Published in final edited form as:

Int Migr Rev. 2016 ; 50(4): 1005–1045. doi:10.1111/imre.12190.

The Interaction between Race and Nativity on the Housing Market: Homeownership and House Value of Black Immigrants in the United States

Rebbeca Tesfai

Temple University

Abstract

There is extensive research investigating race and nativity disparities in the US housing market, but little focuses on the group representing the intersection of the two literatures. This study investigates whether black immigrants are disadvantaged due to racial stratification or are able to leverage human or ethnic capital into positive housing market outcomes compared to US-born blacks. I find that racial stratification affects the housing market outcomes of black immigrants. However, high homeownership and house value relative to US-born blacks suggest that immigrants are able to use ethnic community capital to avoid some of the disadvantage experienced by native-born blacks.

INTRODUCTION

Homeownership has long been synonymous with the “American Dream”; however, for many Americans, homeownership remains elusive (Freeman 2005). Homeownership rates of blacks in the United States have remained 25 percent lower than those of whites since the 1990s, and the house value gap between blacks and whites has *increased* over time (US Census Bureau 2012). Blacks have one of the lowest homeownership rates and housing equity of any racial/ethnic group; in fact, there is only one group with homeownership rates lower than US-born blacks: the foreign-born (regardless of race) (Coulson 1999). While immigrant homeownership rates and house values increase with time in the United States, they never quite reach parity with the US-born of the same race (Borjas 2002).

There is a large research literature on homeownership due to its role as a key source of economic well-being. Homeownership is frequently the largest single investment a household makes (Boehm and Schlottmann 2004) and accounts for nearly half of household wealth in the United States (Gottschalck 2008). Yet for many, the importance of homeownership goes beyond its role in wealth accumulation; it is also an indicator of incorporation into mainstream society. Racial disparities in housing market outcomes are associated with racially segmented housing markets that limit blacks’ ability to own homes relative to whites (Flippen 2001; Krivo and Kaufman 2004). Differential access to homeownership may then restrict blacks’ upward mobility (Alba and Logan 1992). For immigrants, homeownership signifies settlement intentions and is an important gauge of

incorporation. Immigrants who are unsure whether they will remain in the country wait longer to enter into homeownership (Owusu 1998; Singer 2010) and, consequently, are less likely to own property (Dustmann and Mestres 2010).

Although there are two extensive research literatures on race and nativity disparities in homeownership and their implications, very little research focuses on the group representing the intersection of these two literatures: black immigrants. As blacks, African and Caribbean immigrants contend with a socioeconomic system that sees blacks as a monolithic group (Bashi and McDaniel 1997). Consequently, black immigrants, like US-born blacks, may experience structural barriers that impede their homeownership and reduce the value of their homes. Unlike racial gaps, immigrant housing market disadvantages are largely attributed to immigrants' low skills, income, and education (Borjas 2002; Cortes et al. 2007). Therefore, like other foreign-born groups, black immigrants' housing market outcomes may also be attributable to having lower English ability and social and economic capital in the United States than the US-born.

The black immigrant housing market experience provides unique insight into the two related issues of racial stratification and immigrant incorporation. Yet, to my knowledge, Haan's 2007 study is the only housing market research that specifically discusses foreign-born blacks. Haan finds that black immigrants in the United States and Canada have the lowest homeownership rates of any immigrant/racial group, suggesting they experience significant hurdles to homeownership that non-white immigrants and native-born blacks do not.

While extremely important, black immigrants' low homeownership rates are not the only indicator of their housing market position. Once black immigrants decide to become homeowners, the value of the houses they purchase is another way to measure their ability to navigate the housing market. Haan's research provides important insights into the housing market experiences of foreign-born blacks, but does not investigate the value of their homes, nor does it differentiate black immigrants into their composite groups.

There are now a number of studies in the sociological literature asserting that broad racial comparisons mask a great deal of heterogeneity in socioeconomic outcomes. Recent research highlights national origin differences in housing market outcomes among Asians and Hispanics (Krivo 1995; Coulson 1999; Painter, Gabriel, and Myers 2001), yet there have been no commensurate examinations among blacks. Non-Hispanic black immigrants include individuals from Africa and the Caribbean, two groups with very different socioeconomic characteristics. African-born blacks are one of the most highly educated populations in the United States with higher educational attainment than even US-born whites. Despite having lower educational attainment than Africans (Caribbean educational attainment largely mirrors that of US-born blacks), Caribbean immigrants may still have an advantage in the housing market due to their large, well-established population in the United States. Caribbean immigrants' population size may aid them in the housing market either through providing information networks or same nativity real estate and lending agents. Because immigrants' low homeownership rates have been attributed to low skills, income, and education (Borjas 2002; Cortes et al. 2007), these and other characteristics may lead to

variation in housing market outcomes that are masked in investigations which combine all foreign-born blacks into one category.

Despite the considerable socioeconomic variation among blacks, there are no examinations of homeownership or house value that differentiate African and Caribbean-born blacks and disaggregate black immigrants by national origin. This analysis uses the 1990 and 2000 censuses and 2005–2007 pooled American Community Survey to examine black immigrant homeownership and house value. In doing this, I will investigate whether black immigrants are able to leverage their advantaged human or ethnic community capital attributes relative to US-born blacks into positive housing market outcomes, or whether the dampening effects of racial stratification are too great.

BACKGROUND

General Determinants of Homeownership

Previous research provides a number of explanations for persistent racial disparities in housing outcomes ranging from theories that focus on the socioeconomic characteristics of individual homeowners to those focusing on institutional barriers. The explanations most often used are based on the microeconomic model of consumer choice, discrimination, and geographic concentration.

In the microeconomic model of consumer choice, households choose to purchase homes according to their needs and preferences after considering their financial resources (Alba and Logan 1992). In the absence of differences in purchasing opportunities and compositional differences between groups, homeownership rates of minorities are expected to match that of the majority group (ibid.). This logic can be extended to immigrant groups, following assimilation theory, which envisions homeownership as an aspect of social mobility (ibid.). In this theory, with time in the United States, immigrants are expected to acquire human capital and acculturate, which should increase immigrant homeownership to levels closer to that of the US-born.

