Stereotyping Neighborhoods, Not Individuals? Testing the Race-Based Neighborhood Stereotyping Hypothesis

Katherine Pearson
Pennsylvania State University

Spring 2011

Although vast gains have been made in reducing racial inequality during the twentieth century, a persistent problem has been the consistently high levels of residential segregation between blacks and whites. Much research has demonstrated that blacks continue to have higher levels of segregation from whites than do either Hispanics or Asians (Logan, Stults, and Farley 2004). Research has revealed some reason for optimism, finding declines in segregation in recent decades (Logan et al. 2004; Fischer et al. 2004), but despite these declines overall levels of segregation remain high in many of the nation's largest metropolitan areas (Charles 2003). Explanations for continuing levels of residential segregation have traditionally focused on one of two factors: race and class. Class-based explanations maintain that residential segregation results from economic differences, and that the perceived racial inequalities are in fact due to racial disparities in economic standing. Race-based explanations, on the other hand, acknowledge the role of prejudice and discrimination as primary factors in shaping patterns of residential segregation.

The race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis, proposed by Ingrid Gould Ellen, represents a third explanation that combines elements from both race- and class-based theories. Similar to the class-based explanations, Ellen argues that whites are

primarily concerned with the quality and safety of neighborhoods rather than the racial composition of their potential neighbors. The theory incorporates race-based explanations, however, by noting that whites' assessments of the value and safety of a potential neighborhood are influenced by stereotypes about black or mixed neighborhoods. Ellen argues that white avoidance of mixed or predominately black areas should be seen not as an indication of dislike for blacks themselves, but rather a result of race-based stereotypes about black neighborhoods and the fear that integrated neighborhoods will decline in quality and safety (Ellen 2000).

Ellen demonstrates support for the race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis with data from the 1985-1993 American Housing Survey, matched with census tract-level variables from respondents' communities in both 1980 and 1990 obtained from the Urban Institute's Underclass Data Base. Using models predicting current neighborhood satisfaction, evaluation of current neighborhood attributes, housing unit turnover, and probability of entry into housing units, Ellen identifies three main conclusions that indicate support for race-based neighborhood stereotyping over explanations involving pure prejudice or class differences.

First, Ellen finds that while the current population of black residents in a neighborhood has no effect on either satisfaction with current neighborhood or decisions to move, the *rate of change* of that population does matter. She concludes that whites are equally satisfied in neighborhoods that are 10% black as in neighborhoods that are 50% black, but satisfaction decreases if whites feel the percent of black residents is increasing. Ellen argues that this refutes the pure prejudice model, since that perspective implies that people should be unhappier in neighborhoods with more black residents, unless people

had perfectly sorted themselves into neighborhoods by levels of racial tolerance.

Ellen's second finding in support of her theory indicates distinctions between homeowners and renters: the rate of change of the black population has a greater effect on both satisfaction with current neighborhood and mobility decisions for homeowners than for renters. This finding is consistent with the hypothesis, since homeowners are more deeply invested (financially and temporally) in the future of the community than renters, and are thus more likely to be affected by perceived future declines in neighborhood quality. If pure prejudice was operating, on the other hand, renters would be expected to be the first to move out of integrating neighborhoods due to their lower costs of relocation, and satisfaction would not be expected to vary based on homeownership status.

Ellen's third finding is along similar lines, revealing that the rate of change in the black population also has a greater effect on households with children than those without. Similar to homeowners, these households are presumed to be more invested in the community and thus more influenced by potential changes in neighborhood quality. The effect is shown to be especially strong among parents whose children attend public school, who are therefore likely to be more influenced by stereotypes of low-quality public schools in black neighborhoods. Furthermore, analyses of mobility patterns show that, as predicted by the race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis, people who move into integrated areas are likely to be younger, less affluent, and less likely to have children or own a home. This provides further support for the expectation that those with less investment in a community will be less affected by racial composition.

In spite of these arguments that white avoidance derives from neighborhood

stereotypes rather than pure prejudice, a closer examination reveals that these results are not, in fact, incompatible with pure prejudice models. Ihlanfeldt and Scafidi (Ihlanfeldt and Scafidi 2004) argue that, by carefully considering the decision-making process that a rational household would use when considering its mobility options, the results can be seen in a new light that supports race-based explanations as an alternative interpretation. The "decision-making calculus" employed is simple: "move only if the discounted sum of the expected utility losses from remaining in the present unit exceeds the cost of moving" (Ihlanfeldt and Scafidi 2004). Considering again the three major conclusions from Ellen's study, it can be seen that race-based explanations remain plausible.

Although it is reasonable that rates of change and not current populations of black residents would be significant if residents were influenced by concerns about future quality of neighborhoods and not about prejudices, as predicted by the race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis, the lack of significance of the current black population level does not necessarily imply the lack of racial prejudices. Although, as Ellen remarks, it is unlikely that residents have perfectly sorted themselves into neighborhoods whose current black populations exactly match their levels of racial tolerance, it is likely that selection of neighborhoods does matter to some degree. Furthermore, the contact hypothesis predicts that increased contact with minorities works to reduce prejudice (Ihlanfeldt and Scafidi 2004). It may be possible that increased contact with minorities compensates for the increased dissatisfaction that would otherwise be expected to be associated with minority neighbors. Finally, as Ihlanfeldt and Scafidi (2004:335) note, "It is changes in variables and not levels in variables that jar households out of equilibrium and cause them to move". Prejudiced individuals may

tolerate current racial composition as long as other factors outweigh the costs of living with such neighbors, but changes to that composition may be the factor that tips the balance against the current neighborhood.

Alternative explanations also exist for the distinctions found between homeowners and renters and households with and without children. Ellen expects that, if pure prejudice were operating, renters would be the first to leave when black populations increase, due to their lower costs of moving. However, homeowners expect to be in the area longer than renters, and they may be less willing to put up with an increasing population of blacks over that longer term than renters. Renters, who may be equally prejudiced but know they won't be in the neighborhood indefinitely, may decide that in the short term the benefits of the neighborhood outweigh the cost of living near a growing number of blacks (Ihlanfeldt and Scafidi 2004). Similarly, prejudiced parents may be more affected by changes in black population because they're more likely to see costs of living with blacks (in terms of their children's exposure to groups they consider to be morally or biologically inferior) as outweighing other benefits of neighborhood (Ihlanfeldt and Scafidi 2004).

