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Abstract
The COVID-19 pandemic disproportionately affects already-vulnerable minorities, highlighting the need for strong, trusting relationships between governments and minority nonprofits for everyone’s benefit. The current scholarship suggests minority members often lack trust in government. This study contributes to the field by examining trust levels Muslim-American nonprofits have for federal, state, and local government. Nearly two-thirds (65%) of Muslim nonprofit leaders believe that they may be discriminated against in the award of CARES Act funding, but on racial rather than religious ones. Moreover, partisanship affects trust levels. Muslim nonprofits in Republican “red” states show less trust in government compared with those in Democratic “blue” states. This study finds evidence that past relationships with the government strengthen trust. Past awards of government grants correlated positively with higher trust at both federal and local levels.
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The study of Muslim-American philanthropy provides a unique opportunity to examine particular nuances of giving in a faith-based community while providing universal lessons in giving and charity in an increasingly diverse nation. As sociologist Robert Wuthnow pointed out, Muslims are among the new religious groups that have become prominent in the American consciousness, despite having been a presence here for centuries (Wuthnow, 2005). There is an emerging body of scholarship addressing Muslim-American volunteering and philanthropy, as well as their entry into the mainstream of American public life (Jamal, 2005; Khan & Siddiqui, 2017; Lajevardi, 2020). Challenges to their integration into American society, while not unique, do offer an opportunity to examine how a community, defined as much or more by its faith as by its diverse ethnic composition, finds its footing in American public life.

Muslims are a growing but minority in America, especially since 9/11. More than a dozen Muslim nonprofits were raided in the wake of 9/11, and at least three were forced to shut down (Turner, 2011). They are also a targeted minority. Islamophobic attacks only lagged behind anti-Semitic hate crimes in 2019 (Gerteis, Hartmann, & Edgell, 2020; Hassan, 2019). The Muslim community presented a convenient target for both overt and covert rhetoric during the Trump administration to drum up support in the Republican rank and file. Trump also instituted a blanket travel ban from Muslim-majority countries (Mohamed, 2018). While the Biden administration is not the Trump administration, the hostility and fear undoubtedly remain.

Muslim nonprofits play an increasingly important role in Muslim-American civic life. They help represent Muslim concerns to the government and actively engage Muslims in civic and community work. They tend to be smaller than their non-Muslim counterparts, forcing them to make do with severely constrained resources (www.guidestar.org). Their cash reserves and capacity are often inadequate to maintain their standing when facing financial challenges. The Muslim nonprofit sector as a whole is highly vulnerable to the current pandemic and its attendant economic hardships. Their limited finances also imply that Muslim nonprofits need government help to weather the current pandemic.

Today's current pandemic environment raises important questions related to Muslim nonprofit leaders and their trust in government. How much do Muslim nonprofit leaders trust in the government to provide relief? Do they believe they suffer discrimination when seeking government help, especially under the 2021 Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Assistance Act (CARES Act)? Is there a correlation between their trust in government and the political affiliation of the government administration where they are located? Like other minorities, Muslims overwhelmingly support Democrats. More than 65% voted Democratic in the recent election, a trend seen in earlier polls (Mogahed & Ikramullah, 2020).

The national economy is going through upheaval because of measures taken to prevent the spread of COVID-19, leading to an economic recession. Over 25 million individuals lost their jobs between February and April 2020 (Karpman & Acs, 2020). The impact of COVID-19 on the nonprofit sector has been devastating. A 2020 Charity Aid Foundations Report (2020) found that one-third of nonprofits feared they might cease to exist by mid-2021, with the remaining two-thirds having sufficient reserves for only a couple of additional months. As a result, demand has multiplied, while available resources have shrunk catastrophically. Thus, the nonprofit sector as a whole is in dire need of outside assistance. To provide some relief, the government has approved various incentives that might incidentally help the nonprofit sector, along with the rest of society. The most important of these incentives was the CARES Act, passed under the Trump administration in late March 2020. The package is aimed at providing...
financial relief to community businesses and families affected directly by the pandemic. The CARES Act offers a critical opportunity to protect the nonprofit sector from insolvency (US Department of the Treasury, 2020) because it includes provisions for much-needed aid.

Ideally, government support and relief serve all citizens equally and equitably. However, research indicates that government funding is often politically motivated and is usually less likely to be directed toward businesses of color (Bangs, Murrell, & Constance-Huggins, 2007). A report from Bridgespan and Echoing Green (Dorsey, 2020) indicates that nonprofits led by people of color and women are less likely to receive government grants. Other preliminary evidence also supports this assertion for the CARES Act funding. The American Civil Liberties Union notes that the CARES Act, as passed in 2020 under Trump, deThnies benefits to many immigrants, including testing and care, cash rebates, and unemployment insurance (Waheed & Moussavian, 2020). It is to be noted that this may change under Biden's administration. Other reports show banks giving preference to non-minority customers over Black customers in disbursing CARES Act loans (National Community Reinvestment Coalition, 2020).

This study surveyed 252 Muslim-American nonprofit leaders about their trust in local, state, and federal government aid during the current COVID-19 pandemic, measuring their trust in all three government levels. Also assessed are their perceptions of discrimination under the CARES Act due to their Muslim-American identity. We find mixed results. Overall, their trust in each government level is broadly equal. However, government party affiliation does affect trust in state government. Muslim nonprofits in Republican states are less likely to trust Republican-led states. This is not replicated at the local level, but local government is often not affiliated with either party.

The study also finds a substantial proportion of Muslim nonprofit leaders (64%) believe that government may discriminate against Muslims when awarding funds through the CARES Act but will do so on racial or ethnic grounds rather than religious ones. It remains to be seen whether these perceptions may change under the current Biden administration. Our findings are significant, suggesting strong perceptions of discrimination among Muslims when it comes to government funding.

There is an ample body of research indicating Muslim perceptions of discrimination in government funding in other areas. This research is the first to suggest that some level of discrimination might also exist in the awarding of nonprofit contracts. There has been research outside American and other Western governments that points toward some government prejudice toward nonprofits belonging to certain minority groups. Still, this research article is among the first of its kind in America. The government needs to address and resolve this lack of trust to ease minority nonprofits’ acceptance by mainstream society. This is especially important, given the demographic change America faces over the next few decades. America is rapidly transforming from a majority-culture society to a multicultural society. While minorities may not be targeted under the Biden administration as they were under the Trump administration, acceptance will not occur overnight.