The characteristics highlighted in the microeconomic model of consumer choice and assimilation theory are important predictors of homeownership and house value. Yet previous research shows that sociodemographic differences do not fully account for racial disparities in homeownership among the US-born (Rosenbaum 1996; Coulson 1999; Flippen 2001; Freeman 2005). A large body of research on racial differences in housing market outcomes instead points toward processes that stratify groups.

Large unexplained homeownership gaps between blacks and whites suggest that minority households face discrimination in the housing market, and there is ample evidence that racial discrimination occurs at various stages of the home purchase process. Even after controlling for applicants' economic characteristics, blacks are less likely than whites to receive mortgage application approval (Kim and Squires 1995; Dawkins 2005). In addition to being rejected for loans more frequently, minorities are made to fill out unnecessary paperwork to discourage them from completing applications (Gotham 1998). Consequently, blacks' loan applications are more likely to be withdrawn or never completed (Coffey and Gocker 1998).

When blacks receive mortgage approval, they average less favorable loan terms (Fannie Mae Foundation 1998) and pay higher interest rates than whites (Krivo and Kaufman 2004), which reduces their access to capital and results in the purchase of lower priced homes.

Black households experience substantial discrimination by banks preventing potential homebuyers who are financially able to purchase a home from actually doing so (Turner et al. 2002). Potential minority homebuyers also experience discrimination in the real estate market. Blacks are told about fewer available units than whites (Ross and Turner 2005) and are disproportionately steered toward certain neighborhoods by real estate agents due to their race (Galster and Godfrey 2005). This leads to minority concentrations in particular neighborhoods. The overlap between minority concentration and social disadvantage reduces the attractiveness of segregated neighborhoods and, consequently, reduces housing appreciation in minority neighborhoods (Flippen 2004).

While greater residential segregation by race has been shown to negatively impact black housing market outcomes, black immigrants experience segregation in the United States differently from the US-born. Like other immigrants, many foreign-born blacks live in ethnic enclaves. Although a form of residential segregation, recent research shows that ethnic enclaves can be positively associated with immigrants' housing market outcomes. Immigrants are more successful in attaining homeownership in areas that have larger immigrant concentrations (Painter and Yu 2010). In addition, ethnic enclaves are no longer always associated with lower economic resources (Logan et al. 2002; Ishizawa and Stevens 2007; Yu and Myers 2007). These results indicate that even as immigrants attain greater economic resources, they choose to reside in co-ethnic neighborhoods (Bobo and Zubrinsky 1996; Logan et al. 2002).

Living in ethnic enclaves, foreign-born blacks are segregated from whites in the United States. However, both African and Caribbean-born blacks have higher exposure to whites than US-born blacks (Logan 2007), suggesting that they encounter less discrimination in the housing market. Fewer discriminatory experiences in the process of loan applications may lead to fewer application rejections for these groups. This may have an indirect effect on application behavior because anticipating being rejected makes individuals less likely to apply for home loans (Charles and Hurst 2002). Foreign-born blacks, then, are expected to be more likely to pursue homeownership, making them more likely than US-born blacks to own homes. Among blacks, African immigrants perceive the least discrimination in the housing market (Benson 2006). If their *perception* of discrimination reflects their *experiences*, Africans will be more likely to own homes and own homes of higher value than both Caribbean and US-born blacks.

Nativity-Based Determinants of Homeownership

Prior research has focused on group differences in socioeconomic characteristics and racial stratification on housing market outcomes. Just as previous work on these topics does not adequately describe the experiences of black immigrants, research does not give enough attention to socioeconomic characteristics specific to immigrants. The microeconomic model of consumer choice highlights the importance of financial resources to homeownership disparities, but does not acknowledge the effect of remittances and access to credit on

immigrants' housing market outcomes. Assimilation theory, by contrast, does identify remittances as an important determinant of immigrants' available financial resources. It predicts that immigrant socioeconomic outcomes improve as they become more like the US-born over time and links to same-ethnicity social networks diminish. In the case of homeownership, this means that remittances sent to relatives in the country of origin decrease over time, thereby increasing funds available to purchase a home in the United States. Due to its focus on the reduction of ties to the home country, this theory of homeownership does not acknowledge the long-term importance of remittances on available resources for housing market outcomes. Assimilation theory also fails to recognize the ways in which immigrant social networks can be *beneficial* in the housing market.

Regardless of race, a large proportion of immigrants send remittances to support family in the home country, reducing consumption of goods and services in the United States (Owusu 1998). African and Caribbean immigrants may, however, differ in the amount and frequency of remittances. Caribbean-born blacks have a long history of immigration to the United States, and the majority now come to the country through family reunification (Kent 2007). Based on their immigration patterns, it stands to reason that Caribbean-born blacks have more relatives in the United States and, consequently, fewer relatives in the home country to whom they send remittances than African immigrants. With more immediate family in the United States, Caribbean-born blacks are also more likely to be able to split remittances with other relatives. In turn, they would spend less of their household income on remittances than African immigrants. Caribbean-born blacks are then likely to have more available income for investment in the housing market, giving them a housing market advantage relative to African immigrants.

Remittances are most often discussed as a means to support family in the home country; however, the foreign-born may also send remittances to purchase property or for other investments abroad (Singer 2010) if they ultimately intend to return. Although all immigrant groups are comparable in their stated intent to return home, the relative proximity and low cost of return migration for Caribbean immigrants make them more likely to do so (Segal 1987). Given that Caribbean immigrants are more likely to return to their home country and that they have, on average, been in the United States longer than the African-born, Caribbean immigrants who remain in the United States are more likely to have made the decision to live there permanently. Immigrants with intentions to remain in the host country are more likely to own property there than those who plan to return to the home country (Dustmann and Mestres 2010). As a result, Caribbean-born blacks are expected to have higher rates of homeownership than the African-born. Lower levels of remittances due to their intention to stay in the host country may also result in higher house values for Caribbean than African immigrants.

Variation in foreign-born blacks' intentions to settle in the United States has implications on more than just remittances. Intentions to live permanently in the United States also affect immigrants' likelihood of attaining country-specific housing market knowledge. Assimilation theory hypothesizes that time in the United States is important because immigrants gain knowledge and skills beneficial to them in the American housing market and can establish the credit necessary for a home loan. Thus, black immigrants may be less

familiar with the workings of the US housing market than the US-born. Immigrants' lack of housing market knowledge may be compounded by having less money for investment in the host country than the US-born due to sending remittances abroad and having fewer extended family members in the United States to whom they can turn for financial assistance. This combination of characteristics may leave immigrants less able than the US-born to establish the credit necessary to acquire a home loan (Krivo 1995).

