

Who's Dissatisfied? Race and Ethnic Differences in Residential Dissatisfaction and Migration,
2010 - 2011*

Peter Mateyka
U.S. Census Bureau
Social Economic and Housing Statistics
SEHSD Working Paper Number 2015-2

2013 Annual Meeting
Southern Demographic Association
Montgomery, AL

*This work is released to inform interested parties of ongoing research and to encourage discussion of work in progress. Any views or opinions expressed in the paper are the authors' own and do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the U.S. Census Bureau. Please direct correspondence to Peter Mateyka, U.S. Census Bureau, HHES, HQ-7H484E, 4600 Silver Hill Rd., Washington, DC 20233, or via e-mail at peter.mateyka@census.gov.

Abstract

Using longitudinal data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), I examine race and ethnic differences in the likelihood of reporting unfavorable housing, neighborhood, and local services along with whether individuals move upon expressing residential dissatisfaction. The first portion of the analysis looks at the relationship between individual socio-demographic statuses and place characteristics on the residential dissatisfaction of Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics. Housing tenure, duration of residence, home equity, and social and economic characteristics are included as measures of individual statuses. The second section of the analysis focuses on the impact of individual statuses, place characteristics, and residential dissatisfaction on the migration behavior of these race and ethnic groups. Census tract of residence combined with aggregated tract data on neighborhood socioeconomic status and housing supply from the American Community Survey (ACS) serve as place characteristics.

Introduction

The residential environment, defined broadly as the housing unit, neighborhood, and local community, plays an important role in shaping economic opportunities, health, social relationships, and exposure to crime and disorder (Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn 2000; Diez Roux 2001; Sampson et. al. 2002). Therefore, understanding how frequently individuals move out of neighborhoods lacking in economic opportunities or neighborhood instability has broad ranging policy implications.

A longstanding observation in the social sciences is that race and ethnic minorities frequently live in lower quality housing units and neighborhoods than non-Hispanic Whites, and these vulnerable groups are less likely to escape these circumstances by moving (for example, see South and Deane 1993; South and Crowder 1997; Freeman 2005). However, the recent collapse of the housing market and subsequent economic recession has had widespread impacts on access to credit, homeownership, and rental market prices. Additional historical systemic barriers including discriminatory and predatory lending have impacted homeownership access for minority groups. These impacts have created a rapidly changing housing market, necessitating the need for timely data on the housing and mobility patterns of all groups, and particularly those who might be most impacted by these changes.

Initial evidence suggests that Blacks and Hispanics, who benefited greatly from increased access to credit during the housing boom of the early 2000s, also fared the worst during the housing bust (Kochhar et. al. 2009). However, this evidence is limited to comparisons of homeownership and mobility rates before and after the collapse of the housing market. While these studies are useful, they provide limited information on who wants to move, how frequently they move, and what social demographic, housing, and neighborhood characteristics moderate the relationship between wanting to move and moving. This project uses longitudinal data from the 2008 panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) linked to tract-level data from the 2006-2010 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates to understand how frequently residentially dissatisfied individuals of differing race and ethnic groups move.

Research questions

1. Are there differences in reported residential dissatisfaction between Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics?
2. How do the socio-demographic, economic, housing and tract characteristics of dissatisfied householders vary by race and ethnic status?
3. Are there differences in the moving rates of dissatisfied Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics?
4. How do the socio-demographic, economic, housing, and tract characteristics of dissatisfied householders vary by race, ethnicity, and mover status?
5. Which factors are most important for explaining race and ethnic differences in residential dissatisfaction and mobility behavior?

Data

The 2008 SIPP follows an initial sample of about 50,000 households for a 4-year period provided they remain in non-institutionalized residential settings in the continental U.S. during this time. Respondents are interviewed every 4 months and core data on the characteristics of respondents at the time of the interview, including sex, age, presence of children, race, ethnicity, nativity, education, income, and tenure, are collected. In addition to core characteristics, SIPP also collects detailed information during topical modules, which are typically asked only during one or two interview periods over the course of the panel. Data on residential satisfaction are included in the 2008 Wave 6 Adult Well-Being Topical Module. Data on self-reported home-equity are obtained from the Wave 4 Assets and Liabilities Topical Module. Residence information prior to the start of the SIPP panel is collected in the Wave 2 Migration History Module. Detailed address information is collected for the interview residence during each SIPP interview period. While only state of residence is released in the public use files, this project uses restricted-access information on census tract of current residence linked with aggregated tract information from the 2006-2010 ACS as proxies for residential quality.¹

¹ The ACS is designed to be a nationally representative yearly survey with an initial sample of about 3 million addresses. Data is collected monthly, over the course of 1 year, and then combined into one file and weighted to independent subcounty population estimates for July 1st of the survey year. Estimates from the ACS data are produced for single-year, three-year, and five-year time periods, with many of the same characteristics released for each period. The five-year file produces representative estimates for all Census geographies on a number population and housing characteristics.