2 | LITERATURE REVIEW

Trust in government refers to citizens’ perception that government is equitable and fair in policy-making and implementation (Zmerli, 2014). Researchers rely on trust in government to measure the extent to which citizens consider the government and its leaders responsive to their concerns and preferences (Dahl, 1957). Trust has also become increasingly crucial
between nonprofits and government, as the two sectors have become more intertwined and interdependent. Under various arrangements, such as third-party government (Salamon, 1995), contracting regimes (Smith & Lipsky, 1993), and collaborative governance (Ansell & Gash, 2008), government financing of nonprofit activity has surged.

Trust between the nonprofit sector and government is critical for the effective functioning of both. For governments, a robust relationship with nonprofits is essential for working with communities. Community program success depends on social capital, which, in turn, depends on trust between society and its members, especially between different levels of the government and citizens (Fukuyama, 1996; Putnam, 1995).

Trust also increases efficacy by improving coordination, enhancing efficiency, flexibility, and adaptability between nonprofits and government. This results in the government not being burdened with micromanagement or to sanctions (Behn, 1995). Governments are thereby enabled to form collaborative rapid response strategies with other actors during emergencies. For example, after hurricanes Katrina and Rita, rebuilding efforts were greatly facilitated because of organizations with robust preexisting relationships with one another and with government at all levels. This allows all parties to collectively mobilize to supply emergency goods (Simo & Bies, 2007).

Nonprofits often worry that their relationship with the government may undermine their identity and autonomy (Lu, 2018; Lu & Zhao, 2019). They are thus often hesitant to share information with the government. This impedes transparency, detailed information exchange, learning, and mutual understanding (Uzzi, 1996). Information-sharing enables collaborative networks to implement creative and innovative solutions through which to pursue their aims. Redundancy and duplication are also avoided.

These issues are accentuated governmental relations with minority nonprofits. With these issues unresolved, minorities are less likely to cooperate with government programs, even those specifically targeted toward them (Portes & MacLeod, 1996). This eventually reduces the effectiveness of government projects in enacting long-range change and transformational development, thereby reducing both minorities’ ability to function in mainstream society and governmental ability to address inequity (Portes & MacLeod, 1996).

Mutual trust is at least as important for nonprofits, if not more so. It enhances social capital, helps in addressing bureaucratic constraints, and facilitates knowledge transfer and innovation. Also essential is its alleviation of financial anxieties. Government funding enables nonprofits to overcome voluntary failures (Wolpert, 2003). This works to prevent possible panic downsizing and service disruption.

During crises, governments and nonprofits try to mobilize their respective resources. For governments, mutual trust with nonprofits means more rapid, efficient, and effective mobilization and coordination of available resources; for nonprofits, it means less exposure to financial vulnerability and shock.

The current COVID-19 crisis has increased nonprofits’ already heavy reliance on the government. Normally, nearly two-thirds of nonprofit sector revenue comes from government grants, contracts, and service fees (Carrie, 2018). This reliance becomes even more pronounced during a crisis. A recent Charities Aid Foundation Report (2020) reveals that one-third of nonprofits fear closing within the year. Another third cannot determine whether they will survive. Two-thirds report only 2 months of cash reserves. Nonprofits have suffered a precipitous decline in fundraising and human resources while facing an increased service burden because of COVID-19 (Deitrick et al., 2020).

COVID-19 makes trust in government even more relevant. Trust, however, is seldom unconditional or open-ended, but rather is present during a specific period or situation (Levi &
It may very well be damaged by perceived bias or discrimination. Laws and professional standards require government officials to treat all religious and ethnic groups equally. Still, policy execution may be influenced by a host of factors, including individual beliefs, identities, and prejudices (Pfaff, Crabtree, Kern, & Holbein, 2020). Officials’ decisions and actions may be influenced by internal beliefs and/or prejudices they hold (Pfaff et al., 2020). Research suggests these prejudices may affect their decisions and response to citizen concerns. Political ideology also affects bureaucratic decision-making (Stensöta, 2012).

Evidence suggests systemic and structural discrimination against minorities in several government areas, including criminal sentencing and the electoral process (Alesina & La Ferrara, 2002; White, Nathan, & Faller, 2015). Similarly, other evidence shows both school officials (Pfaff et al., 2020) and state officials are more likely to discriminate against Muslim minorities (Lajevardi, 2020). Preferential treatment of certain groups over others is not unique to governments. The literature suggests that people are more likely to give money to those of their own race and ethnicity (Fong & Luttmer, 2009).

In a recent study, Bhati (2020) found that implicit color biases play a role in individuals’ decisions to donate. Similarly, Tremblay-Boire and Prakash (2019) found that Christians in America are more likely to contribute to Christian charities operating in the Middle East rather than Muslim charities. Group identity strongly influences decisions to donate toward a group-specific cause (Hutcheson & Domínguez, 2016; Taniguchi & Thomas, 2011; Wittberg, 2013). Individuals often prefer to donate to people of their race or religion.

Gender discrimination is almost certainly evident in the nonprofit sector. Research shows females are less likely to move up the nonprofit ladder than males (Damman, Heyse, & Mills, 2014; Gibelman, 2000). In addition, there are biases against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBTQA+) employees (Hostetler & Pynes, 2000). Moreover, established literature suggests that faith-based organizations may discriminate in favor of their co-religionists in providing services (Wittberg, 2013; Yip, Twohill, Ernst, & Munusamy, 2010).

Research conducted in the Global South suggests that governments may give preference to some nonprofits over others. Often regimes view nonprofits belonging to some groups as a threat and institute regulations to curtail their activities, creating mistrust (Christensen & Weinstein, 2013; Dupuy, Ron, & Prakash, 2015). At times, government officials may discriminate against nonprofits or nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) based on their country of origin (Dupuy et al., 2015). For example, Russia and several other countries have instituted crackdowns on Western-funded nonprofits. Turkey has cracked down on Kurdish nonprofit groups. Similarly, despite operating in a Muslim-majority country, many Muslim religious charities in Pakistan believe the government discriminates against them because of their explicit Muslim identity (Wasif & Prakash, 2017). While there is research focusing on the Global South, there remains a gap in the literature on government distrust among nonprofits operating in the Global North.