Some immigrants may compensate for lack of credit and social capital using ethnic-specific contacts to their advantage and forming ethnically based systems of capital pooling and rotating credit (Besley, Coate, and Loury 1993). Immigrants may turn to informal credit associations if they are unable to obtain a loan from a formal lending institution, or because they find it preferable to a formal bank. Members of these groups contribute money to the rotating credit associations on a regular basis and receive large sums by rotation or lottery. The forced savings component may play a part in immigrants choosing to save money in an informal organization (Handa and Kirton 1999).

Rotating savings and credit associations are found throughout Africa and, in the Caribbean, are part of the region's African heritage (Handa and Kirton 1999). These associations have also been observed in immigrant communities, providing Ethiopian (Mequanent 1996) and West Indian (Foner 1979) immigrants with the capital necessary to purchase homes. Due to their ubiquity in Africa and the Caribbean, and their endurance over time and place, credit-pooling groups may assist other black immigrant groups in accumulating the capital necessary to purchase homes as well.

Credit-pooling groups may compensate for black immigrants' lower credit and social capital than the US-born, helping them attain the capital necessary to purchase a home. Given the necessity of an ethnic social network for the formation of credit-pooling groups, Caribbean immigrants, the larger black immigrant group, may be better able to use these informal savings associations to finance home purchases. In addition to having a larger population, Caribbean immigrants are also more highly concentrated than the African-born; nearly 60 percent of Caribbean immigrants live in just three metropolitan areas. Africans are more dispersed; however, there are large populations in New York and Washington, DC that have led to the formation of substantial African ethnic enclaves.

In addition to providing access to rotating savings and credit associations and information networks regarding the housing market process, ethnic enclaves may also aid black immigrants by way of same-ethnicity real estate agents and lenders. The potential benefits of same-ethnicity real estate agents and lenders do not, however, seem to be shared by US-born blacks. Ratner (1997) found that same race real estate agents, loan officers, and lenders do not eliminate US-born blacks' pervasive sense of discrimination.

Caribbean immigrants may be most likely to benefit from an ethnic enclave because of their relatively large population and high geographic concentration. Therefore, they may be more likely to utilize credit-pooling groups and have access to same-nativity information networks. These advantages relative to the African-born may make them more likely to own their homes and own homes of higher value. Caribbean immigrants from the top three

sending countries (Jamaica, Haiti, and Trinidad) should have the highest homeownership rates and house values of all Caribbean-born blacks.

Given the variation in the determinants of homeownership among blacks, my objective for this paper is to determine the homeownership pattern and house value of African and Caribbean-born blacks in 1990, 2000, and 2007. I conduct the analysis over three time periods because the black immigrant population has substantially increased over the past three decades. This increased population has led to larger same-nativity social networks over time, which may have an effect on black immigrant housing market outcomes.

DATA AND METHODS

I use data from the 5 percent Public Use Micro Samples (PUMS) of the 1990 and 2000 US censuses and the pooled 2005–2007 (2007) American Community Survey (ACS) (Ruggles et al. 2010). Although there are more recent data available, I focus on time periods before the housing bubble burst. Little is known about the housing market outcomes of black immigrants either before or after the housing market crash. Therefore, it is important to first understand black immigrant housing market outcomes relative to the US-born before determining what effect changes in the housing market have on these groups.

The unit of analysis is the household, and as a result, the data only include heads of household who are aged 25 or over and live in an identifiable metropolitan area. I only include identifiable metropolitan areas because I use metropolitan area level data in the analysis that is not available for unidentified areas. This analysis includes US-born non-Hispanic black or white, and foreign-born non-Hispanic black sub-Saharan African or Caribbean households whose head is not in school.

All individual level characteristics of the household are determined by the characteristics of the household head. Race is defined here with a bridged race variable that uses a modified regression method to determine the probability of a single race for multiple race respondents and assigns a single race to individuals based on these probabilities (Liebler and Halpern-Manners 2008). Although black immigrants come to the United States with unique conceptions of race developed in their home countries which shape how they *respond* to racialization in the United States (Benson 2006), the American system of racial stratification categorizes individuals based on skin color alone (Alba and Nee 1997). As a result, racial differences in treatment by lenders and real estate agents will be based on perceptions of race rather than self-classification or responses to racialization.

Statistical Models

To determine differences in homeownership and house value among blacks in the United States, I use the Heckman selection model. Because house value is dependent on an individual being a homeowner, analyses that do not control for selection into homeownership solely focus on homeowners. Within an ethnic group, individuals who own their home may have substantially different socioeconomic characteristics from those who do not, and the characteristics that differ between homeowners and non-homeowners may also vary by ethnic group. Consequently, results of analyses focusing solely on homeowners

are not representative of the entire population of interest and provide biased, inconsistent parameter estimates (Long 1997). Heckman's selection model addresses this bias by controlling for selection into homeownership *before* estimating house value differences. It does so by determining the predicted probability of homeownership in the first stage of the two-step analysis using the following probit equation:

$$P(Y=1)=F(X\beta+e)$$

The dependent variable in this equation is a dummy variable indicating whether the head of household owns their home. β represents the characteristics influencing the household's selection into homeownership: median metro area house value/median metro area household income, proportion of single-family homes in the metropolitan area, and number of children in the household along with the socioeconomic variables included in the second-stage house value equation (geographic, individual and household, immigration, and human capital characteristics). Median metro area house value/median metro area household income, proportion of single-family homes in the metro area, and number of children are the only variables included in the probit equation, but not the linear regression equation determining house value differences. Median metro area house value/median metro area household income represents affordability of homes in the metropolitan area, and number of children is used because it is positively associated with homeownership. Proportion of single-family homes in the metropolitan area is also a selection variable because markets with a greater share of single-family housing represent more favorable supply conditions and are more conducive to homeownership (Lee and Myers 2003; Dawkins 2005).