The universe for this project is all non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, and Hispanic householders who answered the Wave 6 Adult Well-Being Topical Module and had valid residence information on the restricted-access SIPP files that could be coded to the Census tract.² About 3 percent of households were missing tract-level geography; these householders were excluded from the analysis.

Because our analysis focuses so largely on race and ethnicity, correctly defining the groups under analysis is important. Federal surveys now give respondents the option of reporting more than one race, which means that two basic ways of defining a race group are possible. First, a group such as Blacks may be defined as those who report that they are Black and no other race – the race-alone or single-race concept. Alternatively, the group may be comprised of those who reported that they were Black, regardless of whether they also reported another race – the race-alone-or-in-combination concept. The body of this paper (text, figures, and tables) uses the race-alone concept, and therefore reports data for people who reported that they were White or Black alone. People who reported any of those races in combination with another race, as well as people who reported another race alone, are excluded from the analysis.³

Although Hispanics may be of any race, data in this paper for Hispanics do not overlap with data for the Whites and Blacks – in other words, all race/ethnicity categories are mutually exclusive. In the text of this paper, the groups “White alone, non-Hispanic,” and “Black alone, non-Hispanic” are referred to as “White” and “Black”.

Key Variables

Residential dissatisfaction – respondents who answered yes to one of the following questions are considered to be highly dissatisfied with their residential environments: (1.) Are conditions in your home undesirable enough that you would like to move? (2.) Overall, is the threat of crime where you live undesirable enough that you would like to move? (3.) Is your neighborhood undesirable enough that you would like to move? and (4.) Are the public services undesirable enough that you would like to move? For descriptive purposes, this group is called the “wants to move” group. Respondents who did not answer “yes” to one of these questions are classified in the “did not want to move” group, indicating they did not want to move because of residential dissatisfaction. However, those in this group may still be dissatisfied with their residential environments, just not to the extent that they report wanting to move.

Migration Behavior - Respondents who changed residences from the first month of Wave 7 to the fourth month of Wave 9 are considered movers (the one-year period following the Wave 6 Adult Well-Being Topical Module. In the event that a respondent left the survey, data on the reason the respondent left the survey was used to classify the respondent’s migration status.

² The Wave 6 Adult Well-Being Topical Module was administered from May to August 2010.

³ Use of the single-race populations does not imply that it is the preferred method of presenting or analyzing data. The U.S. Census Bureau uses a variety of approaches. For further information, see the Census 2000 Brief *Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin: 2000* (C2KBR/01-1) at <www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf>.

Results

Table 1 reports frequencies for Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics, on the four variables that were used to calculate the residential dissatisfaction measure primarily used in this paper: (1.) Are conditions in your home undesirable enough that you would like to move? (2.) Overall, is the threat of crime where you live undesirable enough that you would like to move? (3.) Is your neighborhood undesirable enough that you would like to move? and (4.) Are the public services undesirable enough that you would like to move? The results indicate that White householders reported lower instances of residential dissatisfaction so bad that they wanted to move than Blacks and Hispanics.⁴ For example, Whites were about half as likely to report dissatisfaction so severe they wanted to move for any reason compared to Blacks. Moreover, Black householders were the most likely to indicate dissatisfaction with multiple aspects of their residential environment.

Table 2 reports the demographic and neighborhood characteristics of race and ethnic groups by residential dissatisfaction. The results indicate that there were substantial differences in the characteristics of householders who report wanting to move because of residential dissatisfaction. Across all three groups, female-headed family households were more likely to be found in the “wanted to move for housing, safety, neighborhood, or services” group than the “did not want to move group”. The presence of children in a household may both heighten awareness of negative aspects of the residential environment and discourage moving out of concerns for disrupting schooling. 50.7 percent of Blacks and 46.4 percent of Hispanics in the “wanted to move” group had annual household incomes under \$25,000. Those with lower incomes may not be able to afford to live in higher quality homes and neighborhoods. Hispanics who reported wanting to move because of residential dissatisfaction were more likely to be found in the West than other regions. Metropolitan areas in the West were hit hardest by the housing market collapse, and Hispanics living in these areas may be enduring widespread foreclosures and tightened access to quality rental units. Interestingly, Black homeowners in the “wanted to move” group had longer median residential durations (median months lived in the unit) than those in the “did not want to move” group. While lengthy residential durations alone might indicate satisfaction with the housing unit and neighborhood, the aforementioned finding for Black homeowners is striking and may indicate an inability to escape poor residential circumstances for this group.

Table 2 also provides some evidence of the objective neighborhood conditions around the housing units of race and ethnic groups through reported tract of residence characteristics. The results for this section suggest that Whites in the “wanted to move” group frequently live in Census tracts with more favorable characteristics than Blacks and Hispanics in the “did not want to move group”. For example, Whites in the “wanted to move” group live in census tracts with lower poverty, higher median incomes, and fewer vacant units than Blacks in the “did not want to move” group.