3 MINORITIES, COVID-19, AND THE CARES ACT

The pandemic has highlighted and exacerbated racial disparities in America. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s data reveal that COVID-19 death and infection rates for minorities exceed the national average due to income and educational disparities, lack of access to adequate health care, and a higher rate of unemployment (Evelyn, 2020; Williamson et al., 2020). Similarly, during the 2008 economic crisis, the government prioritized corporate
help over individual help. Muslim minorities may benefit from enhanced paid leave and will
certainly use the $1,200 CARES payments. But these provisions are inadequate for long-term
individual relief, especially compared to the massive corporate bailouts echoing those of 2008.

Many factors explain why Muslims do not trust the American government to provide finan-
cial assistance. In America, wealth is increasingly unequally distributed, especially among racial
groups. Since 1983, the wealth of White families has increased 70%, compared with only 30%
for African-Americans. This unequal distribution over nearly 40 years has exacerbated racial
gaps in the United States. While calculating the ratio of wealth during every recession in the
United States, the gap between the wealth of minorities compared with Whites is readily appar-
ent (Mizota, 2020).

During COVID-19, African-Americans and Asians have incurred more health risks because
they are deprived of access to facilities available to Whites (Williamson et al., 2020). Because of
healthcare disparities among different racial and ethnic groups, minorities have less faith in
government health care. These inequalities have been a constant throughout American history.
A similar ethnic and racial disparity was readily apparent in American unemployment as
COVID-19 spread. The economy of almost all countries is shrinking because of the global pan-
demic. As economic activity falls worldwide, countries face the threat of collapse. Many compa-
nies are engaging in wholesale firing and mass layoffs, with the rate of unemployment peaking
in April 2020 (Williamson et al., 2020).

The unemployment rate in the United States is 14.5%, which is half again as great as the
2009 recession. But this rate masks significant inequalities. Unemployment among African-
Americans is 16.6%; among Hispanics, 18.2%; and among Asians, 13.7%. White unemployment,
in contrast, is 12.8% (Fairlie, Couch, & Xu, 2020). These disparities create a sense of injustice
and distrust of the United States government among minorities.

3.1 Muslim-American nonprofit sector, government, and trust

An estimated 3.45 million Muslim-Americans live in America, making up around 1.1% of the
total population (Mohamed, 2018). Muslim-Americans are ethnically diverse, originating from
different backgrounds that include, but are not limited to, Arab, Asian, African, and Middle East-
ern states. There is an increasing Latino population as well. However, none of these groups are
large enough to constitute a majority (Mohamed, 2018). They thus define themselves by their reli-
gious identity rather than a racial or ethnic identity. The Muslim-American population largely
consists of people of color. According to Pew Research Center (2017), the American Muslim com-
munity is made up heavily of immigrants and their children from around the world. Pew esti-
mates that 20% are Black, 28% are Asian, and 8% are Hispanic. While 41% are classified as White,
this particular classification includes Arabs, Persians, and Kurds, who have no other options to
select on American forms other than race (Besheer, 2018; Cooperman, 2017).

Scholars like Smidt (1999) suggest that the largest, sustained migration happened after the
passing of civil rights legislation and immigration reform legislation in the 1960s, which removed
prior quotas and limitations (GhaneaBassiri, 2010). Despite their manifold diversity, due to their
relatively small population size and scattered geographic distribution, they are often forced to
come together to establish mosques, schools, and nonprofit institutions (Siddiqui, 2013).

The number of Muslim nonprofit organizations has grown in tandem with the growth of the
American Muslim population in general. According to Bagby (2017), the Muslim commu-
nity has constructed about 3,000 mosques across America. As of 2017, there were 235 Islamic
schools across America, with more to come (Khan & Siddiqui, 2017). The IRS listed 3,020 Muslim-registered nonprofits in 2020. These IRS-registered organizations under the “Islamic” nonprofits NTEE category (X40) represent only a small portion of the total number of registered Muslim nonprofits (www.guidestar.org).

Many important American Muslim nonprofits are not registered as such under NTEE coding. These include such major organizations as the Islamic Relief USA, the Council of American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), and the Muslim Public Affairs Council (MPAC). Other small Muslim institutions and nonprofits are either not yet registered or still in the process of registration. Several other Muslim nonprofits have emerged, in addition to mosques and schools. However, most are small; large-scale Muslim nonprofit formation is still a distant reality (Khan & Siddiqui, 2017).

In light of 9/11, or perhaps because of rapid growth, the Muslim nonprofit sector faces increased scrutiny (Bail, 2014). During the post-9/11 period, public and government perceptions of Muslim nonprofits have become increasingly hostile (Bloodgood & Tremblay-Boire, 2017; Khan, 2015; Thaut, 2009). In 2001, US law enforcement raided and shut down three prominent Islamic charities for their alleged links to terrorism. In subsequent years, law enforcement agencies raided five additional Muslim charities, although no prosecutions resulted (MacFarquhar, 2006; Turner, 2009; Turner, 2011; Watanabe, 2004; Watanabe & Esquivel, 2009). These events undoubtedly contributed to the overall distrust between Muslim-American nonprofits and the American government. A strong feeling existed among Muslim nonprofits that anti-terrorism laws like the Patriot Act overwhelmingly targeted them (Bloodgood & Tremblay-Boire, 2011; MacFarquhar, 2006; Siddiqui, 2013; Watanabe & Esquivel, 2009).

There was even recognition within government circles that federal actions after 9/11 may have disproportionately targeted Muslim nonprofits. The Treasury Department apparently recognized this, stating, “The Treasury Department understands that the steps that it has taken to shut down charities that support terrorist groups (combined with other successful counter-terrorism efforts across the US) have had the unfortunate and unintended consequence of causing a chilling effect on well-intentioned donor activity within Muslim-American communities” (US Department of the Treasury, 2010). This government fear has caused much uncertainty and distress among American Muslim communities. In addition, in a 2009 statement, President Obama recognized that “[i]n the United States, rules on charitable giving have made it harder for Muslims to fulfill their religious obligation (Obama, 2009).” Both these statements point to a damaging climate of distrust between Muslim nonprofits and the federal government.