Camille Zubrinsky Charles (2003) gives further reason to support the continued relevance of prejudice-based explanations with findings suggesting that differences between homeowners and parents may reflect an increased salience of particular racial stereotypes, such as intelligence and welfare dependence, among those groups of whites. Using data from the 1993-1994 Los Angeles Survey of Urban Inequality, she found that white homeowners exhibited significantly more negative stereotypes of blacks than did renters. The same relationship was found when comparing white parents to nonparents,

but it was not significant. Charles concluded that these results offer support for a pure prejudice interpretation, as they reveal that white homeowners (and perhaps parents) are more likely to hold particular negative stereotypes towards blacks themselves, not just towards black neighborhoods, and thus are likely to be more motivated to move out of integrated neighborhoods.

Ihlanfeldt and Scafadi also test the implications of the race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis, using data from the 1992 and 1994 Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality. They find no difference in willingness to live in integrated neighborhoods between homeowners and renters, or between households with and without children, indicating either that all groups are concerned about neighborhood quality to the same degree, or that racial prejudice does not differ between groups (Ihlanfeldt and Scafidi 2004). They conclude that their results offer no support for Ellen's claim that homeowners and parents would be most affected by neighborhood stereotypes, but note that the issue of whether prejudice or neighborhood stereotypes are to blame for whites' aversion to integrated neighborhoods remains unsolved (2004:356).

The extent to which neighborhood stereotypes are considered to be distinct from more traditional prejudice is clearly a matter of debate. In spite of findings revealing that a declining percentage of whites report adherence to traditional racial stereotypes (Ellen 2000), research continues to show that direct racial stereotypes play an important role in determining whites' neighborhood preferences. Comparing the results from several different analyses using data from the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality, Charles (2003) reports that racial stereotypes are consistently the most powerful predictor of neighborhood racial composition preferences across all racial categories. She confirms

these results using data from the 2000 General Social Survey, concluding that racial prejudice is of primary importance in understanding neighborhood composition preferences.

Using an innovative video experiment from the 2004 Detroit Area Study, Maria Krysan and colleagues (Krysan, Couper, Farley and Forman 2009) examined the extent to which racial composition affects whites' perceptions of neighborhood desirability. They find that although social class matters in determining desirability, racial composition plays a powerful role in shaping desirability as well. Krysan et al. offer a brief test of the neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis, finding mixed support for both neighborhood stereotyping and pure prejudice explanations: both racial stereotypes of individuals and the belief that property values will fall when blacks enter a neighborhood are significant predictors of desirability. This suggests that some combination of neighborhood stereotypes and personal prejudices are acting to determine whites' neighborhood preferences, but further investigation is needed to verify these results.

Krysan (2002) also conducted an investigation into whites' explanations for expressing a desire to leave neighborhoods that were becoming integrated. Consistent with the race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis, Krysan found that the most common reasons whites offer are race-associated neighborhood stereotypes, such as concerns about crime or property values. Krysan also found, however, that education plays a key role in determining whether whites give purely racial or neighborhood stereotypical reasons for leaving: controlling for income and homeownership, better-educated whites are both less willing to stereotype other racial groups and more likely to offer race-associated explanations for their desire to flee. Krysan interprets these results

as an indication that better-educated whites are not necessarily less prejudiced than other whites, but are more adept at expressing their stereotypes in subtle, seemingly race-neutral ways. She concludes that the distinction between directly racial and race-associated explanations is merely semantic: "in the end, each of the reasons is an articulation of a racial stereotype" (2002:693).

Given these concerns related to the accuracy of the race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis and its distinctness from more traditional stereotypical attitudes, further investigation is clearly needed. Studies of the effects of race on neighborhood preferences in real-world neighborhoods have frequently been limited by the fact that race and class are often inextricably intertwined, while studies utilizing vignettes and card techniques often make race such an explicit focus of the questioning that responses may be quite biased by concerns for social desirability. This study builds on the analysis by Krysan et al. (2009), making use of the video experiment embedded in the 2004 Detroit Area Study to examine the effects of race on neighborhood evaluations in a much more subtle way than had been possible using other methods. This study attempts to address the accuracy of the race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis as well to determine whether neighborhood stereotypes are distinct from racial stereotypes.

Data and Methods

The data analyzed in this study come from the 2004 Detroit Area Studies (DAS), a probability sample of Detroit area residents (living in Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb Counties) over the age of 21. A multistage stratified sampling strategy was used to collect oversamples of black residents and people living in racially-mixed areas. Seven hundred and thirty four interviews were completed, with a response rate of 56% (Krysan

et al. 2009). The data for this analysis is restricted to non-Hispanic whites, resulting in a sample size of 345 individuals. All analyses are weighted to account for sampling design and probability of selection.

The 2004 Detroit Area Studies included a video experiment that represents a unique innovation in techniques of investigating whites' neighborhood preferences. Thirteen videos were created, depicting neighborhoods of varying social class and racial composition. One video, showing an unblemished working class neighborhood, did not show any residents and thus the racial composition was left undetermined. The other 12 videos depicted neighborhoods of four social classes (blemished working class, blemished middle class, unblemished middle class, and unblemished upper middle class) and three racial compositions (white, black, and mixed). "Blemished" neighborhoods have well-kept homes but are marked by trash on the lawn, boarded-up garages, or vehicles being repaired. Three videos were filmed for each of the four social classes: one with all white residents, one with all black residents, and one with three white and two black residents. Although the actors portraying residents in the videos changed, the neighborhoods remained the same, and the residents were shown doing the same things in each version of the video. In this way, all neighborhood characteristics were held constant, with racial composition being the only thing to vary (Krysan 2009).

Respondents each viewed four videos. The first video, which was shown to every respondent, was the unblemished working class neighborhood with no residents. Respondents then saw three more videos of neighborhoods in the following order: blemished working class, middle class (half of the sample saw a

Figure 1: Number of Respondents Viewing Each Video

Video	Neighborhood Class	Neighborhood Racial Composition			
		None	White	Black	Mixed
1	Un-blemished working class	345			
2	Blemished working class		117	115	113
3	Blemished middle class		56	54	64
	Un-blemished middle class		56	45	70
4	Un-blemished upper middle class		116	131	98

blemished middle class and half saw an unblemished middle class neighborhood), and un-blemished upper middle class. For these three videos, racial composition was varied so that each person saw one video of all white residents, one of all black residents, and one of both white and black residents. Figure 1 illustrates the number of respondents viewing each video, by neighborhood racial composition and social class.