⁴ The estimates in this paper (which may be shown in text, figures, or tables) are based on responses from a sample of the population and may differ from the actual values because of sampling variability or other factors. As a result, apparent differences between the estimates for two or more groups may not be statistically significant. All comparative statements have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90 percent confidence level unless otherwise noted.

Table 3 reports residential satisfaction by 1-year mobility status and tenure and provides initial evidence for who moves and who does not. It appears that Whites who wanted to move because of residential dissatisfaction did so at higher rates than the overall White population. However, dissatisfied Blacks and Hispanics did so at lower rates than the average group member.

In Tables 4 and 5 I move to the multivariate analysis of wanting to move and actual mobility. Race and ethnicity are included as controls in models predicting both dissatisfaction and mobility. Tenure status, socio-demographic characteristics, tract characteristics, and region are also included in a series of stepwise regressions as potential explanatory factors.

Table 4 presents the weighted logistic regressions predicting wanting to move. While Blacks and Hispanics were more likely than Whites to report wanting to move because of residential dissatisfaction, this was explained largely by differences in individual and tract characteristics between the groups. That is, after controlling for relevant individual and location characteristics, the results indicate Blacks and Hispanics are less likely to report residential dissatisfaction than are Whites (Model 6). In other words, a Black or Hispanic householder with similar socio-demographic characteristics to a White householder, living in similar census tract, in a similar region of the country, is less likely to report wanting to move than the White householder.

Tables 5 and 6 present the weighted logistic regressions predicting a move. Though individual and locational characteristics explain a significant proportion of race/ethnic differences in reports of wanting to move for residential dissatisfaction, these characteristics did not account for race/ethnic differences in actual moving behavior. After controlling for tenure status, dissatisfied Whites, Blacks and Hispanics are significantly less likely to move than are dissatisfied Whites. This result implies that the socio-demographic and locational characteristics used in this paper are unable to account for differences in mobility rates between dissatisfied Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics.

Major Findings

The descriptive results suggest that Blacks and Hispanics were far more likely to report dissatisfaction with at least one aspect of their residential environment so severe they wanted to move than are Whites. Yet, dissatisfied Black and Hispanic householders were less likely to move over the course of one calendar year than the average group member. Only dissatisfied Whites had higher mover rates compared to the overall White mover rate.

The multivariate results indicate that the higher reports of residential dissatisfaction among Blacks and Hispanics compared to Whites are the results of differences in socio-demographic and locational characteristics. A Black or Hispanic householder with similar socio-demographic characteristics to a White householder, living in similar census tract, in a similar region of the country, was actually less likely to report severe residential dissatisfaction than the White householder.

However, these socio-demographic and location characteristics did not account for differences in the mover rates of dissatisfied White, Black, and Hispanic householders. Both dissatisfied Black

and Hispanic householders remained significantly less likely to move than dissatisfied White householders after controlling for these factors.

Works Cited

Diez Roux , Ana V. .2001. “Investigating Neighborhood and Area Effects on Health.” *American Journal of Public Health* 91: 1783-1789.

Freeman, Lance. 2005. “Displacement or Succession? Residential Mobility in Gentrifying Neighborhoods.” *Urban Affairs Review* 40: 463 – 491.

Kochhar, Rakesh, Ana Gonzalez-Barrera and Daniel Dockterman .2009. “Through Boom and Bust: Minorities, Immigrants and Homeownership.” Pew Hispanic Center, Washington, DC.

Leventhal, Tama and Brooks-Gunn, Jeanne. 2000. “The neighborhoods they live in: The effects of neighborhood residence on child and adolescent outcomes.” *Psychological Bulletin* 126: 309-337.

Sampson, Robert J., Morenoff, Jeffrey D. and Thomas Gannon-Rowley. 2002. “Assessing ‘Neighborhood Effects’: Social Processes and New Directions in Research.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:443-78.

South, Scott and Glenn Deane. 1993. “Race and Residential Mobility: Individual Determinants and Structural Constraints.” *Social Forces* 72: 147- 167.

South, Scott and Kyle Crowder. 1997. “Residential mobility between cities and suburbs: race, suburbanization, and back-to-the-city moves.” *Social Forces* 34: 525-538.

Accuracy of the Estimates

Statistics from surveys are subject to sampling and nonsampling error. All comparisons presented in this report have taken sampling error into account and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted. This typically means the 90-percent confidence interval for the differences between the estimates being compared does not include zero.

