. Poor residents in these and similar cities increasingly have found themselves priced out of the housing market and have turned to seeking affordable housing in nearby suburbs.<sup>14</sup> Additionally, immigrant settlement patterns have changed remarkably in the past 20 years. Rather than settling into cities upon arrival as has historically been the case, working poor immigrants are now first settling in suburbs, particularly in the American South.<sup>15</sup> While poor populations moving into the suburbs have been one significant driver of suburban poverty, so too has the outmigration of middle income families who are either moving back into central or into newly developed exurbs, leaving poorer suburban residents behind.<sup>16</sup>

Finally, changes in federal and local housing policy as well as the foreclosure crisis have played an important role. The foreclosure crisis hit suburban areas particularly hard, resulting in the loss of homes for some and a decline in housing values for others. This, in turn, has negatively affected the housing-related labor market in these places. Adding to this has been federal policy efforts to deconcentrate urban poverty by dismantling public housing projects and shifting housing assistance to the provision of housing choice vouchers. Low-

income families that hold such vouchers can use them to rent market rate housing anywhere in a metropolitan area, enabling many to move to the suburbs.<sup>17</sup>

### **Suburban poor people and their neighborhoods**

Currently, little is known about who the suburban poor are, what their lives are like, and how their profiles and experiences compare and contrast with the urban and rural poor. Recent work by the Metropolitan Policy Program at the Brookings Institution, however, does offer some helpful insights.<sup>18</sup> The urban and suburban poor appear to share quite similar labor market profiles. Comparable proportions of the urban and suburban poor are of working age. Poor persons in both cities and suburbs tend to be employed, full time and part time at the same rates. Suburban and urban poor households have similar earnings from work. Aside from these similarities, though, important differences exist. The suburban poor are much more likely to be homeowners than the urban poor, reflecting the fact that suburbs were originally designed for homeownership and zoning practices have reinforced those intentions. The suburban poor are more likely to have completed high school and live in two-parent households than the urban poor. There are also important racial differences. The racial and ethnic composition of the suburban poor mirrors the nationwide distribution; accordingly, the suburban poor are much more likely to be white than the urban poor.

While there are certainly suburban poor people living amidst middle class affluence, increasingly, researchers are finding that the poor are spatially concentrating in particular neighborhoods in the suburbs.<sup>19</sup> Typically scholars identify census tracts where 20 percent or more of the population live below the poverty line as high-poverty neighborhoods or places experiencing concentrated poverty.<sup>20</sup> Since 2000, the number of high-poverty suburban tracts has increased 64 percent. Suburbs now contain nearly as many high-poverty tracts as cities (4,313 vs. 5,353).<sup>21</sup>

This particular trend is noteworthy for two reasons. First, a large body of literature demonstrates that when poverty concentrates spatially, the deleterious effects of poverty on individuals and communities is compounded.<sup>22</sup> Living below the poverty line in a middle class neighborhood is not the same as living below the poverty line in a neighborhood with other similarly situated people. Second, there is evidence suggesting that not all suburbanites may be experiencing the effects of such concentrated poverty equally. Indeed, though the suburban poor are more likely to be white, low-income African Americans and Hispanics are much more likely to live in suburban neighborhoods with higher poverty rates. They are also more likely to live in suburban municipalities with lower performing schools, weaker transportation systems, and less capacity to address poverty.<sup>23</sup> The suburbs are thus not presenting the same sets of opportunities or the same challenges for low-income whites and low-income people of color; patterns of racial inequality that we have observed in cities seem to be reproducing in the suburbs.

## Addressing the needs of the suburban poor

One particular challenge that poor people living in the suburbs face is accessing the safety net, especially those social service programs that are delivered through state and local government or nongovernmental actors. Social service programs provide a wide array of supports and assistance to low-income families to address material needs, employment issues, or other aspects of well-being. Because such programs often are delivered through local nonprofit organizations, the availability of social services varies across local places.<sup>24</sup> There is mounting evidence that there is a significant dearth of social service programs in suburbs.