Although the majority of each interview was conducted via computer-assisted personal interview (CAPI), during the video section the computers were turned over to respondents, so that this section became a computer-assisted self interview (CASI). Respondents watched the videos and then responded directly to questions prompted by the computer, with the interviewer never knowing what their responses were. This method greatly reduces concerns of social desirability bias that have been present in numerous other studies that attempt to understand white racial attitudes. Additionally, the use of race in this experiment was unobtrusive, as respondents viewed many characteristics of a neighborhood without attention being specifically drawn to the racial composition. Because the residents themselves did not appear to be a central focus of the study, and because respondents were able to answer questions about the neighborhood privately, respondents' reactions to these neighborhoods are much less likely to be influenced by concerns for social desirability than in previous studies (Krysan et al. 2009). This experiment thus allows a more accurate representation of whites' reactions

to actual neighborhood conditions than previous studies that make race an explicit focus of questioning.

After watching each video, respondents were asked a series of questions about neighborhood conditions. Respondents were asked what they thought the price of a home in that neighborhood was, how desirable they thought the neighborhood was, how well cared for the properties and yards were, how safe the neighborhood was, what they thought would happen to property values over the next five years, and how good they thought the schools in that neighborhood were. In this study, neighborhood desirability will be the primary dependent variable, with the other five questions serving as measures of neighborhood stereotypes.

This study uses ordinary least squares regression to analyze the factors that influence whites' ratings of neighborhood desirability. To account for the within-person variation, the dataset was stacked so that each individual was represented by several cases, one for each video watched. The person identification number was used as the primary sampling unit to adjust for this clustering. The analysis begins by determining predictors of each of the five measures of neighborhood stereotypes: price, yard maintenance, safety, future property values, and school quality. Neighborhood-level characteristics (racial composition and social class) and respondent-level demographics (age, gender, marital status, education, political ideology, household income, and parenthood status) are used to predict each stereotype. Following this preliminary investigation, the primary dependent variable is the desirability ratings for the three experimental videos that depicted residents. Neighborhood-level characteristics and respondent demographics are again used as predictors, with the addition of several items

measuring traditional prejudice. The desirability rating from the first video with no residents is also included as a control of between-person differences in neighborhood preferences. The five neighborhood stereotypes are included as independent variables in these sets of analyses. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics and question wording for each of these measures.

RESULTS

The first set of analyses investigates the extent to which each of the five neighborhood stereotypes are, in fact, race-based. Ellen's discussion of race-based neighborhood stereotypes centers on evaluations of neighborhood quality and safety, which she predicts are determined by the racial composition of the neighborhood being evaluated. Because of its experimental design, the Detroit Area Study offers a unique opportunity to investigate the extent to which whites' perceptions of neighborhood quality and safety are actually determined by racial composition. Table 2 shows the results of regression models predicting four measures of neighborhood quality (current price, yard maintenance, future property values, and school quality) and one measure of neighborhood safety. Wald tests of the significance of the two race indicator variables are presented as well. These results indicate that the only neighborhood measures that are influenced by the racial composition of the neighborhood are safety and school quality. For these two measures, black neighborhoods are rated lower than white neighborhoods, although mixed neighborhoods are not significantly different from white neighborhoods. Evaluations of price, yard maintenance, and future property values, on the other hand, are not affected by the racial composition of the neighborhood, once class and respondent demographics are controlled.

These results seem puzzling, especially in light of Ellen's emphasis on future property values as the determining factor in whites' decisions to avoid black or mixed neighborhoods. If whites' perception of future property values does not depend on racial composition, then whites' avoidance of integrated or black neighborhoods cannot be explained as simply a desire to protect their financial investments from declining property values. It is less surprising that respondents' ratings of the current price of homes and maintenance of yards were unaffected by racial composition, because the homes and yards were directly observed by the respondents as they watched the videos. It is likely that there is less room for racial composition to affect ratings based on direct observations, compared with ratings of items such as safety and schools, which could not be observed directly in the video and therefore relied on more subjective evaluations of the neighborhood. The fact that perceptions of safety and ratings of school quality are influenced by racial composition does, however, provide some support for the preliminary assumption of the race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis: at least some of these measures of neighborhood quality and safety are dependent on the racial composition of the neighborhood.

I turn next to my primary evaluation of the validity of the race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis. Table 3 investigates the extent to which the previously examined neighborhood stereotypes mediate the effect of race on neighborhood desirability. Models I through III confirm the findings by Krysan et al. (2009) that racial composition does influence neighborhood desirability. Model IV extends this analysis further, however, by including the five measures of neighborhood stereotypes. If, as Ellen maintains, racial composition matters only in that it affects

whites' evaluations of neighborhoods, then neighborhood stereotypes will mediate the effect of racial composition on neighborhood desirability. Model IV shows that this is exactly what happens. Although racial composition remained significant as neighborhood class and respondent demographics were controlled for, the addition of neighborhood stereotypes greatly reduces the magnitude of the coefficients. Mixed neighborhoods are no longer significantly different from white neighborhoods, and although black neighborhoods remain significantly different from white neighborhoods, the magnitude of the coefficient has been reduced by about half. This is strong support for the race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis, indicating that neighborhood stereotypes do indeed explain much of the effect of racial composition on neighborhood desirability. It is important to note, however, that the effect of racial composition is not completely explained by neighborhood stereotypes: black neighborhoods continue to be rated as less desirable than white neighborhoods, even when neighborhood stereotypes are controlled.

The remaining analyses attempt to determine whether neighborhood stereotypes are distinct from stereotypes and prejudice towards blacks themselves. Although Table 3 reveals support for the primary argument of the race-based neighborhoods stereotyping hypothesis, it does not address critiques that neighborhood stereotypes may be proxies for a continuing negative affect towards blacks themselves, or may result from prejudice towards black individuals. Tables 4 and 5 show the results of analyses investigating whether race moderates the effect of neighborhood stereotypes on desirability. If race affects desirability only by influencing whites' evaluations of the neighborhood in terms of quality and safety, then none of the interactions between race and neighborhood

stereotypes should be significant. If there are interactions between neighborhood stereotypes and racial composition, however, it may indicate that neighborhood stereotypes are in fact connected to traditional prejudice.