Nonsampling errors in surveys may be attributed to a variety of sources, such as how the survey is designed, how respondents interpret questions, how able and willing respondents are to provide correct answers and how accurately the answers are coded and classified. The Census Bureau employs quality control procedures throughout the production process including the overall design of surveys, the wording of questions, the review of the work of the interviewers and coders, and the statistical review of reports to minimize these errors. The SIPP weighting procedure uses ratio estimation whereby sample estimates are adjusted to independent estimates of the national population by age, race, sex and Hispanic Origin. This weighting partially corrects for bias due to undercoverage, but biases may still be present when people who are missed by the survey differ from those interviewed in ways other than age, race, sex, and Hispanic origin. How this weighting procedure affects other variables in the survey is not

precisely known. All of these considerations affect comparisons across different surveys or data sources.

For further information on statistical standards and the computation and use of standard errors, go to <http://www.census.gov/sipp/source.html> or contact Tracy Mattingly of the Census Bureau's Demographic Statistical Methods Division on the internet at Tracy.l.Mattingly@census.gov.

Additional information on the SIPP can be found at the following websites:

www.sipp.census.gov/sipp/ (the main SIPP website),

www.sipp.census.gov/sipp/workpaper/wp230.pdf (SIPP Quality Profile), and

www.sipp.census.gov/sipp/usrguide/sipp2001.pdf (SIPP User's Guide).

Table 1: Detailed Residential Dissatisfaction by Race and Ethnicity

Characteristic	Residential dissatisfaction. R wants to move for ...																
	Total		Not dissatisfied		Any reason		Multiple reasons		Housing reason		Safety reason		Neighborhood reason		Service reason		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Total	108,070	100.0	97,974	90.7	10,095	9.3	4,731	4.4	6,334	5.9	4,391	4.1	5,041	4.7	1,884	1.7	
Race and Hispanic Origin																	
White, non-Hispanic, alone	81,267	100.0	75,140	76.7	6,126	7.5	2,547	3.1	3,901	4.8	2,199	2.7	2,906	3.6	1,016	1.2	
Black, non-Hispanic, alone	13,722	100.0	11,486	11.7	2,236	16.3	1,302	9.5	1,383	10.1	1,281	9.3	1,218	8.9	569	4.1	
Hispanic, of any race, alone or in combination	13,082	100.0	11,348	11.6	1,733	13.3	881	6.7	1,050	8.0	910	7.0	917	7.0	298	2.3	

Table 2: Demographic Characteristics by Race and Ethnicity, and Residential Dissatisfaction

Characteristic	Total						White						Black						Hispanic					
	Not diss			Diss			Not diss			Diss			Not diss			Diss			Not diss			Diss		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent	
Total	97,974	100.00		10,095	100.00		75,140	100.00		6,126	100.00		11,486	100.00		2,236	100.00		11,348	100.00		1,733	100.00	
Tenure																								
Renter	28,915	29.51		5,666	56.13		17,852	23.76		2,807	45.81		5,648	49.17		1,663	74.39		5,415	47.72		1,196	69.02	
Owner	69,060	70.49		4,429	43.88		57,289	76.24		3,320	54.19		5,838	50.83		573	25.61		5,933	52.28		537	30.98	
Positive equity	5,297	5.41		610	6.04		3,846	6.71		406	12.22		674	11.54		78	13.68		778	13.11		126	23.40	
Negative equity	63,762	65.08		3,819	37.84		53,443	93.29		2,914	87.78		5,164	88.46		494	86.32		5,155	86.89		411	76.60	
Median duration of residence in months																								
Renter		28.00			28.00			25.00			27.00			30.00			28.00			33.00			35.00	
Owner		124.00			110.00			129.00			116.00			120.00			149.00			84.00			81.00	
Age																								
15 to 24 years	3,061	3.12		599	5.93		2,141	2.85		322	5.26		416	3.62		163	7.29		504	4.44		113	6.53	
25 to 34 years	14,256	14.55		2,355	23.33		9,911	13.19		1,320	21.54		1,943	16.92		531	23.77		2,401	21.16		504	29.08	
35 to 44 years	17,627	17.99		2,080	20.61		12,285	16.35		1,198	19.55		2,364	20.58		423	18.91		2,978	26.24		460	26.53	
45 to 54 years	21,484	21.93		2,342	23.20		16,223	21.59		1,473	24.04		2,644	23.02		508	22.48		2,618	23.07		367	21.18	
55 to 64 years	18,358	18.74		1,591	15.76		14,891	19.82		1,027	16.76		2,028	17.66		384	17.18		1,439	12.68		180	10.40	
65 years and over	23,189	23.67		1,128	11.17		19,689	26.20		787	12.84		2,091	18.20		232	10.38		1,409	12.42		109	6.28	
Sex																								
Female	51,304	52.37		6,128	60.71		38,913	51.79		3,527	57.57		7,044	61.33		1,553	69.45		5,347	47.12		1,049	60.50	
Male	46,670	47.64		3,967	39.30		36,227	48.21		2,600	42.43		4,442	38.67		683	30.55		6,001	52.88		685	39.50	
Nativity and Citizenship																								
Native-born	87,311	89.12		8,798	87.15		71,255	94.83		5,821	95.01		10,125	88.15		2,026	90.60		5,930	52.26		952	54.90	
Foreign-born	10,663	10.88		1,298	12.85		3,885	5.17		306	4.99		1,361	11.85		210	9.40		5,418	47.74		782	45.10	
Citizen	5,622	5.74		571	5.66		2,621	3.49		181	2.95		848	7.38		103	4.59		2,154	18.98		288	16.59	
Non-citizen	5,041	5.15		727	7.20		1,264	1.68		125	2.04		513	4.47		108	4.81		3,264	28.76		494	28.51	
Marital Status																								
Married	50,848	51.90		3,985	39.47		40,788	54.28		2,700	44.06		3,649	31.77		489	21.88		6,412	56.50		796	45.93	
Widowed	11,053	11.28		660	6.54		9,101	12.11		438	7.16		1,307	11.38		150	6.70		645	5.68		72	4.16	
Divorced/Separated	18,332	18.71		2,555	25.31		13,700	18.23		1,561	25.49		2,651	23.08		589	26.36		1,982	17.46		404	23.32	
Never married	17,740	18.11		2,895	28.68		11,552	15.37		1,427	23.29		3,879	33.77		1,007	45.06		2,309	20.35		461	26.58	
Household Type																								
Family household - married couple	49,254	50.27		3,810	37.74		39,883	53.01		2,597	42.39		3,358	29.23		453	20.28		6,063	53.43		759	43.81	
Family household - male	4,480	4.57		631	6.25		2,785	3.71		336	5.48		707	6.16		127	5.66		987	8.70		169	9.77	
Family household - female	11,301	11.53		2,371	23.49		6,391	8.50		981	16.01		2,991	26.04		880	39.37		1,919	16.91		510	29.44	
Non-family household - male	14,949	15.26		1,304	12.92		11,647	15.50		846	13.81		1,992	17.34		337	15.06		1,310	11.54		121	7.00	
Non-family household - female	17,748	18.11		1,927	19.09		14,285	19.01		1,335	21.79		2,414	21.02		428	19.14		1,049	9.24		164	9.46	