In one study, Scott Allard and Benjamin Roth examine nonprofit social service provision in five program areas across 67 different suburban municipalities located in metropolitan Chicago, Los Angeles, and Washington, DC, in the wake of the Great Recession.<sup>25</sup> Using information about the location and expenditures of nonprofit service organizations formally filing with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), the authors calculate per-poor-person social service program revenues at the municipal level. The authors find most suburban municipalities have *no nonprofit organizations* operating in any given program area. For example, 54 out of 67 suburban municipalities had no registered employment service nonprofits, and 37 of 67 had no registered nonprofits that specialized in providing emergency food assistance. Even in communities where nonprofit service organizations were present, most were poorly resourced. Looking at the 30 suburban municipalities with at least one registered emergency food assistance nonprofit, the authors find per poor person revenues of those nonprofits to be less than \$50 annually in 18 of the 30 municipalities. While these data do not capture large regional providers that offer important services and programs in the suburbs, the absence of locally registered nonprofits suggests there is little local indigenous capacity.

The dearth of social service provision in the suburbs is especially pronounced when compared with the number of social service organizations available in urban census tracts with similar poverty rates. For example, drawing on national data, Alexandra Murphy and Danielle Wallace examine variation in the absence of three different types of social service organizations across cities and suburbs: (1) hardship organizations like shelters and food pantries, which help people meet their daily needs; (2) employment organizations that provide services such as job training; and (3) education organizations, such as those that operate GED programs.<sup>26</sup> They find that once demographic and economic neighborhood features are taken into account, suburban poor neighborhoods are much more likely to lack any of these antipoverty organizations. This is especially true for those organizations that promote upward mobility, like those that provide assistance with employment and education. The authors conclude that these findings suggest that with respect to access to social service organizations, low-income individuals may be better off in urban neighborhoods than suburban ones, since suburban living can isolate residents

from organizational resources that could help them meet their daily needs and become more upwardly mobile.

Even in those suburban places where service organizations do exist, the lack of adequate public and private transportation options for many low-income households makes it difficult to access programs of support. Indeed, studies have found that physical proximity to social services is critical for their use and that the probability low-income households will make use of social services increases the closer that they are located to service providers.<sup>27</sup> Yet, suburban service organizations tend to serve much larger catchment areas than their urban counterparts, often serving entire counties or multi-county regions. Not only do larger service areas often correspond to greater spatial barriers to accessing services, they also spread organizational staff and resources thinly across many communities.

Though, with time, a stronger suburban safety net may develop and “catch up” to that found in urban poor neighborhoods, significant funding barriers exist. Many of the policy tools and interventions we use to combat poverty are directed at urban areas. Most poverty-related philanthropy is also directed towards urban poverty; studies show that the grant dollars per poor person are much lower in suburbs than central cities. Established nonprofits in urban areas often have longstanding relationships with these funders that give them a competitive edge and make it difficult for new, suburban organizations to break through. In addition, community foundations in the suburbs tend to be newer and smaller than those in central cities and thus have not been able to grow an asset base that can meet rising suburban need.<sup>28</sup>

### The diversity of the suburban poverty challenge

Though much of our focus has been on how suburban poverty differs from urban poverty, it is important to recognize the differences that exist across suburbs experiencing rising poverty rates. Just as the suburbs are incredibly heterogeneous, so too are the challenges poverty poses to suburbs and the tools and resources suburbs have at their disposal to meet these challenges. To reflect such diversity, Murphy created a typology of poor suburban areas that weighed demographic realities, economic conditions, and local community resources.<sup>29</sup> Drawing on in-depth interviews with nonprofit service providers in eight suburbs outside of two Northeastern cities, she identifies three categories of suburbs experiencing rising poverty: (1) symbiotic suburbs, which most closely mirror poor urban neighborhoods; (2) skeletal suburbs, which were once thriving industrial locations but now offer few job opportunities; and (3) overshadowed suburbs, which are relatively affluent overall, but have deep pockets of poverty. The suburbs and social service organizations within these suburban types face distinct challenges and opportunities in their efforts to address the needs of their poor clients.