The data provide some support for this hypothesis. Table 4 uses a single scale to measure neighborhood stereotypes, calculated by summing the values for each of the five stereotypes and then standardizing. The results show that the neighborhood stereotype scale interacts with racial composition, working to suppress the increase in desirability that results from increasingly positive ratings of neighborhoods in black and mixed neighborhoods, compared to white neighborhoods. The results show that a one-unit increase in the neighborhood stereotype scale, indicating a more favorable rating of neighborhoods, has a bigger payoff in terms of desirability in white neighborhoods than in black neighborhoods.

These results are examined further in Table 5, which shows interactions for each of the five neighborhood stereotypes separately. The interactions all run in the direction indicated in Table 4, although they are significant for only two stereotypes: yard maintenance and safety. The interaction between yard maintenance and race reveals that while an increase in the perception that yards and properties are well maintained results in an increase in desirability regardless of racial composition, the increase in desirability is more than two and a half times larger in white neighborhoods as in black neighborhoods, and almost one and a half times as large as in mixed neighborhoods. Similarly, increases in the perception of safety have a bigger effect on desirability in white neighborhoods than in black or mixed neighborhoods. The increase in desirability due to a one-unit increase in perception of safety is 76% larger in white neighborhoods

than in black neighborhoods, and 46% larger in white neighborhoods than in mixed neighborhoods.

The finding that safety affects desirability differently depending on racial composition indicates that the importance of safety as a predictor of desirability may involve more than a race-neutral desire to live in a safe place. The race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis would predict that racial composition affects perceptions of neighborhood safety, as was demonstrated in Table 2. The hypothesis states, however, that although whites' perception of safety and quality may be influenced by racial stereotypes about which kinds of neighborhoods are safe and high quality, the stereotypes themselves reflect only race-neutral desires to live in safe and high-quality neighborhoods. Although whites may perceive black or mixed neighborhoods to be less safe than white neighborhoods, an equal level of safety should result in equal increases desirability, since whites' true concern is with safety itself, and not prejudice towards potential neighbors. Table 5 illustrates, however, that the increase in desirability associated with increasing safety and yard maintenance is suppressed in black and mixed neighborhoods.

Although these findings raise the possibility that neighborhood stereotypes may involve more than just evaluations of neighborhoods, the results are not conclusive. A second way of examining the possible connections between racial stereotypes and neighborhood stereotypes can be seen by returning to Table 3. Models III and IV in Table 3 also test whether neighborhood stereotypes mediate the effect of traditional racial stereotypes on desirability, in addition to mediating the effect of racial composition on desirability. The race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis draws a sharp

distinction between racial stereotypes directed towards minorities themselves and neighborhood stereotypes that are based on perceptions of minority neighborhoods. If stereotypes of individuals and stereotypes of neighborhoods are indeed distinct, then the effect the measures of prejudice (stereotypes of individuals) on desirability should not be influenced by neighborhood stereotypes. If neighborhood stereotypes are simply an extension of prejudice towards individuals, however, then the inclusion of neighborhood stereotypes in the model would be expected to mediate the effect of prejudice on neighborhood desirability.

Models III and IV reveals that this is in fact the case. Although measures of prejudice are significant in Model III, the inclusion of neighborhood stereotypes in Model IV greatly reduces the coefficients of each measure of prejudice, and renders all but two insignificant. This is evidence that traditional prejudice towards individuals is closely connected to neighborhood stereotypes: neighborhood stereotypes are the mechanism through which prejudice affects neighborhood desirability. These results are consistent with Krysan's (2002) conclusions that neighborhood stereotypes are not distinct from prejudices against black individuals themselves, but are in fact "less blatant expressions of what are, nevertheless, fundamentally negative racial attitudes."

Discussion and Conclusion

The use of video vignettes in the 2004 Detroit Area Study allows for a unique opportunity to explore the true effects of race on whites' neighborhood preferences, and the extent to which those preferences are driven by neighborhood stereotypes or prejudice towards individuals. The results from this study reveal mixed support for Ingrid Gould Ellen's race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis. Although neighborhood

stereotypes themselves were shown to mediate the effect of race on neighborhood desirability, as predicted by the neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis, the extent to which these neighborhood stereotypes are distinct from traditional racial prejudice is called into question. Neighborhood stereotypes are clearly central in explaining the effect of race on neighborhood desirability, but these stereotypes towards neighborhoods do not appear to represent the departure from racial stereotypes towards individuals themselves that Ellen describes.

This analysis offers a global approach to the issue of neighborhood stereotypes, beginning by examining the stereotypes themselves to determine the extent to which each is, in fact, race-based. The results offer a mixed support for the assumption that neighborhood stereotypes are race-based, given that racial composition was a significant predictor in only two of the five neighborhood stereotypes. According to the analysis, safety and school quality are the only 'race-based' neighborhood stereotypes.

The lack of significance of race in predicting future property values is particularly important, given Ellen's emphasis on future neighborhood quality as one of the primary mechanisms underlying the race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis. When asked directly, 47% of whites in this sample answered that it was either somewhat or very likely that property values will fall when blacks move into a neighborhood. Yet when results from the video experiment are examined, racial composition does not affect whites' predictions of future property values. The video experiments provide a subtle test of whites' perceptions of neighborhoods, because race was manipulated without informing respondents that it was a subject of interest. The fact that, when this subtle measurement is used, racial composition does not affect predictions of property values

indicates that the claim of falling property values due to the presence of black families may be simply a more socially acceptable method of expressing prejudice towards blacks themselves.

In spite of the findings that not all neighborhood stereotypes are influenced by racial composition, however, the race-based assumption of the neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis can be accepted, at least with respect to certain types of stereotypes.

The results of this study show a great deal of support for Ellen's primary contention, that neighborhood stereotypes explain the effect of racial composition on whites' neighborhood preferences. Although racial composition is a significant predictor of neighborhood desirability after controlling for class and respondent demographics, the inclusion of the five neighborhood stereotypes greatly reduces the effect of racial composition. Coupled with the finding that at least some of these stereotypes can be considered to be race-based, this study reveals strong support for the contention that race-based neighborhood stereotypes do, indeed, explain the effect of racial composition on neighborhood desirability.

It is important to note that future property values are not a significant predictor of neighborhood desirability. Coupled with the finding that perceptions of future property values are not influenced by neighborhood racial composition, this finding gives reason to be skeptical of one of Ellen's primary findings in support of the race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis: that the main reason whites avoid black or integrated neighborhoods is out of concern for declining property values and the resulting financial losses that would be sustained. Ellen found that white homeowners are more affected by neighborhood racial composition, and especially changes in that composition,

than are white renters. Because she assumes that prejudice would affect homeowners and renters equally, she interprets this difference as a reflection of the different levels of financial investment in neighborhoods between homeowners and renters. If, however, whites' assessment of future property values are truly not affected by racial composition, and future property values do not affect neighborhood desirability, then it is unlikely that the difference between homeowners and renters can be explained by level of financial investment in the community.