After controlling for selection into homeownership using the probit model just described, the second step of the Heckman selection model determines house value in the following second-stage equation:

$$\ln(v_h)=X_h\beta+\sigma_{eu}\lambda_h$$

House value (v_h) is determined using the self-reported categorical house value variable from the censuses and ACS, using the midpoint of each category as the value of the home. β is a vector of parameters to be estimated, and σ_{eu} represents the covariance between the error terms in the house value equation and the homeownership equation. The inverse Mills ratio (λ_h) is a control variable accounting for selection bias into homeownership. A significant Mills' lambda indicates that controlling for selection into homeownership has a significant effect on house value that is not captured by the independent variables in the house value equation.

Group-level differences found in housing market outcomes can be due to a variety of factors. While the Heckman selection model determines homeownership and house value gaps, it does not determine how much of these variations are explained by group-level differences in characteristics (endowments) or are unexplained differences in returns to characteristics (coefficients). To establish how much of the racial/ethnic gaps in housing market outcomes remain unexplained after controlling for socioeconomic characteristics, I conducted Fairlie's

extension of the Oaxaca–Blinder decomposition of the homeownership probit model (Fairlie 2005) and a Oaxaca–Blinder decomposition of the house value regression after controlling for selection into homeownership.

The Fairlie decomposition of homeownership gaps between groups is written as:

$$\overline{H}^w - \overline{H}^b = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N^w} \frac{F(X_i^w \hat{\beta}^w)}{N^w} - \sum_{i=1}^{N^b} \frac{F(X_i^b \hat{\beta}^w)}{N^b} \right] + \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N^b} \frac{F(X_i^b \hat{\beta}^w)}{N^b} - \sum_{i=1}^{N^b} \frac{F(X_i^b \hat{\beta}^b)}{N^b} \right]$$

where H represents homeownership and the superscripts w and b represents whites and a black ethnic group, respectively. The term in the first bracket represents the part of the racial/ethnic homeownership gap that is due to group differences in endowments. The second term represents the part due to differences in coefficients.

After controlling for selection into homeownership, the Oaxaca–Blinder decomposition finds the house value differential between groups using the following equation:

$$\overline{HV}^w - \overline{HV}^b = [(\overline{X}^w - \overline{X}^b)\beta^b] + [(\beta^w - \beta^b)\overline{X}^w]$$

where $\overline{HV}^w - \overline{HV}^b$ represents the house value difference between whites and a black ethnic group. As in the Fairlie decomposition, the term in the first bracket represents differences in endowments and the second bracket represents differences in coefficients.

Independent Variables

The main independent variable is ethnicity, with black immigrants divided by race and nativity (non-Hispanic US-born blacks and whites, and non-Hispanic foreign-born African and Caribbean blacks). Based on the possible positive effect of rotating credit associations and living in an ethnic enclave on immigrant housing market outcomes, immigrants from countries with large US populations should have higher rates of homeownership and higher house values than others from their region. To highlight these effects, I also disaggregate foreign-born blacks into immigrants from Nigeria, other African countries, Jamaica, Haiti, Trinidad and Tobago, and other Caribbean countries. I only differentiate one major African sending country because the population of all other African immigrant groups is considerably smaller than the population from major Caribbean sending countries.

In addition to race and nativity of the household head, I include geographic characteristics to control for variations in homeownership and house value that are related to location. These variables are region (northeast, midwest, south, and west), state, and city population. City population is included because both home value and homeownership depend, in part, upon the population density of an area. In more densely populated areas, a larger percentage of the housing market will be comprised of rental units. The values of the homes in these areas will be higher due to higher demand.

I control for household factors that affect homeownership and house value by including individual and family characteristics that play a role in likelihood of homeownership. Households choose to purchase homes according to their needs and preferences after considering their financial resources. Therefore, homeownership is positively associated with marriage (Myers and Lee 1998), age, income, and having children (Alba and Logan 1992). Accordingly, the individual and family characteristics included in the analysis are age, marital status, household income (in 1999 dollars), and a dummy variable indicating whether households received pre-tax income from public assistance programs.

In addition to individual and household factors, human capital characteristics also have a significant effect on homeownership and house value. Educational attainment determines, at least in part, whether individuals can receive home loans or save for a down payment. It is also associated with the wages individuals receive; higher wages make home loan approval more likely. For the foreign-born, attending school in the United States may be invaluable in teaching them to use their education and other forms of human capital in ways that are rewarded in the US labor market (Friedberg 2000). I estimate whether education was completed in the United States by calculating age at immigration (age-years in the United States) and comparing that to the estimated age at which each individual completed their education (six plus years of education). If age of education completion is less than immigration age, I assume that education was completed outside of the United States.

Finally, immigration characteristics have also been found to have an effect on the housing market outcomes of the foreign-born. Results of previous research suggest that the negative effects of foreign birth on homeownership are mediated by English ability (Flippen 2001); therefore, English ability is included in this analysis as an immigration characteristic along with citizenship and immigration cohort. Immigration cohort, defined as immigration by 1980 (pre-1980), 1981–1990, 1991–2000, and 2001–2007, is included in the analysis. The native-born and pre-1980 immigrants are pooled into one reference group in the regression analyses due to collinearity; the probability of homeownership does not differ between the native-born and immigrants of the same race who have lived in the United States for more than 20 years (Colburn 1998).

RESULTS

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for heads of households by race/ ethnicity with major immigrant-sending countries from Africa and the Caribbean highlighted. Black immigrants are younger than the US-born in all three time periods with Africans the youngest and US-born whites the oldest of all four groups. Although age is usually positively associated with marriage, there is very little difference between the marriage rates of the oldest group (US-born whites) and the youngest (black immigrants). In fact, though the youngest, Nigerians have the highest marriage rate of all racial/ethnic groups.

In addition to being the youngest and most likely to be married, Nigerians are also most highly educated. The proportion with at least a college degree is over twice that of whites in all three time periods. Overall, African immigrants are the most highly educated in all three

time periods, but the difference between all Africans and all other race/ethnic groups decreases over time.

While educational differences decrease over time, the same is not true of immigration characteristics. In all three years, a larger proportion of African immigrants came to the United States 5–10 years prior to the survey period than Caribbean-born blacks. Assimilation theory would predict that Caribbean immigrants have higher household incomes than the African-born because they have lived in the United States longer than even Nigerians who have spent the most time in the country. However, the household income of Caribbean immigrants is lower than that of African immigrants in 2000 and 2007. Despite Caribbean immigrants' low household income relative to the African-born, they still have higher average household income than US-born blacks in all three years. Although black immigrants have larger households, the average number of working adults per household is very similar to that of US-born blacks; therefore, it is unlikely that this explains nativity differences in household income.