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics by Race and Ethnicity, and Residential Dissatisfaction (continued)

Characteristic	Total						White						Black						Hispanic																																																									
	Notdiss			Diss			Notdiss			Diss			Notdiss			Diss			Notdiss			Diss																																																						
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent																																																					
Own Children Under 18	69,912	71.36	6,155	60.97	56,041	74.58	4,103	66.97	7,971	69.39	1,331	59.55	5,901	52.00	720	41.56	6,057	6.18	969	9.60	4,348	5.79	585	9.56	645	5.61	181	8.10	1,064	9.38	203	11.70	16,195	16.53	1,951	19.32	11,303	15.04	1,011	16.50	2,050	17.85	474	21.20	2,842	25.04	466	26.89	5,809	5.93	1,020	10.11	3,448	4.59	427	6.97	820	7.14	249	11.15	1,541	13.58	344	19.86												
Annual Household Income	25,485	26.01	4,003	39.65	17,486	23.27	2,064	33.69	4,365	38.00	1,135	50.75	3,634	32.02	804	46.40	26,726	26.77	2,832	28.05	19,095	25.41	1,687	27.53	3,436	32.56	512	29.56	17,566	17.93	1,571	15.56	13,870	18.46	1,095	17.87	1,722	14.99	245	10.98	1,974	17.39	230	13.29	11,255	11.49	760	7.53	9,366	12.46	568	9.27	917	7.98	96	8.57	972	8.57	96	5.55	17,444	17.80	930	9.22	15,324	20.39	713	11.64	1,047	9.11	127	5.70	1,074	9.46	90	5.19
Employment Status	62,792	64.09	6,405	63.45	47,756	63.56	4,018	65.59	7,084	61.68	1,291	57.73	7,952	70.08	1,096	63.22	5,158	5.26	669	6.62	3,609	4.80	329	5.37	872	7.97	161	9.30	30,024	30.64	3,022	29.93	23,775	31.64	1,779	29.03	3,530	30.73	767	34.29	2,719	23.96	476	27.49																																
Educational Attainment	10,039	10.25	1,556	15.42	4,981	6.63	570	9.30	1,519	13.22	351	15.68	3,539	31.18	636	36.67	23,784	24.28	2,529	25.06	17,849	23.75	1,453	23.71	2,968	26.14	498	28.71	33,999	34.70	4,105	40.67	26,177	34.84	2,663	43.47	4,567	39.76	986	44.09	3,255	28.68	456	26.33	30,152	30.78	1,905	18.87	26,133	34.78	1,441	23.52	2,432	14.33	1,587	13.99	144	8.28																		
Metropolitan Status	17,226	17.58	1,407	13.94	14,927	19.87	1,065	17.39	1,151	10.02	200	8.94	1,147	10.11	142	8.20	80,749	82.42	8,688	86.06	60,213	80.13	5,061	82.61	10,335	89.98	1,591	91.80	18,070	18.44	1,889	18.71	14,767	19.65	1,259	20.55	1,649	14.35	361	16.16	1,655	14.58	269	15.50	37,250	38.02	3,559	35.25	26,094	34.73	1,875	30.60	6,837	59.53	1,186	53.04	4,319	38.06	498	28.73	20,080	20.50	2,448	24.25	14,705	19.57	1,465	23.92	998	8.69	175	7.81	4,377	38.57	808	46.63
Region of Residence	13,444	13.44	11,98	11.98	14,29	14.29	13,11	13.11	11,58	11.58	11,58	11.01	10,96	10.96	9,23	9.23	66,777	66.77	52,89	52.89	77,62	77.62	69,78	69.78	36,85	26.66	28,76	28.76	8,04	8.04	10,21	10.21	8,51	8.51	11,15	11.15	14,13	14.13	9,25	9.25	11,37	11.37	56,590.57	56,590.57	46,441.42	46,441.42	60,735.95	60,735.95	50,967.15	50,967.15	45,744.55	45,744.55	37,811.69	37,811.69	49,274.39	49,274.39	57,56	57.56	48,76	48.76																