There are several reasons to be cautious in drawing this conclusion, however. Neighborhood desirability is quite different from actual mobility decisions, and it is possible that whites may find neighborhoods desirable in their current condition, in spite of the belief that property values will fall. Future property values may be much more influential in determining actual mobility decisions than desirability ratings. Additionally, Ellen's analyses of current neighborhood satisfaction and exit decisions emphasize the importance of *changes* in racial composition rather than current levels. The video vignettes offer an indication only of current racial composition, and as a result the impact of changing racial composition on property values may be overlooked.

Although far from offering a complete answer, this concern can be partially addressed by examining the relationship between property values and mixed neighborhoods. One contention of the race-based neighborhood stereotyping hypothesis is that whites assume that mixed neighborhoods will quickly become predominately black (Ellen 2000:4). It is possible, therefore, that mixed neighborhoods would indicate to white respondents the possibility for high rates of change, while black neighborhoods would indicate low rates of change, as the neighborhood is already all-black. If rates of

change are influential in determining the effect of property values, then it is likely that future property values would have more of an effect in mixed neighborhoods than in white or black neighborhoods. The fact that the interaction between mixed neighborhoods and future property values is insignificant suggests that property values may be irrelevant regardless of either current neighborhood composition or potential changes to that composition. It is also possible, however, that mixed neighborhoods are simply not a good proxy measure for rate of change. Future research should address the issue of whether racial composition, and specifically changes to that composition, affects whites' assessment of future property values. In spite of these concerns, this finding does suggest that whites' opposition to integrated neighborhoods is purely the result of race-neutral economic interests. This finding is consistent with Ihlanfeldt and Scafadi's (2004) argument that homeowners and renters may be equally prejudiced, but homeowners may be more motivated to leave integrated neighborhoods because of the longer amount of time they would otherwise expect to be living near people they find undesirable.

In addition to this speculation regarding the role of economic interests in motivating whites' avoidance of integrated areas, this study offers several concrete reasons to believe that neighborhood stereotypes are more closely tied to prejudice towards individuals than Ellen's theory allows. The finding that several neighborhood stereotypes interact with racial composition indicates that whites perceive these stereotypes differently depending on the race of the neighborhood. If whites are truly concerned only with neighborhood quality and safety, then those factors should not be expected to result in different effects on desirability depending on racial composition.

The fact that racial composition moderates the effect of certain neighborhood stereotypes on neighborhood desirability indicates that race matters in ways not predicted by Ellen's hypothesis. That an equal increase in perception of safety results in a greater increase in desirability for white neighborhoods than for black neighborhoods implies that something other than a race-neutral desire to live in a neighborhood one perceives to be safe is operating, serving to suppress the effect of increases in positive evaluations of black neighborhoods.

A second strong argument for the interconnectedness of neighborhood stereotypes and traditional racial stereotypes is the finding that neighborhood stereotypes mediate not only the effect of racial composition, but also the effect of traditional prejudice on neighborhood desirability. This implies that traditional prejudice affects neighborhood stereotypes, which in turn affect neighborhood desirability. If neighborhood stereotypes were truly distinct from pure prejudice, as Ellen argues, then neighborhood stereotypes could not mediate the effect of prejudice. Combined with the findings that racial composition moderates the effect of some neighborhood stereotypes on desirability, and the finding that assessment of future property values is both not race-based and not a significant predictor of desirability, this study casts doubt on Ellen's assertion that neighborhood stereotypes are distinct from racial stereotypes. This study does find strong support for the argument that neighborhood stereotypes explain the effect of racial composition on neighborhood desirability for whites, but it appears that neighborhood stereotypes simply represent an alternative method of expressing dislike towards and stereotypes about black neighbors themselves, in addition to the types of neighborhoods in which blacks are perceived to live.

REFERENCES

Charles, Camille Zubrinsky. 2003. "The Dynamics of Racial Residential Segregation." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:167-207.

Ellen, I G. 2000. *Sharing America's neighborhoods: The prospects for stable racial integration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ Pr.

Fischer, Claude S, Gretchen Stockmayer, Jon Stiles, and Michael Hout. 2004. "Distinguishing the geographic levels and social dimensions of U.S. metropolitan segregation, 1960-2000." 41:37-59.

Ihlanfeldt, K R, and B Scafidi. 2004. "Whites' neighbourhood racial preferences and neighbourhood racial composition in the United States: evidence from the multi-city study of urban inequality." 19:325-359.