Household income is highly correlated with homeownership; however, Nigerians, who have higher household income than US-born blacks, have homeownership rates half as large in 1990 (Table 2). As expected, homeownership increases with time in the United States for all immigrant groups, but Nigerians experience one of the largest increases in homeownership. By 2007, their homeownership rates are higher than US-born blacks and comparable to Jamaican immigrants who have the highest homeownership rates of all immigrants. These findings lend some initial support for the hypothesis that a large population and same-ethnicity social networks aid immigrants in the housing markets given that Nigerians and Jamaicans are the largest black immigrant groups from each region. Although less likely to own their home than whites, African and Caribbean immigrants own homes worth more than US-born white households in 1990 and 2007.

Models of Homeownership and House Value

Heckman's selection model has two steps: The first determines differences in the predicted probability of homeownership and the second finds the natural log of the house values after controlling for selection into homeownership. Both steps of the analyses for all metropolitan areas in 1990, 2000, and 2007 are presented in Table 3. The results of models highlighting major immigrant-sending countries are italicized within Table 3; all other coefficients are identical in the models differentiating African and Caribbean immigrants and those that highlight major immigrant-sending countries. In 1990, all blacks have significantly lower predicted probability of homeownership than whites, with substantial variation among blacks. Although Haan (2007) found that black immigrants are less likely than native-born blacks to own their homes, when I disaggregate blacks into African and Caribbean immigrants, I find that this is not true of all foreign-born blacks. Africans have the largest homeownership disadvantage of all blacks while Caribbean immigrants' predicted probability of homeownership is much closer to that of whites, with a negative coefficient that is about half that of US-born blacks.

The coefficients of most independent variables have the expected association with homeownership with the exceptions of speaking English at least very well and being a

naturalized citizen. Controlling for immigration characteristics is expected to reduce the homeownership gap between the US- and foreign-born, yet in this analysis these variables are negatively associated with homeownership. The relationship observed is due to the association between immigration characteristics and homeownership for Caribbean immigrants. When immigration variables are added to a model that only includes geographic characteristics (not shown), Caribbean immigrants' homeownership disadvantage *increases* relative to US-born whites while it decreases the homeownership gap for African immigrants. Given that Caribbean immigrants make up the majority of the foreign-born black population, this explains the negative coefficients observed in the full model. These results indicate that, unlike other immigrant groups, immigration characteristics are an advantage for black immigrants, specifically for the larger immigrant group, Caribbeans.

National statistics (US Census Bureau 2012) show that the racial gap in homeownership remains relatively constant over time; however, I find substantial variation between 1990 and 2007. US-born blacks are increasingly less likely than whites to own their homes after controlling for all independent variables; the US-born have a coefficient of -0.31 in 1990, but by 2007, the coefficient is -0.39 . The increase in the homeownership disadvantage is also observed for foreign-born blacks between 1990 and 2000; however, between 2000 and 2007 black immigrant homeownership increases relative to whites. By 2007, the homeownership gap between whites and African immigrants reaches its lowest point with an African coefficient of -0.63 . The decrease in the African coefficient is predominantly due to the dramatic decline in the Nigerian homeownership disadvantage; Nigerians' probability of homeownership increases steadily over time with their homeownership disadvantage decreasing by nearly half by 2007, and surpassing other African-born blacks. The Nigerian population increased substantially between 1990 and 2007; therefore, the increase in Nigerian homeownership over time may reflect the importance of same-ethnicity networks. Jamaicans' high likelihood of homeownership relative to all other black immigrant groups may also reflect the relationship between same-ethnicity social networks and positive housing market outcomes.

After controlling for selection into homeownership, the second step of the Heckman selection model presented in Table 3 finds the natural log of house value for all identifiable metropolitan areas in 1990, 2000, and 2007. In 1990, both groups of black immigrants own homes of higher value than US-born blacks, and Caribbean house values are equivalent to whites. Africans' homes are worth 11 percent less than whites almost entirely due to the effect of controlling for human capital characteristics. Adding human capital characteristics to a model that only includes geographic characteristics (not shown) decreases the coefficient for all groups, but the most dramatic decline occurs for African immigrants: Africans' coefficient plummets from 0.68 to -0.21 . The importance of human capital may explain why, unlike in the homeownership equation, Nigerians' homes are worth significantly less than whites and all other immigrant groups and do not lose this disadvantage over time.

Caribbean-born blacks' house value remains equivalent to whites in 2000, while African house values decrease between 1990 and 2000. Immigrants' coefficients then increase substantially between 2000 and 2007. By 2007, Caribbean immigrants' homes are worth 12

percent more than whites, and Africans' house values are equivalent to whites. The low homeownership rates and high house values of black immigrants relative to US-born whites are consistent with previous work finding low homeownership rates but high house values when comparing immigrants to US-born whites (Chatterjee and Zahirovic-Herbert 2011).

Caribbean-born blacks' high house value at the national level may be at least partially determined by their concentration in major immigrant settlement areas. Although I control for geographic characteristics including metropolitan area housing characteristics in the national level analysis, these variables may not fully capture the characteristics of major immigrant settlement areas that affect house value. For example, immigrants may benefit from geographic concentration in areas with substantial same-ethnicity social networks or from living in areas with high home values. To more accurately determine the housing market outcomes of black immigrants relative to US-born whites and blacks, I also conducted the analyses for two major immigrant settlement areas with sizable populations of both African and Caribbean immigrants: the New York and Washington, DC metropolitan areas¹ (Appendix 1).

While the results of the homeownership equation in these major immigrant settlement areas are very similar to the findings of the national analysis, I find striking differences between the national and New York and Washington, DC analyses in the house value equation. In 2007, all blacks own homes of significantly lower values than whites in these major immigrant settlement areas. The significantly lower house value of Caribbean immigrants (−13%) in 2007 is a marked difference from the national analysis where Caribbean immigrants own homes of 12 percent higher value than whites. Caribbeans' low house value in New York and Washington, DC suggests that the house value advantage at the national level is due to their concentration in metropolitan areas with high average house values.