Islamophobia was a prominent theme in President Trump’s election strategy (Lajevardi, 2020) and his post-election executive orders. In January 2017, Trump signed an executive order instituting a ban on travel from six Muslim-majority countries. Several Islamic nonprofits called out Trump’s Islamophobic rhetoric, notably the CAIR, which stated at the time, “Unfortunately, it is President Trump’s policies, appointments, and statements that have contributed to the mainstreaming of Islamophobia and anti-immigrant rhetoric. It is time for him to clearly state that he is the president of all Americans, including American Muslims, and that he rejects Islamophobia, anti-Semitism and all other forms of bigotry” (“CAIR Calls on Trump to Repudiate Islamophobia, Anti-Muslim Hate Crimes During Address to Congress,”, n.d.).

Even though Muslims are proud Americans, many felt governmental actions and rhetoric at the time made their survival increasingly difficult (Cooperman, 2017; Lajevardi, 2020). Matters may improve under the Biden presidency, but the damage undoubtedly lingers. Interestingly, an Associated Press exit poll suggested that nearly 35% of American Muslims voted for President Trump (Schor & Crary, 2020). This is similar to results from a post-election poll
conducted in 2020 by the Institute for Social Policy and Understanding (ISPU, 2020), suggesting Muslim support for President Trump largely consisted of Muslim-Americans who identified as White (Mogahed & Ikramullah, 2020). The preponderance of the evidence that at least some American Muslim nonprofit leaders distrust the government. Similarly, they may also believe that the government will discriminate against them regarding the CARES Act funding.

The American government is a federal structure, comprising three distinct levels: federal, state, and local. The nonprofit sector interacts with the government across all these levels. Because the American government is federal and fragmented, it is often the case that different political parties control different branches of government. It is often common to find a local Democratic mayor and council under a state Republican administration, or the reverse (it is to be noted that many municipalities, especially smaller ones, are not affiliated with any state or national party). Nonprofits are often likely to trust one level of government over another. Similarly, the particular party in power may also affect trust. Most Muslim-Americans support the Democratic Party. Reasons for this support could be their evident satisfaction with the Obama administration and the lower number of hate crimes and discrimination during Obama’s term (Cooperman, 2017; Mohamed, 2018).

There is strong evidence of a positive correlation between religious observance and civic engagement. Several studies have looked at civic engagement and religiosity and found that among churchgoers, there is greater civic engagement among the more religiously inclined (Jamal, 2005; Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995). Scholars have pointed out that faith-based institutions can increase one’s level of civic skills, political efficacy, and political knowledge. As Amaney Jamal argues, this overflow process from the religious to the political sphere has been well-documented at the local level (Smidt, 1999).

4 | HYPOTHESES AND DISCUSSION

There is limited evidence suggesting that Republican legislators are less likely to address minority group concerns, particularly Black concerns (Butler & Broockman, 2011). Research also suggests that minorities generally do better under Democratic administrations (Hajnal & Horowitz, 2014). Many Americans believe that the Democratic Party serves racial and ethnic minority interests and that the Republican Party does not (reflecting the two parties’ respective modern-day majority constituencies). Minorities themselves often claim this. In one survey, over 70% of Blacks believe that the Democratic Party works hard on African-American issues. Similarly, Latinos and Asian Americans are only a little less likely to believe that the Democratic Party is more responsive to issues that affect them (Hajnal & Horowitz, 2014). This study, therefore, hypothesizes the following:

**H1.** Nonprofit leaders in Republican-governed states are less likely to trust their state government than nonprofit leaders in Democratic-governed states.

**H2.** Nonprofit leaders located in Republican-governed cities are less likely to trust the local government than nonprofit leaders in Democratic-governed cities.

It is also possible that Muslim nonprofits who have worked previously with the government will be more likely to trust the government to meet their needs and trust in the success of future
transactions. More specifically, if they have received an earlier grant, they may think they are more likely to receive future grants. Thus, we hypothesize the following:

**H3.** Leaders of nonprofits who previously received a government grant are more likely to trust the government.

As discussed earlier, an issue closely correlated with trust is discrimination. Muslims are a unique religious minority and are arguably one of the most diverse religious communities in America, belonging to several ethnicities (Arabs, Africans, African-Americans, South Asians, Hispanics, and others). They are bound together by their common religion. Historically, there have been several instances of discrimination against Muslims globally because of their religious background, including recently in India and China (Fox, 2007). It is therefore highly possible that Muslims fear that the American government will discriminate against them on religious grounds. Thus, we hypothesize the following:

**H4.** Leaders who feel that government discriminates against faith-based organizations (FBOs) are more likely to feel that they are being discriminated against because of their Islamic faith.

At the same time, racial and ethnic categories are often conflated in the Muslim-American experience (GhaneaBassiri, 2010). For example, recent research suggests that Muslim-Americans are often considered a racial or ethnic minority rather than a religious one by non-Muslims (Alimahomed-Wilson, 2018; Dana, Lajevardi, Oskooii, & Walker, 2018; GhaneaBassiri, 2010; Lajevardi, 2020) in a phenomenon known as racialization. Scholars define racialization as extending a racial meaning to a previously racially unclassified relationship, social practice, or group (Omi & Winant, 2014). Thus, racialization is a racial formation process, where racial categories are continuously occupied, transformed, and destroyed within specific political, social, and economic contexts. Thus, Muslims’ racialization is defined by reference to religion and other aspects of culture, such as physical appearance. America has similarly racialized Jews in the past, as have European nations.

With racialization, Muslims may have become a de facto racial category of their own in the eyes of non-Muslims. Some research suggests that a White woman often loses her White privilege as soon as she dons the hijab. She is then White and a Muslim, a racial identity of its own (Franks, 2000; Selod, 2019). Thus, Muslims may feel that the government may discriminate against them based on a racialized construct rather than a faith identity. We, therefore, hypothesize the following:

**H5.** Leaders who feel that government discriminates against nonprofits due to their perceived foreignness (ethnicity) are more likely to feel discriminated against as Muslims.