Logan, John R, Brian J Stults, and Reynolds Farley. 2004. "Segregation of minorities in the metropolis: two decades of change." 41:1-22.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	St. Dev.	Description
Desire	4.60	1.535	Desirability ratings for the three videos with actors. "How would you rate the neighborhood you just saw as a place to live?" Coded with 1=very undesirable and 7=very desirable.
Neighborhood-Level Characteristics			
Black	0.334	0.472	Coded 1 if all residents in the neighborhood were black; 0 otherwise
Mixed	0.333	0.472	Coded 1 if three residents were white and two were black; 0 otherwise
White	0.333	0.472	Coded 1 if all residents in the neighborhood were white; 0 otherwise
Blemished Working Class	0.333	0.472	Coded 1 for blemished working class neighborhood; 0 otherwise.
Blemished Middle Class	0.175	0.380	Coded 1 for blemished middle class neighborhood; 0 otherwise.
Middle Class	0.159	0.366	Coded 1 for middle class neighborhood; 0 otherwise.
Upper Middle Class	0.334	0.472	Coded 1 for upper middle class neighborhood; 0 otherwise. Every respondent saw the same version of this video, with no residents pictured.
Demographics			
Age	49.59	16.28	Age of respondent
Female	0.515	0.500	Coded 1 if respondent was female; 0 otherwise
Married	0.634	0.482	Coded 1 if respondent was married; 0 otherwise
Education			
Less than High School	0.079	0.271	Coded 1 if respondent had no degree and less than a high school education; 0 otherwise
High School or equivalent	0.265	0.442	Coded 1 if respondent had a high school degree; 0 otherwise
Some college, No Degree	0.273	0.446	Coded 1 if respondent had some college but no degree; 0 otherwise
Associate's Degree	0.075	0.263	Coded 1 if respondent had an associate's degree; 0 otherwise
Bachelor's Degree	0.146	0.353	Coded 1 if respondent had a bachelor's degree; 0 otherwise
Post-Graduate Degree	0.125	0.331	Coded 1 if respondent had a master's, professional, or doctorate degree; 0 otherwise
Other Degree	0.037	0.188	Coded 1 if respondent had any other type of degree; 0 otherwise
Ideology	4.170	1.281	"We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. On page 42 in the booklet is a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place yourself on this scale?". Coded 1=very liberal to 7=very conservative
Parent	0.381	0.486	Coded 1 if respondent has children under the age of 18 at home; 0 otherwise
Household Income	9.181	3.758	"Which letter on the booklet page fits your total family income in 2003 before taxes?" Coded 1=None or less than $5,000; 2=$5,000 to $9,999; 3=$10,000 to $14,999; 4=$15,000 to $19,999; 5=$20,000 to $29,999; 6=$30,000 to $39,999; 7=$40,000 to $49,999; 8=$50,000 to $59,999; 9=$60,000 to $69,999; 10=$70,000 to $79,999; 11=$80,000 to $89,999; 12=$90,000 to $99,999; 13=$100,000 to $124,999; 14=$125,000 to $149,999; 15=$150,000 or more.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	St. Dev.	Description
Traditional Prejudice			
Blacks should work hard like other ethnicities	2.993	0.801	"Many people say Irish, Italian, Jewish, and many other ethnic groups overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Minorities today should do the same without any special favors." Coded from 1=Strongly Disagree to 4=Strongly Agree.
Blacks are involved in gangs	1.129	1.520	"Where would you rate [Whites/Blacks] in general on this scale where 1 means tends to not be involved with street crime or gangs and 7 means tends to be involved with street crime or gangs?" Coded by subtracting score respondents gave whites as a group from the score they gave blacks as a group.
Blacks are on welfare	0.651	1.827	"Where would you rate [Whites/Blacks] in general on this scale where 1 means tends to prefer to be self-supporting and 7 means tends to prefer to live off welfare?" Coded by subtracting score respondents gave whites as a group from the score they gave blacks as a group.
Blacks are Unintelligent	-1.266	1.550	"Where would you rate [Whites/Blacks] in general on this scale, where 1 means tends to be unintelligent and 7 means tends to be intelligent?" Coded by subtracting score respondents gave whites as a group from the score they gave blacks as a group.
Blacks don't care for kids	0.969	1.330	The last set of characteristics asks if people in each group tend to do a good job of supervising their children or tend to do a bad job of supervising their children. Where would you rate [Whites/Blacks in general on this scale where "1" means tends to do a bad job of supervising their children and a "7" means tends to do a good job of supervising their children? Coded by subtracting score respondents gave whites as a group from the score they gave blacks as a group.
Blacks don't take care of their yards	2.946	0.988	"The next questions ask for your opinions about the reasons why Blacks tend to live in less desirable homes or neighborhoods than Whites... The first reason blacks have less desirable housing is... because Blacks don't take good care of their houses and yards. Do you think this happens very often, often, sometimes, rarely, or almost never?" Coded 1=Almost never to 5=Very Often
*Neighborhood Stereotypes**			
Price	3.733	1.597	"On average, what do you think a home costs in the neighborhood in the video?" Coded with 1=Under $25,000; 2=$25,000 to $59,999; 3=$60,000 to $99,999; 4=$100,000 to $149,999; 5=$150,000 to $199,999; 6=$200,000 to $249,999; 7=$250,000 to $299,999; 8=$300,000 or more.
Yard	3.829	1.594	"How would you rate the neighborhood you just saw in terms of people taking care of their property and yard?" Coded with 1=People take very poor care of property and yard through 7=People take excellent care of property and yard.
Safety	3.872	1.373	"How unsafe or safe do you think the neighborhood in the video looks like it would be?" Coded with 1=Very unsafe through 7=Very Safe.
Property Value	3.749	1.407	"What do you think will happen to property values over the next five years?" Coded with 1=Property values will decrease a lot through 7=Property values will increase a lot.
Schools	3.681	1.339	"How about the schools in the neighborhood in the video? What would be your best guess about the quality of the schools?" Coded with 1=Very Poor Schools through 7=Excellent Schools.

** These five stereotype measures combine ratings of the neighborhoods in the three experimental videos each respondent viewed showing residents of varying racial composition. Ratings on these same items referring to the neighborhood in the control video with no residents were also used in models to control for differences between respondents.*

Table 2: Predictors of Neighborhood Stereotypes (N=275)

	Price			Yard			Safety			Future Property Values			Schools		
	B	S.E.	Sig.	B	S.E.	Sig.	B	S.E.	Sig	B	S.E.	Sig.	B	S.E.	Sig.
Constant	2.511	2.511		3.806	0.315	***	4.074	0.608	***	3.574	0.315	***	3.171	0.298	***
Neighborhood-level Characteristics															
Race															
Black	-0.081	0.085		-0.029	0.112		-0.346	0.111	**	-0.153	0.099		-0.280	0.086	***
Mixed	-0.055	0.078		0.007	0.105		-0.186	0.101	+	-0.038	0.099		-0.132	0.097	
(White)	—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—	
Neighborhood Class															
Blemished Working Class	-2.849	0.087	***	-2.393	0.102	***	-1.759	0.109	***	-1.947	0.110	***	-1.911	0.098	***
Blemished Middle Class	-1.616	0.098	***	-1.431	0.132	***	-1.209	0.130	***	-1.074	0.102	***	-1.093	0.104	***
Middle Class	-0.620	0.109	***	0.118	0.111		-0.110	0.113		-0.107	0.102		-0.270	0.108	*
(Upper Middle Class)	—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—	
Neighborhood 1 Control	0.5309	0.076	***	0.275	0.033	***	0.268	0.059	***	0.355	0.039	***	0.35	0.0392	***
Demographics															
Age	-0.001	0.004		-0.004	0.003		-0.006	0.004		-0.005	0.003		-0.001	0.003	
Female	-0.084	0.114		0.042	0.092		0.003	0.102		0.078	0.095		-0.022	0.083	
Married	-0.068	0.110		-0.116	0.107		-0.018	0.099		0.051	0.112		0.055	0.103	
Education															
Less than High School	0.699	0.323	*	0.562	0.212	**	0.220	0.200		0.459	0.204	*	0.535	0.224	*
(High School or equivalent)	—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—	
Some college, No Degree	0.157	0.130		0.169	0.129		0.067	0.145		0.331	0.130	*	0.230	0.116	*
Associate's Degree	0.336	0.205		0.352	0.165	*	0.175	0.172		0.518	0.131	***	0.536	0.163	***
Bachelor's Degree	0.347	0.169	*	0.292	0.141	*	0.185	0.155		0.387	0.163	*	0.367	0.130	**
Post-Graduate Degree	0.243	0.187		0.238	0.152		0.215	0.188		0.253	0.204		0.177	0.156	
Other Degree	0.592	0.189	**	0.225	0.317		0.174	0.179		0.140	0.290		0.442	0.255	+
Ideology	0.107	0.056	+	0.052	0.036		0.040	0.035		-0.000	0.037		0.055	0.033	
Parent	-0.048	0.107		0.021	0.104		-0.086	0.115		-0.057	0.113		-0.027	0.097	
Household Income	0.015	0.016		-0.048	0.015	***	-0.042	0.019	*	-0.055	0.015	***	-0.041	0.014	**
R^2	0.671			0.578			0.432			0.521			0.524		
Wald test of significance of Race	F=	0.470		F=	0.080		F=	4.820	*	F=	1.390		F=	5.330	**