Decomposition

The results of the Heckman selection model show that, on average, both US- and foreign-born blacks are disadvantaged in the housing market relative to whites. However, the results do not determine how much of the disadvantage is due to group-level differences in socio-demographic characteristics and how much remains unexplained and could be at least partially attributed to discrimination. Table 4 presents the results of the Fairlie and Oaxaca–Blinder decompositions differentiating homeownership and house value gaps into these components.

The key finding of the homeownership decomposition is the extremely large proportion of the African homeownership gap that is due to differences in coefficients. Although African immigrants perceive the least discrimination in the housing market (Benson 2006), they seem to *experience* the most discrimination of all black groups; approximately 70 percent of Africans' homeownership disadvantage remains unexplained after controlling for socioeconomic characteristics. This is in stark contrast to the outcomes for Caribbean-born blacks; differences due to coefficients account for 35 percent of the homeownership gap in 1990 and 2000 and 24 percent in 2007.

¹The metropolitan areas are defined as primary metropolitan statistical areas.

Unlike the homeownership decomposition, most, if not all, of the gap between white and Caribbean house values is due to differences in the returns to characteristics in all three years. Although returns to characteristics make up the majority of the Caribbean house value gap in 2007, the coefficients are negative reflecting their higher home values relative to US-born whites. The negative value of the coefficients also implies that Caribbean immigrants have higher house values even with the same characteristics as whites. Disaggregating black immigrants into major immigrant-sending countries shows that all Caribbean immigrant groups have negative coefficients of similar size in 2007. While the results indicate that Caribbean immigrants receive better returns to characteristics than whites, much of this is based on where they live, not their socioeconomic characteristics; living in the northeast, south, and in the suburbs accounted for the vast majority of this Caribbean advantage (not shown).

Given the importance of location, decompositions were also conducted in New York and Washington, DC alone (Appendix 2). In these analyses, the Caribbean gaps due to returns to characteristics either become positive or remain negative but are no longer significant. When the negative coefficient does persist, it is due to the large negative constant term (not shown). The constant represents group-specific differences that are not captured by the variables included in the analysis (O'Connor, Hammack, and Scott 2010) such as use of rotating credit associations. The difference between the national and local analyses once again indicates that in national analyses, Caribbean immigrants appear to have an advantage, but that is only because of their high concentration in the New York and Washington, DC metropolitan areas where house values are higher.

DISCUSSION

Despite socioeconomic differences between native and foreign-born blacks, very little research has investigated nativity differences in housing market outcomes. The overwhelming focus of the existing literature is residential segregation as opposed to whether black immigrants own their homes and, if so, how much these homes are worth. This gap in the literature suggests researchers have implicitly assumed that black immigrants have similar housing market outcomes to US-born blacks due to racial stratification. However, racial stratification in the housing market is not the only factor determining black immigrants' housing market outcomes; there is also variation in homeownership and house value among blacks based on nativity.

As in the descriptive statistics, the regression analyses show that Africans are least likely to own their homes and, though they own homes of higher value than US-born blacks, own homes of significantly lower value than Caribbean-born blacks in the full model. Caribbean immigrants are more likely to be homeowners than US-born blacks at the national level in all three time periods. Although Caribbean-born blacks are significantly less likely than US-born whites to own their homes, Caribbean immigrants own homes of equivalent or higher value than US-born whites at the national level. The results of the national analysis suggest that Caribbean-born blacks are more advantaged than whites in terms of house value. However, this advantage is predominantly due to their concentration in the New York and Washington, DC metropolitan areas, two areas with high home values relative to the rest of

the nation. When the analysis is limited to New York and Washington, DC (Appendix 1), Caribbean-born blacks' homes are worth significantly less than those of US-born whites but still more than US-born blacks.

Black immigrants' housing market success relative to US-born blacks indicates that, for foreign-born blacks, immigration characteristics are not always a detriment to housing market outcomes. While immigration characteristics are negatively associated with homeownership for the African-born, the opposite is true of Caribbean immigrants. As the larger immigrant group, Caribbean immigrants presumably have access to wider and more diverse ethnic-specific social networks allowing their immigrant characteristics to be a benefit rather than a hindrance in the housing market. For example, previous work has shown that the advantage of immigrant communities has a stronger positive effect on the homeownership of immigrants with weaker English skills than those with stronger English skills (Haurin and Rosenthal 2009). Given the negative association between homeownership and immigration characteristics, the results of this analysis indicate that the same is true of black immigrants. Those with low levels of English ability or less knowledge of the local housing market make use of their ethnic-specific social network so that their immigrant characteristics are not a barrier in the housing market.

The importance of same-ethnicity social networks is also confirmed by the results for the largest immigrant groups from each region (Nigerians and Jamaicans). Although Nigerians do have worse housing market outcomes than other African immigrants in 1990, with population growth, their housing market outcomes surpassed those of other African immigrants in 2000 and 2007. Not only do Nigerians and Jamaicans have higher rates of homeownership than their regional counterparts, their probability of homeownership is slightly higher in New York and Washington, DC than in the national analysis (Appendix 1).

Nigerian and Jamaican housing market outcomes in major immigrant settlement areas may stem from being better able to benefit from same-ethnicity lending or real estate agents and from rotating credit associations due to their large population size. Access to same-ethnicity real estate and loan agents has been shown to decrease the potential misunderstandings for immigrants in the house purchasing process (Ratner 1997). In addition, credit-pooling groups are one way that socially connected immigrant groups respond to credit market exclusion (Besley, Coate, and Loury 1993). Responses such as these to the difficulties of navigating the American housing market may explain why black immigrants seem to be protected from some of the disadvantage experienced by US-born blacks.

The decomposition analyses do in fact show that the larger black immigrant groups are protected in that a smaller proportion of housing market deficits remain unexplained after controlling for socioeconomic characteristics. In the house value decomposition, the majority of the difference between whites and foreign-born blacks also remains unexplained, but the coefficients indicate that Caribbean immigrants have an *advantage* relative to whites. However, here again, location drives the findings for the Caribbean-born. When decompositions are conducted for New York and Washington, DC alone, the Caribbean advantage either disappears or loses significance; when the negative coefficient persists, it is entirely due to the constant. In this analysis, the value of the constant may indicate the

importance of social networks or other immigrant characteristics that are not adequately captured in this analysis.