Aggregated tract-level characteristics	67,50	67.50	57,13	57.13	71,86	71.86	63,19	63.19	57,50	57.50	49,10	49.10	57,56	57.56	48,76	48.76	0.41	0.41	0.31	0.31	10.52	10.52	10.07	10.96	10.96	0.36	0.36	12.03	12.03	11.86	11.86	11.07	11.07	0.43	0.43	0.35	0.35	17.11	17.11	17.11	17.11	22.20	22.20	15.99	15.99	0.24	0.24	11.75	11.75	14.86	14.86	12.29	12.29	12,98	12.98	25.70	25.70	26.74	26.74	25.48	25.48	26.72	26.72	23.20	23.20	23.82	23.82									
Percent age 65+	67,50	67.50	57,13	57.13	71,86	71.86	63,19	63.19	57,50	57.50	49,10	49.10	57,56	57.56	48,76	48.76	Percent non-Hispanic white	11.98	11.98	14.29	14.29	13.11	13.11	11,58	11.58	10,96	10.96	9,23	9.23	Percent unemployed (16+ in the labor force population)	10.21	10.21	8,51	8.51	11,15	11.15	14,13	14.13	9,25	9.25	11,37	11.37	56,590.57	56,590.57	46,441.42	46,441.42	60,735.95	60,735.95	50,967.15	50,967.15	45,744.55	45,744.55	37,811.69	37,811.69	49,274.39	49,274.39	57,56	57.56	48,76	48.76																
Percent owner-occupied (all occupied-units)	0.41	0.41	0.31	0.31	10.52	10.52	10.07	10.96	10.96	0.36	0.36	12.03	12.03	15.99	15.99	Percent vacant units (all housing units)	11.86	11.86	11.07	11.07	10.43	10.43	0.35	0.35	17.11	17.11	12,98	12.98	25.70	25.70	Percent in poverty (16+ population)	11.75	11.75	14.86	14.86	12.29	12.29	12,98	12.98	26.74	26.74	25.48	25.48	26.72	26.72	23.20	23.20	23.82	23.82																											
Percent in poverty (16+ population)	11.75	11.75	14.86	14.86	12.29	12.29	12,98	12.98	26.74	26.74	25.48	25.48	26.72	26.72	23.20	23.20	Percent foreign-born	25.16	25.16	23.20	23.20	23.82	23.82																																																					
Percent less than 18 years old	24.01	24.01	25.16	25.16	23.20	23.20	23.82	23.82																																																																				

Table 3: Tract-level characteristics by Tenure, Race and Ethnicity, and Residential Dissatisfaction

Owner

Characteristic	Total		White		Black		Hispanic	
	Not diss	Diss	Not diss	Diss	Not diss	Diss	Not diss	Diss
Aggregated tract-level characteristics								
Percent age 65+	13.97	12.51	14.47	13.24	11.86	11.06	11.14	9.53
Percent non-Hispanic white	72.09	60.42	79.13	71.92	37.65	23.53	37.89	28.68
Percent unemployed (16+ in the labor force population)	7.44	9.46	6.91	8.20	10.98	15.16	9.00	11.12
Median income	60823	51206	62921	53946	49297	42156	51874	43917
Percent owner-occupied (all occupied-units)	73.98	68.23	75.60	69.81	65.84	62.61	66.22	64.42
Percent vacant units (all housing units)	10.06	11.32	9.86	10.69	12.53	15.92	9.47	10.26
Median year housing units built post-1978	0.44	0.39	0.45	0.40	0.41	0.34	0.43	0.38
Percent in poverty (18+ population)	10.15	13.67	9.18	11.94	15.09	19.15	14.69	18.55
Percent foreign-born	9.93	11.35	8.39	9.53	10.56	9.77	24.18	24.23
Percent less than 18 years old	24.12	25.54	23.61	24.58	25.78	27.20	27.43	29.71