For example, symbiotic suburbs are suburbs whose most defining political, economic, and institutional relationship is

with the neighboring city. There is a significant movement of people, poverty-related problems, and resources across the urban-suburban boundary. This fluidity significantly shapes poverty dynamics in these suburbs. Organizations often find themselves straddling the divide between city and suburb in terms of who they provide services to, and how they appeal for support.

Skeletal suburbs, on the other hand, are physical and political skeletons of the vibrant manufacturing places they used to be. Because these suburbs are empty shells of their former selves, outside organizations and political actors work to fill these skeletons, perhaps using the few remaining resources for their own benefit. The severity of the economic and political deterioration in these places leaves little for stakeholders to build on, leading them to question whether these suburbs can ever be revitalized.

In contrast, overshadowed suburbs have small, segregated pockets of poverty. Zoning practices, commercial amenities, and a lack of public space keep poverty in these suburbs publicly hidden. So too does the fact that these suburbs are often home to newly poor, downwardly mobile middle class people who do not “look poor” and who may face different social service challenges than those who have experienced poverty longer. Because of this invisibility, many residents in these suburbs do not recognize the poverty that exists in their backyard. This presents a challenge for antipoverty organizations competing for resources with urban and other suburban locations where poverty is not hidden; their burden is to prove that poverty exists in their midst at all.

These categories are based on a small sample in one region in the United States and so are likely not comprehensive; other categories may exist. Nevertheless, they are useful in highlighting the variation in how poverty manifests in the suburbs and how such variation matters for the challenges experienced by residents and the local safety net—variation masked by the concept of “suburban poverty.”

## **Conclusion: Research and policy implications**

The changing geography of poverty in the United States has brought renewed scholarly and policy attention to the suburbs. This is much needed. American suburbs have long been in an academic and policy “blind spot.”<sup>30</sup> The rise of suburban poverty brings with it new, unanswered questions about the relationship between poverty and place and the current and future role of policy in this relationship. There is much about suburban poverty we do not know. Because most poverty research has focused on cities, we are only beginning to understand the consequences and meaning of these spatial shifts in poverty across metropolitan America. Developing a sound research agenda around the subject will be of critical importance to the development of effective, evidence-based policies and programs aimed at suburban residents, neighborhoods, municipalities, and the regions in which they are situated.

Central to this research agenda is the development of more case studies of different types of suburbs in different regions in the United States. As we have shown, there is significant variation in how suburbs experience poverty as well as how they can and do respond. Case studies that illuminate how the spatial, social, economic, cultural, demographic, and political context of suburbs differently shapes the experiences of the suburban poor and the suburbs where they live will be useful for policymakers interested in, for example, crafting a regional approach to poverty in cities and their suburbs. Such approaches require urban-suburban collaboration. A significant impediment to these strategies is the fragmentation seen outside cities; there may be numerous municipalities with their own independent budgets, own structures of governance, and own methods of providing services. It can be very difficult to get these autonomous political jurisdictions to work together; collaboration is often viewed as a threat to local control. Case study research that examines how these municipalities are structured, governed, and how they understand poverty in their community would be useful in identifying ways to promote and encourage regional cooperation. Policy solutions that can seed and build capacity to collaborate across boundaries and jurisdictions will be key to any long-term success in addressing suburban poverty.

Case studies will also be essential in understanding the role that race, ethnicity, and immigrant status play in these dynamics. As noted above, the racial and ethnic distribution of the suburban poor is different than that of the urban poor. At the same time, the resources and opportunities available to low-income people of color in the suburbs differs from those available to low-income whites. This suggests that the patterns of racial inequality observed in cities seem to be replicating in the suburbs. We should be wary that the kinds of entrenched poverty that we see in many of our neglected urban areas run the risk of taking hold in the suburbs if left unchecked. To combat this, investigation into these racial differences and explicit acknowledgement of them in the policymaking process will be essential in developing tools to help all suburban poor people in the variety of places where they live.