One issue that cannot be addressed using census data is the effect of immigrants' settlement intentions on housing market outcomes. African immigrants' lower homeownership probabilities relative to the Caribbean-born may be related to lower intentions to stay in the United States permanently. Caribbean immigrants in the United States who intend to return home are more likely to do so than the African-born. Immigrants with intentions to return to the home country are less likely to own property in the host country (Dustmann and Mestres 2010). Consequently, the low homeownership rates of Africans relative to the Caribbean-born may be attributable to Africans' lower likelihood of having made a permanent commitment to living in the United States.

Another aspect of the Caribbean advantage that cannot be adequately addressed in most survey data is *why* immigrants choose to live in an ethnic enclave. Although immigrants may benefit from the same-nativity social network of ethnic enclaves, immigrants may also choose to live in these areas because they face better conditions in the housing market (Borjas 2002). One way to address this issue in analyses would be to focus on refugees who have less choice about where to settle. Census data do not provide information on the visa status of individual immigrants; however, the Yearbook of Immigration Statistics provides group-level data on the entry visas of those who attained legal permanent residence (US Immigration and Naturalization Service 2002; US Department of Homeland Security 2011). Based on these data, the majority of the immigrants highlighted in this analysis came to the United States on diversity or family-based visas. Somali immigrants are the largest black immigrant group with over half of the population coming to the United States as refugees. However, the number of Somali household heads in the 5 percent census and pooled ACS is extremely small, making housing market analyses impossible without restricted census data.

While housing market research based on US census data does not directly address the housing market outcomes of refugees, research in Canada found that, similar to other immigrant groups, refugees rely heavily on social networks to find their permanent residence (Murdie 2008). In addition to compensating for immigration characteristics, this may be a response to perceived housing market discrimination. Minority immigrants can often avoid discrimination by living within their own ethnic community or by relying on same-ethnicity social networks (Dion 2001). This strategy is extremely likely both in the United States and Canada given that in both countries blacks face higher levels of discrimination than any other group (ibid.).

Regardless of the host country, black immigrants seem to be able to at least partially avoid discrimination in the housing market, which may allow them to have higher levels of economic attainment than native-born blacks. Although homeownership and house values have declined recently, homeownership is still an important aspect of socioeconomic attainment. For lower income and minority households in particular, homeownership plays a key role in wealth accumulation (Boehm and Schlottmann 2004), accounting for 80 percent of black households' median net worth (Gottschalck 2008).

Given the importance of homeownership in black household wealth and the increase in the black immigrant population, nativity-based variation in black housing market outcomes has important implications for black wealth research. Black immigrants' higher levels of homeownership and higher house values relative to native-born blacks may leave them better able to accumulate wealth. Racial differences in inheritance and other intergenerational transfers have been shown to play an important role in the racial wealth gap (Blau and Graham 1990); therefore, these nativity differences could lead to better socioeconomic outcomes for the next generation.

When researching racial housing market and wealth disparities, there is little acknowledgment of the now substantial foreign-born black population. However, if the patterns observed hold over time, as the first-generation black immigrant population grows and the second generation reaches adulthood, the average homeownership rates and house values of blacks in the United States will increase. Yet, this increase will not be due to increases in the 3+ generation housing market outcomes. Further research is needed to understand the effect of nativity-based variation in housing market outcomes on the wealth of blacks in the United States. Without doing so, decreases in black/white housing market and wealth disparities may be attributed to decreased racial discrimination rather than a changing composition of the black population.

The impact of discrimination on nativity differentials in housing market and wealth outcomes among blacks will also become an increasingly important topic in Europe, Australia, and Canada. Although it has been suggested that minorities experience less discrimination in other major host countries than do blacks in the United States (McLaren 2003), this is not supported by the available evidence. In Europe, violent reactions to immigrants have increased in the last decade and there is rising support of anti-immigrant political parties in Austria and France (Rustenbach 2010). Analyses have found that the basis for the perceived immigrant threat in European countries is the ethnic/racial backgrounds of these new immigrants (Schneider 2008). While racial conflicts are less common in Canada and Australia, this is not necessarily indicative of less discrimination than Europe (or the United States). Blacks, in particular, bear the brunt of anti-immigrant sentiments. Africans more frequently report finding it difficult to be a migrant or refugee than other immigrant groups in Australia (Fozdar and Torezani 2008) and are the only refugee group that is disadvantaged in the housing market relative to the Australian-born (Forrest and Hermes 2012).

Despite the anti-immigrant sentiments with which blacks must contend, studies of perceived housing discrimination and fair housing audits in Canada underestimate the amount and severity of discrimination against blacks in the housing market (Dion 2001). As in this analysis, researchers find that immigrants ameliorate the negative effects of discrimination through the use of same-ethnicity social networks (Dion 2001; Murdie 2008; Owusu 2010). However, with the expected increase in second- and third-generation immigrants in Australia, Canada, and Europe, there will be a growing number of blacks that will be unable to take advantage of ethnic social networks. In addition, generational change will effect blacks' *perceptions* of discrimination. The first generation may see discrimination as a low price to pay for living in a safe environment or in a country where there is greater possibility

for economic advancement, but subsequent generations will not have this frame of reference. Research in the United Kingdom suggests that discrimination and racial inequalities will be less acceptable to native-born minorities (Reitz 1988).

Another avenue for future research would be to explore how changes in the nativity composition of the black population impact the housing and wealth outcomes of blacks in other major host countries. Based on the results of this analysis, second- and third-generation blacks in Europe, Canada, and Australia will be more likely to experience discrimination than their first-generation counterparts because they lack the immigrant social network. If blacks in other major host countries remain marginalized, housing market outcomes of native-born blacks will be lower than other racial groups. In addition to reducing their chances of owning a home or the value of the home they purchase, more discrimination experiences can also reduce the likelihood that they pursue homeownership. Therefore, second- and third-generation blacks in these countries may mirror those of US-born blacks, and, over time, black wealth accumulation may decrease.