## 5 | METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS

### 5.1 | Sampling

We used GuideStar's catalog (guidestar.org) of 3,120 Islamic nonprofits listed as “Islamic” under the NTEE category “X40.” Because our survey was conducted online, we then culled
409 organizations without online contact information. We collected the data for control variables for the remaining 2,711 using their publicly available IRS form 990 (www.irs.gov).

This study’s survey targeted Muslim nonprofit leadership. It required participants to hold an active paid or unpaid upper-level administrative or board position. Eligible titles implying authority included Executive Director, Chief Executive Officer, President, Chief Operating Officer, Administrative Manager, Human Resources Manager, Chief Financial Officer, Finance Director, Managing Team Member (Development Director, Program Director and/or Office Manager and other titles suggesting managerial responsibility), and Director of Communications. Eligible leadership positions also included active board members or founders who held active roles, with or without a specific title.

We sent out surveys via Qualtrics and received 401 responses out of the pool of 2,711. We eliminated a further 158 responses due to validity issues. These issues included eligibility criteria, incomplete or repetitive responses, and failure to meet the study completion deadline. Our final data sample numbered 252. The revenue range of organizations in the sample was between $1 million and $4.99 million. Of the 252 finally considered, 134 were located in Republican-governed states while 118 were in Democratic-governed states. There were also 33 nonprofits in Republican cities, while the rest were in non-Republican cities. We used a dummy variable for a Republican and non-Republican city since several cities have governments with no clear political affiliation.

The respondents were diverse. Women formed 44% of the survey respondents. The demographic was also racially diverse, with Asians (30%), White (44%), and African-Americans (10%) making up most of the respondents. Many nonprofit leaders thought there would be some level of discrimination in awarding the CARES Act funding, with 56% believing there would be discrimination based on their race. In comparison, 36 thought government would discriminate on the grounds of their faith. Table 1 supplies further details for survey participants’ demographic characteristics.

6 | RESULTS

We translated responses into a forced-choice scale of 1–3 to assess perceptions of discrimination in receiving CARES Act funding. Respondents indicating no discrimination were placed in Category 1; those indicating possible discrimination were placed in Category 2; while those perceiving definite discrimination were placed in Category 3. A substantial number (64%) felt government might discriminate against them. Overall, 70 responded that they would be discriminated against as Muslims; 85 responded “maybe,” and 90 responded “no.” This finding suggests a widespread belief that there may be government discrimination against them in funding.

We also asked about trust regarding individual government levels (federal, state, and local). The results were broadly similar across all levels, although they were slightly higher at the federal level. This may be because most aid was through the CARES Act, which is a federal program (Table 2).

6.1 | Regression

Since the scale of trust was on a continuum, we employed the ordinary least squares regression (OLS) technique to assess government trust, perceptions of discrimination, and how demographic factors affected these. We corroborated results by running a binary logistical regression
| Characteristic                                                        | N = 252a |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| Perceptions of being discriminated based on being a minority        |          |
| 0                                                                   | 114 (45%)|
| 1                                                                   | 138 (55%)|
| Perceptions of being discriminated based on faith                    |          |
| 0                                                                   | 161 (64%)|
| 1                                                                   | 91 (36%) |
| Republican state                                                    |          |
| 0                                                                   | 134 (53%)|
| 1                                                                   | 118 (47%)|
| Republican mayor                                                    |          |
| 0                                                                   | 219 (87%)|
| 1                                                                   | 33 (13%) |
| Gender                                                              |          |
| Female                                                              | 111 (44%)|
| Male                                                                | 141 (56%)|
| African-American                                                    |          |
| 0                                                                   | 226 (90%)|
| 1                                                                   | 26 (10%) |
| White                                                               |          |
| 0                                                                   | 140 (56%)|
| 1                                                                   | 112 (44%)|
| Asian                                                               |          |
| 0                                                                   | 176 (70%)|
| 1                                                                   | 76 (30%) |
| Islamic school                                                      |          |
| 0                                                                   | 90 (36%) |
| 1                                                                   | 162 (64%)|
| Education                                                           |          |
| Associate degree in college (2 years)                               | 14 (5.6%)|
| Bachelor’s degree in college (4 years)                              | 73 (29%) |
| Doctoral degree                                                     | 34 (13%) |
| High school graduate (high school diploma or equivalent including GED)| 1 (0.4%) |
| Master’s degree                                                     | 115 (46%)|
| Professional degree (JD, MD)                                        | 1JD (4.0%)|
| Some college but no degree                                          | 5 (2.0%) |
| Nonprofit activity area                                             |          |
| Arts, culture, and humanities                                       | 12 (4.8%)|
| Education and research                                              | 103 (41%)|

(Continues)
RESULTS

We find some support for a party’s affiliation correlation with trust level in government. Muslim leaders living in Republican states are less likely to trust state government (H1: \( p < .05 \)), but there was no similar correlation at the local level (H2). We also find that initial government funding leads to more trust in state and federal government (\( p < .05 \)), but not in local government. We do not find significant evidence that Muslim leaders who think that faith-based groups will be discriminated against are more likely to believe that Muslims will be discriminated against (H3). However, Muslim leaders who believe ethnic minorities will face discrimination regarding government grants are more likely to think Muslims will be discriminated against in receiving COVID-19 grants (H4: \( p < .05 \)). This suggests Muslims perceive discrimination as predicated on race rather than religious identity (Tables 3 and 4).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Overall, this paper finds a strong perception among Muslim-Americans that the government may discriminate against them when awarding COVID relief. We also find that partisanship

TABLE 1 (Continued)

| Characteristic             | N = 252^a |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| Environment and animals   | 8 (3.2%)  |
| Health                    | 12 (4.8%) |
| Human services            | 23 (9.1%) |
| International             | 13 (5.2%) |
| Other                     | 12 (4.8%) |
| Public, societal benefit  | 33 (13%)  |
| Religion                  | 36 (14%)  |

^aStatistics presented: \( n (\%) \).