Importantly, in crafting research and policy around suburban poverty, it is not sufficient to simply take existing theories and policies developed in urban areas to new settings. Though cities and suburbs share a number of features, as do their poverty populations, there are important differences. Strategies that may be effective in cities will not necessarily work in suburbs, due to differences in transportation, population densities, organizational capacities, and political will. Further, given the heterogeneity of suburbs, what works in one suburb may not be the best approach for another.

While there are many challenges ahead in the efforts to address suburban poverty, there is reason to believe communities and regions can make progress. First, suburbs have significant assets and resources that may allow them to respond vigorously to the difficulties at hand. We should expect there to be a lag in communities’ ability to generate local and regional responses to rising poverty. But, over the

next 5 to 10 years, we may see suburban regions develop more local and shared institutional capacity to act. Second, even though public antipoverty program spending has leveled off in recent years, today's safety net contains a much more robust set of public assistance programs than when cities went through similar processes during the middle part of the 20th century. Unlike the urban poor in these earlier eras, the suburban poor have access to a variety of supports that may mediate the consequences of poverty. The key will be maintaining these public commitments, preventing retrenchment that would compromise the safety net's ability to respond to need, and finding ways to improve how programs are implemented.

Key to any success in addressing rising suburban poverty, however, will be recognizing that urban and suburban areas have a shared fate. The rise of suburban poverty has not coincided with a decline in urban poverty, quite the opposite. Just as labor markets have become more regional entities, where growth in urban and suburban areas is heavily linked, so too must our approaches to alleviating poverty. In the end, efforts that are limited to a particular segment of a metropolitan area—urban or suburban—are unlikely to yield much long-term impact at all. ■

---

<sup>1</sup>This article summarizes the May 2015 IRP Webinar given by Alexandra K. Murphy and Scott W. Allard.

<sup>2</sup>E. Kneebone and A. Berube, *Confronting Suburban Poverty in America* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2013).

<sup>3</sup>E. Kneebone and N. Holmes, "The Growing Distance between People and Jobs in Metropolitan America," Metropolitan Opportunity Series No. 58, The Brookings Institution, 2014.

<sup>4</sup>S. W. Allard, "Places in Need: The Changing Geography of Poverty and the American Safety Net," Paper presented at the Poverty and Place Conference, Center for Poverty Research, University of California, Davis, November 13, 2014; E. Kneebone "The Growth and Spread of Concentrated Poverty, 2000 to 2008–2012," The Brookings Institution, Metropolitan Policy Program, 2014.

<sup>5</sup>See, for example, S. W. Allard and B. Roth, "Strained Suburbs: The Social Service Challenges of Rising Suburban Poverty," Metropolitan Opportunity Series No. 7, The Brookings Institution, Metropolitan Policy Program, 2010; Kneebone and Berube, *Confronting Suburban Poverty*; E. Kneebone and E. Garr. "The Suburbanization of Poverty: Trends in Metropolitan America, 2000 to 2008," The Brookings Institution, Metropolitan Policy Program, 2010; D. Andrulis, L. Duchon, and H. Reid, "Dynamics of Race, Culture, and Key Indicators of Health in the Nation's 100 Largest Cities and Their Suburbs," *The Social and Health Landscape of Urban and Suburban America Report Series*, Brooklyn: SUNY Downstate Medical Center, 2003; K. B. Anacker (Ed). *The New American Suburb: Poverty, Race, and the Economic Crisis* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2015).

<sup>6</sup>United States Census Bureau, "Poverty Thresholds," accessed August 25, 2015 at <https://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/>

<sup>7</sup>C. DeNavas-Walt and B. Proctor, US Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, P60-249, *Income and Poverty in the United States: 2013*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington DC, 2014.

<sup>8</sup>A. Murphy and D. Wallace. "Opportunities for Making Ends Meet and Upward Mobility," *Social Science Quarterly* 91, No. 5 (2010): 1164–1186.

<sup>9</sup>See Anacker, *The New American Suburb*.

<sup>10</sup>Kneebone and Berube, *Confronting Suburban Poverty*.