Renter

Characteristic	Total		White		Black		Hispanic	
	Not diss	Diss	Not diss	Diss	Not diss	Diss	Not diss	Diss
Aggregated tract-level characteristics								
Percent age 65+	12.68	11.56	13.70	12.95	11.30	10.99	10.77	9.09
Percent non-Hispanic white	58.83	47.45	72.76	67.25	36.02	27.74	36.72	28.80
Percent unemployed (16+ in the labor force population)	8.70	10.86	7.61	8.86	11.33	13.78	9.53	11.48
Median income	50084	42389	53723	47444	42072	36316	46426	39053
Percent owner-occupied (all occupied-units)	55.50	49.26	59.85	55.35	48.89	44.45	48.08	41.73
Percent vacant units (all housing units)	11.15	12.42	10.75	11.27	13.36	15.42	10.17	10.87
Median year housing units built post-1978	0.35	0.25	0.37	0.29	0.30	0.23	0.33	0.18
Percent in poverty (18+ population)	14.87	19.11	12.73	15.22	19.19	23.26	17.42	22.45
Percent foreign-born	15.21	16.61	11.88	13.22	14.08	14.08	27.36	28.01
Percent less than 18 years old	23.28	25.13	21.87	22.93	25.17	26.58	25.94	28.27

Table 4: 1-Year Mobility Status and Tenure by Race and Ethnicity

	All Householders						Dissatisfied Householders						Satisfied Householders					
	Total			Mover			Owner			Mover			Owner			Renter		
	Number	Percent	Stayer	Number	Percent	Stayer	Number	Percent	Stayer	Number	Percent	Stayer	Number	Percent	Stayer	Number	Percent	Stayer
Total	111,480	100.0	100,716	90.3	10,764	9.7	74,554	100.0	71,500	95.9	3,054	4.1	36,926	100.0	29,216	79.1	7,710	20.9
White, alone	83,461	100.0	75,994	91.1	7,467	8.9	61,444	100.0	58,960	95.8	2,484	4.2	22,017	100.0	17,034	77.4	4,983	22.6
Black, alone	14,316	100.0	12,547	87.7	1,769	12.3	6,529	100.0	6,283	96.1	246	3.9	7,787.12	100.0	6,264	80.4	1,523	19.6
Hispanic, of any race, alone or in combination	13,704	100.0	12,176	88.8	1,528	11.2	6,582	100.0	6,257	94.8	324	5.2	7,122.24	100.0	5,919	83.1	1,204	16.9
Total	10,488	100.0	8,540	81.4	1,948	18.6	4,499	100.0	4,132	91.8	367	8.2	5,989	100.0	4,408	73.6	1,581	26.4
White, alone	6,339	100.0	5,128	80.9	1,211	19.1	3,369	100.0	3,062	90.9	306	9.1	2,970	100.0	2,066	69.6	904	30.4
Black, alone	2,362	100.0	1,849	78.3	513	21.7	583	100.0	549	94.1	34	5.9	1,778.74	100.0	1,300	73.1	478	26.9
Hispanic, of any race, alone or in combination	1,787	100.0	1,563	87.5	224	12.5	547	100.0	521	95.2	26	4.8	1,239.98	100.0	1,042	84.0	198	16.0
Total	100,992	100.0	92,176	91.3	8,816	8.7	70,055	100.0	67,367	96.2	2,687	3.8	30,937	100.0	24,808	80.2	6,129	19.8
White, alone	77,122	100.0	70,866	91.9	6,256	8.1	58,075	100.0	55,898	96.3	2,178	3.7	19,047	100.0	14,968	78.6	4,079	21.4
Black, alone	11,954	100.0	10,697	89.5	1,256	10.5	5,945	100.0	5,734	96.4	211	3.6	6,008	100.0	4,963	82.6	1,045	17.4
Hispanic, of any race, alone or in combination	11,917	100.0	10,613	89.1	1,304	10.9	6,036	100.0	5,736	95.1	298	4.9	5,882	100.0	4,877	82.9	1,005	17.1