TABLE 2 Survey summary

| Statistic                              | N  | M    | SD  | Min | Pctl(25) | Pctl(75) | Max |
|----------------------------------------|----|------|-----|-----|---------|---------|-----|
| Perception of being discriminated      | 252| 1.881| .824| 1   | 1       | 3       | 3   |
| Trust in Federal Government            | 252| 3.345| 1.225| 1   | 2       | 4       | 5   |
| Trust in State Government              | 252| 3.421| 1.190| 1   | 3       | 4       | 5   |
| Trust in Local Government              | 252| 3.317| 1.168| 1   | 3       | 4       | 5   |
| Age                                    | 252| 44.861| 10.420| 18  | 38      | 50      | 85  |

on a dichotomous variable (1 for the level of trust being four or above on a scale of five, see Table A1) and similarly 1, when a respondent said yes to the question that the government would discriminate against Muslim nonprofits (see Table A2).
TABLE 3  Government trust levels

| Dependent variable | Trust in Federal Government | Trust in State Government | Trust in Local Government |
|--------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
|                    | (1)                        | (2)                       | (3)                       |
| Trust in State Government | 0.541*** (0.071)          | 0.381*** (0.050)         | 0.594*** (0.059)         |
| Trust in Local Government | −0.063 (0.075)            | 0.528*** (0.052)         | −0.049 (0.059)           |
| Trust in the Muslim Community | 0.089 (0.067)           | −0.067 (0.056)           | 0.209*** (0.058)         |
| Trust in Allah      | −0.119* (0.070)           | 0.142** (0.058)          | −0.250*** (0.061)        |
| Republican governor | 0.236* (0.131)            | −0.232** (0.110)         | −0.045 (0.118)           |
| Republican mayor    | −0.171 (0.198)            | 0.081 (0.167)            | 0.280 (0.176)            |
| Age                | −0.002 (0.007)            | 0.003 (0.005)            | −0.006 (0.006)           |
| Male               | 0.144 (0.131)             | −0.049 (0.110)           | 0.190 (0.116)            |
| African-American   | 0.425* (0.251)            | −0.403* (0.210)          | 0.404* (0.223)           |
| White              | 0.162 (0.187)             | −0.019 (0.157)           | 0.099 (0.166)            |
| Asian              | −0.174 (0.192)            | −0.262 (0.160)           | 0.336** (0.169)          |
| Previous Govt Grant | 0.226* (0.131)            | 0.227** (0.110)          | −0.146 (0.117)           |
| School             | 0.251 (0.168)             | −0.085 (0.141)           | 0.320** (0.148)          |
| Bachelor's degree in college (4 years) | 0.022 (0.303)          | −0.219 (0.253)           | 0.505* (0.267)           |
| Doctoral degree    | 0.215 (0.340)             | −0.329 (0.285)           | 0.468 (0.301)            |
| High school graduate (high school diploma or equivalent including GED) | −0.764 (1.064)          | −0.093 (0.893)           | 0.124 (0.946)            |
| Master's degree    | −0.069 (0.310)            | 0.006 (0.260)            | 0.286 (0.275)            |
| Professional degree (JD, MD) | −JD708* (0.424)       | −0.144 (0.357)           | 0.213 (0.379)            |
| Some college but no degree | −0.282 (0.529)        | 0.076 (0.444)            | 0.458 (0.469)            |
| Focus: Education and research | −0.045 (0.319)       | −0.157 (0.267)           | 0.650** (0.280)          |
| Focus: Environment and animals | −0.087 (0.469)       | −0.025 (0.393)           | 0.833** (0.413)          |
| Focus: Health      | 0.018 (0.413)             | −0.058 (0.346)           | 0.467 (0.366)            |
| Focus: Human services | −0.121 (0.382)         | −0.298 (0.320)           | 0.729** (0.336)          |
| Focus: International | 0.201 (0.403)           | −0.256 (0.337)           | 0.295 (0.358)            |
| Focus: Other       | 0.259 (0.430)             | −0.621* (0.359)          | 0.880** (0.378)          |
| Focus: Public, societal benefit | −0.159 (0.354)       | −0.034 (0.297)           | 0.556* (0.313)           |
| Focus: Religion    | 0.083 (0.343)             | −0.314 (0.286)           | 0.468 (0.303)            |
| Constant           | 1.551** (0.712)           | 0.390 (0.603)            | 0.666 (0.638)            |
| Observations       | 252                       | 252                       | 252                       |
| $R^2$              | .467                      | .603                      | .537                      |
| Adjusted $R^2$     | .403                      | .555                      | .481                      |
| Residual std. error (df = 224) | 0.947                  | 0.794                     | 0.842                     |
| $F$ statistic (df = 27; 224) | 7.270***                | 12.582***                | 9.612***                  |

*p < .1. **p < .05. ***p < .01.
TABLE 4  
Perceived discrimination in awarding of Government COVID relief among Muslims

| Dependent variable | Discrimination against Muslims |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| Race-based discrimination | 0.283*** (0.108) |
| Faith-based discrimination | 0.122 (0.112) |
| Trust in Federal Government | −0.040 (0.056) |
| Trust in Federal Government | −0.002 (0.055) |
| Trust in Federal Government | 0.011 (0.055) |
| Trust in Federal Government | 0.020 (0.057) |
| Republican governor | −0.376*** (0.111) |
| Republican mayor | −0.076 (0.166) |
| Age | 0.015*** (0.006) |
| Male | −0.041 (0.110) |
| African-American | 0.123 (0.210) |
| White | 0.237 (0.156) |
| Asian | 0.274* (0.159) |
| Previous government grant | −0.133 (0.110) |
| Islamic school | 0.424*** (0.140) |
| Education: Bachelor’s degree in college (4 years) | 0.452* (0.251) |
| Education: Doctoral degree | 0.125 (0.285) |
| Education: High school graduate (high school diploma or equivalent including GED) | 1.346 (0.895) |
| Education: Master’s degree | 0.472* (0.260) |
| Education: Professional degree (JD, MD) | 0JD85 (0.357) |
| Education: Some college but no degree | 0.180 (0.442) |
| Focus: Education and research | −0.255 (0.263) |
| Focus: Environment and animals | −0.344 (0.391) |
| Focus: Health | −0.019 (0.344) |
| Focus: International | −0.550 (0.339) |
| Focus: Other | −0.310 (0.358) |
| Focus: Public, societal benefit | −0.251 (0.295) |
| Focus: Religion | −0.234 (0.286) |
| Constant | 0.678 (0.603) |
| Observations | 252 |
| $R^2$ | .184 |
| Adjusted $R^2$ | .078 |
| Residual SE | 0.791 ($df = 222$) |
| $F$ statistic | 1.731** ($df = 29; 222$) |

*p < .1. **p < .05. ***p < .01.
affects these perceptions, as Muslim leaders living in Republican-led states are less likely to trust the government. Moreover, we find that racial discrimination affects leaders’ perception that the government will discriminate against Muslims. These data provide more substantial evidence that Muslims believe they are stereotyped as racialized rather than a religious minority. This study goes beyond merely Muslim-Americans and hints at broader issues of trust in government, particularly among nonprofits belonging to racialized minorities. It is also possible that in spite of the highly diverse nature of the Muslim-American community, misperceptions, and racialization by non-Muslims, along with collaboration with other racialized minorities, lead Muslim-American nonprofit leaders to fear ethnic more than religious discrimination.