Note: Omitted categories for dummy variables are in parenthesis

+ $p \leq 0.1$ * $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

Table 3: Neighborhood Stereotypes as Mediators of the Effect of Race on Desirability (N=275)

	Model I			Model II			Model III			Model IV		
	B	S.E.	Sig	B	S.E.	Sig	B	S.E.	Sig.	B	S.E.	Sig.
Constant	4.852	0.118	***	4.639	0.266	***	4.968	0.427	***	1.177	0.379	**
Race of Neighborhood												
Black	-0.436	0.176	*	-0.378	0.123	**	-0.379	0.123	**	-0.188	0.085	*
Mixed	-0.317	0.161	*	-0.205	0.104	+	-0.205	0.104	+	-0.114	0.072	
(White)	—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—	
Neighborhood Class												
Blemished Working Class				-2.146	0.114	***	-2.146	0.114	***	-0.123	0.145	
Blemished Middle Class				-1.435	0.132	***	-1.458	0.133	***	-0.206	0.118	+
Middle Class				-0.256	0.141	+	-0.231	0.139	+	-0.111	0.115	
(Upper Middle Class)				—	—		—	—		—	—	
Neighborhood Control												
Desire of Neighborhood 1				0.295	0.054	***	0.255	0.047	***	0.074	0.041	+
Demographics												
Age							-0.003	0.003		-0.002	0.003	
Female							0.059	0.095		0.089	0.072	
Married							-0.159	0.110		-0.128	0.078	
Education												
Less than High School							0.351	0.202	+	-0.123	0.138	
(High School or equivalent)							—	—				
Some college, No Degree							0.160	0.129		-0.035	0.104	
Associate's Degree							0.327	0.275		-0.062	0.187	
Bachelor's Degree							0.288	0.167	+	-0.115	0.122	
Post-Graduate Degree							0.348	0.158	*	-0.033	0.128	
Other Degree							0.334	0.376		0.018	0.298	
Ideology							0.071	0.039	+	-0.010	0.029	
Parent							-0.153	0.116		-0.136	0.091	
Household Income							-0.046	0.017	**	-0.009	0.013	
Prejudice												
Blacks should work hard							0.124	0.062	*	-0.010	0.046	
Blacks don't take care of yards							-0.119	0.062	+	0.031	0.048	
Blacks are involved in crime							-0.089	0.038	*	-0.071	0.027	**
Blacks are on welfare							0.086	0.031	**	0.049	0.021	*
Blacks are unintelligent							-0.095	0.034	**	-0.007	0.020	
Blacks don't take care of kids							-0.047	0.046		0.001	0.034	
Neighborhood Stereotypes												
Price										0.138	0.033	***
Yard										0.234	0.071	***
Safety										0.360	0.075	***
Property Value										0.131	0.051	**
Schools										0.095	0.072	
R^2		0.014			0.452			0.511			0.758	
Wald test of significance of Race												

Note: Omitted categories for dummy variables are in parenthesis
+ p ≤ 0.1 * p ≤ 0.05 ** p ≤ 0.01 *** p ≤ 0.001

Table 4: Race as a Moderator of the Effect of Neighborhood Stereotype Scale on Desirability (N=275)

	Model I			Model II		
	B	S.E.	Sig.	B	S.E.	Sig.
Constant	4.777	0.385	***	4.783	0.368	***
Race of Neighborhood						
Black	0.088	-2.270	***	-0.198	0.090	*
Mixed	-0.124	0.075	+	-0.112	0.073	
(White)	—	—		—	—	
Neighborhood Class						
Blemished Working Class	0.008	0.138		0.002	0.139	
Blemished Middle Class	-0.169	0.125		-0.166	0.126	
Middle Class	-0.056	0.104		-0.052	0.103	
(Upper Middle Class)	—	—		—	—	
Demographics						
Desire of Neighborhood 1	0.083	0.039	*	0.079	0.039	*
Age	-0.002	0.003		-0.002	0.003	
Female	0.101	0.074		0.109	0.073	
Married	-0.132	0.079	+	-0.121	0.078	
Education						
Less than High School	-0.145	0.136		-0.139	0.134	
(High School or equivalent)	—	—		—	—	
Some college, No Degree	-0.057	0.102		-0.052	0.101	
Associate's Degree	-0.130	0.197		-0.117	0.193	
Bachelor's Degree	-0.124	0.118		-0.128	0.114	
Post-Graduate Degree	-0.028	0.128		-0.032	0.126	
Other Degree	-0.001	0.307		0.007	0.298	
Ideology	-0.014	0.030		-0.019	0.029	
Parent	-0.144	0.094		-0.153	0.092	+
Household Income	-0.009	0.012		-0.009	0.012	
Prejudice						
Blacks should work hard	-0.008	0.047		-0.010	0.045	
Blacks don't take care of yards	0.039	0.045		0.042	0.045	
Blacks are involved in crime	-0.064	0.026	*	-0.062	0.025	*
Blacks are on welfare	0.050	0.021	*	0.052	0.021	*
Blacks are unintelligent	-0.006	0.020		-0.015	0.019	
Blacks don't take care of kids	-0.009	0.032		-0.011	0.031	
Neighborhood Stereotypes						
Neighborhood Stereotype Scale	0.199	0.011	***	0.218	0.011	***
Interactions						
N. stereo*black				-0.036	0.013	**
N. Stereo*mixed				-0.018	0.011	+
$\mathbf{R^2}$		0.748			0.752	