Table 5: Weighted Logistic Regressions Predicting Residential Dissatisfaction

Covariates	Dependent: Residential Dissatisfaction ¹		
	Point Estimate	95 Percent C.I (Odds ratios)	
Demographic (person-level)			
Age (ref 15-24):			
25-34	1.17	1.05	1.30
35-44	1.00	0.90	1.12
45-54	1.06	0.95	1.18
55-64	0.94	0.84	1.06
65+	0.49	0.43	0.55
Female (ref - male)	1.27	1.21	1.33
Race and Hispanic origin (ref - non-Hispanic white)			
Non-hispanic black (ref - non-Hispanic white)	0.90	0.84	0.96
Hispanic (ref - non-Hispanic white)	0.80	0.74	0.86
Nativity and Citizenship (ref - native-born)			
Foreign-born, Citizen (ref - native-born)	0.80	0.72	0.88
Foreign-born, Non-citizen (ref - native-born)	0.76	0.70	0.84
Married (ref - not married)	0.91	0.87	0.96
Presence of Children (ref - no children present)			
Child between the ages of 0 and 5, only	1.38	1.27	1.51
Child between the ages of 6 and 17, only	1.17	1.10	1.24
Children ages 0 to 5 and ages 6 to 17	1.36	1.24	1.48
College degree (ref - less than college degree)	0.73	0.69	0.77
Household income (ref - less than \$25,000)			
\$25,000 to \$49,999	0.85	0.81	0.90
\$50,000 to \$74,999	0.83	0.78	0.89
\$75,000 to \$99,999	0.69	0.63	0.75
\$100,000 or more	0.65	0.59	0.71
Tenure			
Renter (ref - owner)	1.89	1.79	1.99
Owner, negative home-equity (ref - owner)	1.52	1.38	1.67
Objective neighborhood (tract-level)			
Percent non-Hispanic white	0.99	0.99	0.99
Percent unemployed	1.03	1.02	1.03
Percent owner-occupied (all occupied-units)	0.99	0.99	1.00
Median year units built post 1978	0.81	0.77	0.85
Percent vacant units (all housing units)	1.01	1.01	1.01
Percent of population age 17 and under	1.02	1.01	1.02
Region and metro status			
Nonmetro (ref - metro)	0.69	0.62	0.77
Micropolitan (ref - metro)	0.98	0.90	1.05
Region (ref - North)			
Midwest	1.00	0.93	1.07
South	0.91	0.85	0.98
West	1.08	1.01	1.16
Somer's D	0.46		

1. Sample includes all White, Black, and Hispanic, householders eligible for the adult well-being module with address information.

Table 6: Weighted Logistic Regressions Predicting Mover Status

Covariates	Dependent: Moved ¹		
	Point Estimate	95 Percent C.I. (Odds ratios)	
Demographic (person-level)			
Age (ref 15-24):			
25-34	0.73	0.67	0.80
35-44	0.52	0.47	0.57
45-54	0.35	0.32	0.39
55-64	0.30	0.27	0.34
65+	0.31	0.28	0.34
Female (ref - male)	1.09	1.04	1.14
Race and Hispanic origin (ref- dissatisfied non-Hispanic white)			
Dissatisfied Non-hispanic black (ref- dissatisfied non-Hispanic white)	0.73	0.64	0.84
Dissatisfied Hispanic (ref- dissatisfied non-Hispanic white)	0.43	0.36	0.50
Satisfied Non-hispanic white (ref- dissatisfied non-Hispanic white)	0.54	0.50	0.58
Satisfied Non-hispanic black (ref- dissatisfied non-Hispanic white)	0.41	0.37	0.45
Satisfied Hispanic (ref- dissatisfied non-Hispanic white)	0.50	0.45	0.55
Nativity and Citizenship (ref - native-born)			
Foreign-born, Citizen (ref - native-born)	0.88	0.79	0.97
Foreign-born, Non-citizen (ref - native-born)	0.88	0.80	0.96
Married (ref - not married)	0.81	0.77	0.85
Presence of Children (ref - no children present)			
Child between the ages of 0 and 5, only	0.99	0.91	1.08
Child between the ages of 6 and 17, only	0.85	0.80	0.92
Children ages 0 to 5 and ages 6 to 17	0.89	0.81	0.97
College degree (ref - less than college degree)	0.99	0.93	1.04
Household income (ref - less than \$25,000)			
\$25,000 to \$49,999	0.86	0.82	0.91
\$50,000 to \$74,999	0.83	0.77	0.89
\$75,000 to \$99,999	0.78	0.71	0.86
\$100,000 or more	0.84	0.77	0.92
Tenure			
Renter (ref - owner)	4.37	4.13	4.63
Owner, negative home-equity (ref - owner)	1.26	1.12	1.42
Objective neighborhood (tract-level)			
Percent non-Hispanic white	1.00	1.00	1.00
Percent unemployed	1.00	1.00	1.01
Percent owner-occupied (all occupied-units)	1.00	1.00	1.00
Median year units built post 1978	1.20	1.14	1.26
Percent vacant units (all housing units)	1.00	1.00	1.01
Percent of population age 17 and under	1.00	1.00	1.01
Region and metro status			
Nonmetro (ref - metro)	0.81	0.73	0.90
Micropolitan (ref - metro)	0.86	0.80	0.94
Region (ref - North)			
Midwest	1.46	1.35	1.58
South	1.57	1.46	1.69
West	1.49	1.38	1.61
Somer's D	0.53		

1. Sample includes all White, Black, and Hispanic, householders eligible for the adult well-being module with address information.

Note: Move period is 1 year.