This may impact Muslim-American perceptions and fears related to discrimination under Republican-led administrations since Republicans are perceived as favorable to religion but hostile to racial minorities. Local partisanship is not a significant factor in driving the trust gap. This may be because of the perception that local Democratic–Republican partisanship is less important than at state and federal levels. This perception may be based on the traditional understanding among citizens and scholars that partisanship does not matter in local politics (Adrian, 1952; Bailey & Rom, 2004; Ladd & Yinger, 1989). Although some recent research suggests partisanship plays a prominent role in local politics (Tausanovitch & Warshaw, 2014; Warshaw, 2019), it may be that the perception that partisan politics are unimportant continues to exist.

Perhaps most significantly, the data show that Muslim-Americans appear to use favorable government experiences to allay fears of discrimination. As stated earlier, Muslim-Americans are a highly diverse community and have no one ethnic or racial majority. Understanding how Muslim-Americans respond to crisis holds important lessons for other American nonprofit leaders and American society in general—especially given the demographic change emerging in the next few decades when America as a whole will transform from a majority-culture society to a multicultural society. Understanding how a highly diverse but racialized minority works with the government at all levels offers lessons for policy-makers to build trust bridges in the future.

This study makes a unique contribution to a broader literature on religious and racial discrimination by examining both types. It further shows how racial and religious discrimination may be combined in the Muslim-American experience, as Muslims appear to have been racialized in non-Muslim perception.

There is a significant body of literature addressing evidence of racial discrimination (Butler & Broockman, 2011; Gong, Xu, & Takeuchi, 2017; White et al., 2015); and, separately, addressing evidence of religious discrimination in American society (Dana et al., 2018; Lajevardi, 2020; Pfaff et al., 2020), but there is no research connecting the two. This research breaks ground as it illustrates how religious discrimination may combine or be subsumed by racial discrimination to the detriment of mutual understanding, acceptance, and appreciation between the Muslim community and society as a whole.

Another possibility is that these findings may have been affected and exaggerated by the protests in the wake of George Floyd’s death at the hands of the Minneapolis police. However, this is probably not the case since the survey was conducted beforehand. It is thus unlikely that the data and results were impacted either by his death or the ensuing protests and conversations.

This study is merely a starting point. More work needs to be done to understand levels of trust between government and nonprofits, and how misperceptions and discrimination issues impact their relationship. This study has several limitations. The study sample was based on
NTEE categories, which often do not account for all nonprofits in a single category. Similarly, future studies may gauge a larger sample of Muslim nonprofits or draw comparisons between Muslim nonprofits and other racialized minorities. Nonetheless, the study does break ground in minority-based philanthropy, specifically Muslim charity. It also assesses how perceptions of discrimination may exist among some nonprofits in the United States, thus opening up research avenues on issues of racial and faith-based discrimination.

While this study addresses Muslim perceptions of discrimination and mistrust, it does not test whether there was actual discrimination toward Muslim nonprofits in the CARES Act funding and disbursement. Future research should look at real-world experiences to see if there is real discrimination toward Muslim nonprofits in government work. Additionally, this study involves explicitly Muslim nonprofit organizations, which means that there are lower chances of generalizability in faith-based nonprofit organizations running in the United States. However, we believe that the lessons learned from the Muslim nonprofit sector are also likely to be generalizable to other racialized minorities in the United States like Jewish-Americans, African-Americans, Asians, and other groups. However, because of each group's specific experiences with the government, there may be some individual differences, a topic that future research can further explore.

Moreover, the research also opens avenues for discussion regarding trust that the nonprofit sector holds for the government. There is an opportunity for a broader discussion about discrimination both within and outside the nonprofit sector and in several other areas besides funding. There is an opportunity to delve more into whether specific religious or racialized minorities face discrimination in employment, promotion, or other aspects of their careers.

Similarly, there is an opportunity to delve into how distinguishing racial, religious, or other characteristics may affect nonprofit work with government, further, and whether there are implications for the nonprofit practitioner. This study also seems to indicate that government entities would be well-advised to take up trust-building measures to help create a robust atmosphere of equity and impartiality. Government entities need to engage more fully with nonprofits belonging to people of color and may also need to target them for specific relief acts. Similarly, nonprofits belonging to minorities also need to engage more fully to remove any lingering legacy of mistrust.

A 2020 study by the Washington DC-based think tank ISPU showed the diversity of political affiliation among Muslim-Americans. Some key findings are relevant to this discussion. In the community surveyed by ISPU, 65% of respondents believed they should be building coalitions with the Black Lives Matter movement. In comparison, 37% felt that the country was headed in the right direction. Of additional interest are similarities between Muslims and Jews, who both felt a certain amount of religious discrimination in the United States as a result of their faith (Mogahed & Ikramullah, 2020).