<sup>11</sup>E. Garr, "The Landscape of Recession: Unemployment and Safety Net Services across Urban and Suburban America," The Brookings Institution, Metropolitan Policy Program, 2011; Kneebone and Berube, *Confronting Suburban Poverty*.

<sup>12</sup>S. W. Allard and S. Paisner, *The Rise in Suburban Poverty*, Oxford Handbooks Online (New York: Oxford University Press, Forthcoming).

<sup>13</sup>A. Murphy, *When the Sidewalks End: Poverty in an American Suburb* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press Forthcoming); S. W. Allard, "Access to Social Services: The Changing Urban Geography of Poverty and Service Provision," Metropolitan Policy Program Survey Series, Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 2004.

<sup>14</sup>A. Ehrenhalt, *The Great Inversion and the Future of the American City* (New York, NY: Vintage Books, 2013).

<sup>15</sup>R. Suro, J. H. Wilson, and A. Singer, "Immigration and Poverty in America's Suburbs," Metropolitan Opportunity Series, Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 2011.

<sup>16</sup>See, for example, J. F. Madden, "Has the Concentration of Income and Poverty among Suburbs of Large U.S. Metropolitan Areas Changed over Time?" *Papers in Regional Science* 82 (2003): 249–275.

<sup>17</sup>Kneebone and Berube, *Confronting Suburban Poverty*.

<sup>18</sup>Kneebone and Berube, *Confronting Suburban Poverty*.

<sup>19</sup>P. Jargowsky, "Architecture of Segregation: Civil Unrest, the Concentration of Poverty, and Public Policy," The Century Foundation Issue Brief, 2015.

<sup>20</sup>P. Jargowsky, *Poverty and Place: Ghettos, Barrios, and the American City* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1997).

<sup>21</sup>Kneebone, "The Growth and Spread of Concentrated Poverty."

<sup>22</sup>W. J. Wilson, *The Truly Disadvantaged* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1987); D. Massey and N. Denton, *American Apartheid* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993).

<sup>23</sup>See A. Holliday and R. Dwyer, "Suburban Neighborhood Poverty in U.S. Metropolitan Areas in 2000," *City & Community* 8, No. 2 (2009): 155–176; A. Howell and J. Timberlake, "Racial and Ethnic Trends in the Suburbanization of Poverty in US Metropolitan Areas, 1980–2010," *Journal of Urban Affairs* 36, No. 1 (2013): 79–98; Kneebone and Berube, *Confronting Suburban Poverty*.

<sup>24</sup>S. W. Allard, *Out of Reach: Place, Poverty, and the New American Welfare State* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009); Allard, "Access to Social Services."

<sup>25</sup>Allard and Roth, "Strained Suburbs."

<sup>26</sup>Murphy and Wallace, "Opportunities for Making Ends Meet."

<sup>27</sup>S. W. Allard, R. Tolman, and D. Rosen, "Proximity to Service Providers and Service Utilization among Welfare Recipients," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 22, No. 4 (2003): 599–613; R. J. Kissane, "What's Need Got to Do With It—Barriers to Use of Nonprofit Social Services," *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 30 (2003): 127–148; J. E. Mosley, H. K. Anheier, Y. Hasenfeld, and H. Katz, "The Challenge of Meeting Social Needs in Los Angeles: Nonprofit Human Service Organizations in a Diverse Community," UCLA School of Public Policy and Social Research, 2003.

<sup>28</sup>S. Reckhow and M. Weir, "Building a Stronger Regional Safety Net: Philanthropy's Role," Metropolitan Opportunity Series. The Brookings Institution, Metropolitan Policy Program, 2011.

<sup>29</sup>A. Murphy, "The Symbolic Dilemmas of Suburban Poverty," *Sociological Forum* 25, No. 3 (2010): 541–569.

<sup>30</sup>R. Puentes and D. Warren, "One-Fifth of America: A Comprehensive Guide to America's First Suburbs," Survey Series, The Brookings Institution, Metropolitan Policy Program, 2006.