Note: Omitted categories for dummy variables are in parenthesis

+ p ≤ 0.1 * p ≤ 0.05 ** p ≤ 0.01 *** p ≤ 0.001

Table 5: Race as a Moderator of the Effect of Neighborhood Stereotypes on Desirability (N=275)

	Model I			Model II			Model III			Model IV			Model V			Model VI		
	B	S.E.	Sig.	B	S.E.	Sig.	B	S.E.	Sig.	B	S.E.	Sig.	B	S.E.	Sig	B	S.E.	Sig
Constant	1.177	0.379	**	0.971	0.402	*	0.360	0.069	***	0.808	0.429	+	1.037	0.415	*	0.926	0.434	*
Race of Neighborhood																		
Black	-0.188	0.085	*	0.213	0.235		0.589	0.235	*	0.425	0.275		0.231	0.218		0.272	0.252	
Mixed	-0.114	0.072		0.074	0.177		0.285	0.235		0.345	0.245		-0.062	0.222		0.183	0.248	
(White)																		
Neighborhood Class																		
Blemished Working Class	-0.123	0.145		-0.123	0.145		-0.135	0.145		-0.136	0.144		-0.143	0.143		-0.133	0.144	
Blemished Middle Class	-0.206	0.118	+	-0.208	0.118	+	-0.203	0.117	+	-0.199	0.117	+	-0.217	0.118	+	-0.205	0.119	+
Middle Class	-0.111	0.115		-0.103	0.115		-0.092	0.114		-0.102	0.112		-0.118	0.115		-0.110	0.114	
(Upper Middle Class)																		
Demographics																		
Desire of Neighborhood 1	0.074	0.041	+	0.070	0.040	+	0.067	0.039	+	0.070	0.040	+	0.071	0.040	+	0.070	0.040	+
Age	-0.002	0.003		-0.002	0.003		-0.002	0.003		-0.002	0.003		-0.002	0.003		-0.002	0.003	
Female	0.089	0.072		0.095	0.072		0.105	0.070		0.095	0.072		0.091	0.071		0.092	0.072	
Married	-0.128	0.078		-0.119	0.077		-0.117	0.075		-0.119	0.078		-0.127	0.078		-0.122	0.077	
Education																		
Less than High School	-0.123	0.138		-0.115	0.139		-0.102	0.135		-0.122	0.138		-0.120	0.136		-0.121	0.136	
(High School or equivalent)																		
Some college, No Degree	-0.035	0.104		-0.028	0.103		-0.026	0.101		-0.034	0.104		-0.031	0.103		-0.032	0.103	
Associate's Degree	-0.062	0.187		-0.052	0.185		-0.056	0.180		-0.068	0.185		-0.045	0.185		-0.051	0.186	
Bachelor's Degree	-0.115	0.122		-0.108	0.120		-0.113	0.114		-0.125	0.118		-0.119	0.120		-0.121	0.119	
Post-Graduate Degree	-0.033	0.128		-0.038	0.128		-0.042	0.125		-0.039	0.129		-0.021	0.127		-0.038	0.128	
Other Degree	0.018	0.298		0.029	0.292		-0.002	0.286		0.018	0.288		0.009	0.294		0.030	0.293	
Ideology	-0.010	0.029		-0.012	0.028		-0.012	0.028		-0.014	0.028		-0.017	0.028		-0.013	0.028	
Parent	-0.136	0.091		-0.143	0.090		-0.143	0.088		-0.142	0.091		-0.146	0.090		-0.140	0.091	
Household Income	-0.009	0.013		-0.009	0.012		-0.009	0.012		-0.009	0.012		-0.008	0.012		-0.009	0.012	
Blacks should work hard	-0.010	0.046		-0.010	0.045		-0.014	0.044		-0.016	0.045		-0.011	0.046		-0.014	0.045	
Blacks don't take care of yards	0.031	0.048		0.031	0.048		0.039	0.047		0.037	0.048		0.035	0.048		0.033	0.048	
Blacks are involved in crime	-0.071	0.027	**	-0.069	0.026	**	-0.069	0.026	**	-0.072	0.027	**	-0.070	0.026	**	-0.071	0.026	**
Blacks are on welfare	0.049	0.021	*	0.049	0.020	*	0.054	0.020	**	0.053	0.021	*	0.049	0.020	*	0.050	0.020	*
Blacks are unintelligent	-0.007	0.020		-0.014	0.019		-0.019	0.018		-0.013	0.019		-0.012	0.019		-0.013	0.019	
Blacks don't take care of kids	0.001	0.034		0.001	0.033		-0.004	0.031		0.000	0.033		-0.001	0.033		0.001	0.033	
Neighborhood Stereotypes																		
Price	0.138	0.033	***	0.185	0.044	***	0.139	0.031	***	0.139	0.032	***	0.136	0.032	***	0.136	0.032	***
Yard	0.234	0.071	***	0.231	0.071	***	0.320	0.068	***	0.221	0.070	**	0.226	0.072	**	0.229	0.072	**
Safety	0.360	0.075	***	0.368	0.073	***	0.360	0.069	***	0.441	0.079	***	0.370	0.074	***	0.370	0.074	***
Property Value	0.131	0.051	**	0.134	0.051	**	0.136	0.051	**	0.144	0.051	**	0.174	0.062	**	0.130	0.051	*
Schools	0.095	0.072		0.094	0.073		0.105	0.069		0.108	0.069		0.096	0.072		0.163	0.087	+
Interactions																		
Price*black				-0.106	0.059	+												
Price*Mixed				-0.048	0.043													
Yard*black							-0.201	0.056	***									
Yard*Mixed							-0.102	0.055	+									
Safety*Black										-0.155	0.067	*						
Safety*Mixed										-0.113	0.057	*						
Property Value*Black													-0.111	0.059	+			
Property Value*Mixed													-0.012	0.058				
Schools*Black																-0.123	0.067	+
Schools*Mixed																-0.077	0.065	
R^2	0.7575			0.7594			0.7644			0.7606			0.7595			0.7593		

Note: Omitted categories for dummy variables are in parenthesis

+ p ≤ 0.1 * p ≤ 0.05 ** p ≤ 0.01 *** p ≤ 0.001