Another area for future research is a comparison between Muslim nonprofits and nonprofits of other racialized minority groups. It would also be informative to see whether perceptions change in light of the recent passage of the Biden administration’s $1.9 trillion bailout. While the COVID-19 pandemic may soon be over, the lessons learned during this crisis can improve nonprofit and other group relationships in future emergencies. The implications for the practitioner are clear. To develop a robust and trusting relationship with minority groups, the government needs to engage with them more regularly. Our findings suggest that earlier work with the government positively builds trust between the government and nonprofits.
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| Dependent variable                              | Trust in Federal Government (1) | Trust in State Government (2) | Trust in Local Government (3) |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Trust in State Government                      | 0.218*** (0.073)                | 0.483*** (0.058)            |                             |
| Trust in Federal Government                    | 0.176*** (0.059)                | 0.023 (0.060)               |                             |
| Trust in Local Government                      | -0.028 (0.075)                 | 0.492*** (0.059)            |                             |
| Trust in Muslim Community                      | 0.033 (0.031)                  | -0.025 (0.028)              | 0.089*** (0.027)            |
| Trust in Allah                                 | -0.068** (0.033)               | 0.046 (0.030)               | -0.118*** (0.029)          |
| Republican state                              | 0.100 (0.063)                  | -0.125** (0.056)            | -0.041 (0.056)              |
| Republican mayor                              | -0.073 (0.094)                 | 0.030 (0.085)               | 0.108 (0.084)               |
| Age                                            | 0.0004 (0.003)                 | -0.001 (0.003)              | -0.002 (0.003)              |
| Male                                           | 0.057 (0.063)                  | -0.039 (0.056)              | 0.116** (0.055)            |
| African-American                               | 0.081 (0.119)                  | -0.083 (0.107)              | 0.084 (0.106)               |
| White                                          | 0.066 (0.089)                  | 0.045 (0.080)               | 0.014 (0.079)               |
| Asian                                          | -0.095 (0.091)                 | -0.129 (0.082)              | 0.116 (0.081)               |
| Previous government Grant                      | 0.134** (0.062)                | 0.127** (0.056)             | -0.028 (0.056)              |
| Islamic school                                 | 0.126 (0.079)                  | -0.068 (0.072)              | 0.147** (0.071)            |
| Bachelor's degree in college (4 years)         | -0.150 (0.145)                 | -0.115 (0.130)              | 0.281** (0.128)            |
| Doctoral degree                                | -0.091 (0.163)                 | -0.083 (0.146)              | 0.283* (0.144)             |
| High school graduate (high school diploma or equivalent including GED) | -0.484 (0.507) | -0.222 (0.457) | 0.159 (0.453) |
| Master's degree                                | -0.159 (0.148)                 | 0.040 (0.134)               | 0.162 (0.132)              |
| Professional degree (JD, MD)                   | -JD309 (0.202)                 | -0.138 (0.183)              | 0.257 (0.181)              |
| Some college but no degree                     | -0.124 (0.255)                 | 0.118 (0.230)               | 0.464** (0.226)            |
| Education and research                         | 0.090 (0.151)                  | -0.087 (0.136)              | 0.253* (0.134)             |
| Environment and animals                        | -0.023 (0.222)                 | 0.190 (0.200)               | 0.183 (0.198)              |
| Health                                         | 0.115 (0.196)                  | -0.079 (0.177)              | 0.193 (0.175)              |
| Human services                                 | -0.067 (0.181)                 | -0.117 (0.163)              | 0.236 (0.161)              |
| International                                  | 0.216 (0.192)                  | -0.174 (0.173)              | 0.194 (0.172)              |
| Other                                          | 0.071 (0.205)                  | -0.345* (0.183)             | 0.341* (0.181)             |
| Public, societal benefit                       | -0.006 (0.168)                 | -0.048 (0.151)              | 0.180 (0.149)              |
| Religion                                       | 0.088 (0.163)                  | -0.198 (0.147)              | 0.237 (0.145)              |
| Constant                                       | 0.475 (0.333)                  | 0.323 (0.301)               | -0.087 (0.299)            |
| Observations                                   | 252                            | 252                         | 252                        |
| $R^2$                                          | .265                           | .412                        | .423                       |
| Adjusted $R^2$                                  | .176                           | .341                        | .354                       |
### TABLE A1  (Continued)

| Dependent variable | Trust in Federal Government (1) | Trust in State Government (2) | Trust in Local Government (3) |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Residual SE (df = 224) | 0.452                           | 0.406                           | 0.403                         |
| $F$ statistic (df = 27; 224) | 2.988***                       | 5.814***                       | 6.083***                      |

*p < .1. **p < .05. ***p < .01.

### TABLE A2  Logistic regression for discrimination (1 if Respondents said “Yes” to Discrimination)

| Dependent variable | Discrimination against Muslims |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Race-based discrimination | 0.204*** (0.060) |
| Faith-based discrimination | 0.019 (0.062) |
| Trust in Federal Government | −0.023 (0.031) |
| Trust in Federal Government | 0.015 (0.031) |
| Trust in Federal Government | 0.012 (0.031) |
| Trust in Federal Government | 0.007 (0.032) |
| Republican governor | −0.138** (0.062) |
| Republican mayor | −0.080 (0.092) |
| Age | 0.005* (0.003) |
| Male | 0.039 (0.061) |
| African-American | 0.141 (0.117) |
| White | 0.199** (0.087) |
| Asian | 0.161* (0.088) |
| Previous government Grant | −0.044 (0.061) |
| Islamic school | 0.230*** (0.078) |
| Education: Bachelor’s degree in college (4 years) | 0.195 (0.140) |
| Education: Doctoral degree | 0.014 (0.158) |
| Education: High school graduate (high school diploma or equivalent including GED) | 0.714 (0.497) |
| Education: Master’s degree | 0.170 (0.144) |
| Education: Professional degree (JD, MD) | 0JD25 (0.198) |
| Education: Some college but no degree | −0.096 (0.245) |
| Focus: Education and research | −0.201 (0.146) |
| Focus: Environment and animals | −0.178 (0.217) |
| Focus: Health | 0.051 (0.191) |
| Focus: Human services | −0.166 (0.177) |
| Focus: International | −0.204 (0.188) |
| Focus: Other | −0.083 (0.199) |

(Continues)
| Focus: Public, societal benefit | Dependent variable Discrimination against Muslims |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Focus: Religion               | −0.205 (0.164)                                  |
| Constant                      | −0.181 (0.159)                                  |
| Observations                  | 252                                             |
| $R^2$                          | 0.167                                           |
| Adjusted $R^2$                | 0.058                                           |
| Residual SE                   | 0.439 ($df = 222$)                             |
| $F$ statistic                 | 1.534** ($df = 29; 222$)                       |

*p < .1. **p < .05. ***p < .01.