References

- Alba RD, Logan JR. Assimilation and Stratification in the Homeownership Patterns of Racial and Ethnic Groups. *International Migration Review*. 1992; 26(4):1314–41.
- Alba R, Nee V. Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration. *International Migration Review*. 1997; 31(4):826–74. [PubMed: 12293207]
- Bashi V, McDaniel A. A Theory of Immigration and Racial Stratification. *Journal of Black Studies*. 1997; 27(5):668–82.
- Benson JE. Exploring the Racial Identities of Black Immigrants in the United States. *Sociological Forum*. 2006; 21(2):219–47.
- Besley T, Coate S, Loury G. The Economics of Rotating Savings and Credit Associations. *The American Economic Review*. 1993; 83(4):792–810.
- Blau FD, Graham JW. Black-White Differences in Wealth and Asset Composition. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 1990; 105(2):321–39.
- Bobo L, Zubrinsky CL. Attitudes on Residential Integration: Perceived Status Differences, Mere In-Group Preference, or Racial Prejudice? *Social Forces*. 1996; 74(3):883–909.
- Boehm, TP, Schlottmann, AM. *Wealth Accumulation and Homeownership: Evidence for Low-Income Households*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc; 2004.
- Borjas GJ. Homeownership in the Immigrant Population. *Journal of Urban Economics*. 2002; 52:448–76.
- Charles KK, Hurst E. The Transition to Home Ownership and the Black-White Wealth Gap. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*. 2002; 84(2):281–97.
- Chatterjee S, Zahirovic-Herbert V. Homeownership and Housing Equity: An Examination of Native–Immigrant Differences in Housing Wealth. *International Advances in Economic Research*. 2011; 17:211–23.
- Coffey B, Gocker JC. Racial Disparities in Mortgage Lending: The Example of Urban Ohio. *Social Justice*. 1998; 25(3):115–27.
- Colburn A. Immigration and Housing. *Housing Economics*. 1998; 46(7):11–14.
- Cortes A, Herbert CE, Wilson E, Clay E. Factors Affecting Hispanic Homeownership: A Review of the Literature. *Cityscape*. 2007; 9(2):53–91.
- Coulson NE. Why are Hispanic- and Asian-American Homeownership Rates so Low?: Immigration and Other Factors. *Journal of Urban Economics*. 1999; 45:209–27.
- Dawkins CJ. Racial Gaps in the Transition to First-Time Homeownership: The Role of Residential Location. *Journal of Urban Economics*. 2005; 58:537–54.

- Dion KL. Immigrants' Perceptions of Housing Discrimination in Toronto: The Housing New Canadians Project. *Journal of Social Issues*. 2001; 57(3):523–39.
- Dustmann C, Mestres J. Savings, Asset Holdings, and Temporary Migration. *Annals of Economics and Statistics/ Annales d'Économie et de Statistique*. 2010; (97/98):289–306.
- Fairlie RW. An Extension of the Blinder–Oaxaca Decomposition Technique to Logit and Probit Models. *Journal of Economic and Social Measurement*. 2005; 30:305–16.
- Fannie Mae Foundation. African American and Hispanic Attitudes on Home Ownership: A Guide for Mortgage Industry Leaders. Washington, DC: Fannie Mae Foundation; 1998.
- Flippen C. Racial and Ethnic Inequality in Homeownership and Housing Equity. *The Sociological Quarterly*. 2001; 42(2):121–49.
- Flippen C. Unequal Returns to Housing Investments? A Study of Real Housing Appreciation among Black, White, and Hispanic Households. *Social Forces*. 2004; 82(4):1523–51.
- Foner N. West Indians in New York City and London: A Comparative Analysis. *International Migration Review*. 1979; 13(2):284–97.
- Forrest J, Hermes K. The Housing Resettlement Experience of Refugee Immigrants to Australia. *Journal of Refugee Studies*. 2012; 26(2):187–206.
- Fozdar F, Torezani S. Discrimination and Well-Being: Perceptions of Refugees in Western Australia. *International Migration Review*. 2008; 42(1):30–63.
- Freeman L. Black Homeownership: The Role of Temporal Changes and Residential Segregation at the End of the 20th Century. *Social Science Quarterly*. 2005; 86(2):403–26.
- Friedberg RM. You Can't Take it with You? Immigrant Assimilation and the Portability of Human Capital. *Journal of Labor Economics*. 2000; 18(2):221–51.
- Galster G, Godfrey E. By Words and Deeds: Racial Steering by Real Estate Agents in the US in 2000. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 2005; 71(3):251–68.
- Gotham KF. Race, Mortgage Lending and Loan Rejections in a US City. *Sociological Focus*. 1998; 31(4):391–405.
- Gottschalck, AO. Current Population Reports. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau; 2008. Net Worth and the Assets of Households: 2002; p. 70–115.
- Haan M. The Homeownership Hierarchies of Canada and the United States: The Housing Patterns of White and Non-White Immigrants of the Past Thirty Years. *International Migration Review*. 2007; 41(2):433–65.
- Handa S, Kirton C. The Economics of Rotating Savings and Credit Associations: Evidence from the Jamaican 'Partner'. *Journal of Development Economics*. 1999; 60:173–94.
- Haurin DR, Rosenthal SS. Language, Agglomeration and Hispanic Homeownership. *Real Estate Economics*. 2009; 37(2):155–83.
- Ishizawa H, Stevens G. Non-English Language Neighborhoods in Chicago, Illinois: 2000. *Social Science Research*. 2007; 36(3):1042–64.
- Kent MM. Immigration and America's Black Population. *Population Bulletin*. 2007; 62(4):1–16.
- Kim S, Squires GD. Lender Characteristics and Racial Disparities in Mortgage Lending. *Journal of Housing Research*. 1995; 6(1):99–113.
- Krivo LJ. Immigrant Characteristics and Hispanic-Anglo Housing Inequality. *Demography*. 1995; 32(4):599–615. [PubMed: 8925949]
- Krivo LJ, Kaufman RL. Housing and Wealth Inequality: Racial–Ethnic Differences in Home Equity in the United States. *Demography*. 2004; 41(3):585–605. [PubMed: 15461016]
- Lee SW, Myers D. Local Housing-Market Effects on Tenure Choice. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*. 2003; 18:129–57.
- Liebler CA, Halpern-Manners A. A Practical Approach to Using Multiple-Race Response Data: A Bridging Method for Public-Use Microdata. *Demography*. 2008; 45(1):143–55. [PubMed: 18390296]
- Logan, JR. Who are the Other African Americans? Contemporary African and Caribbean Immigrants in the United States. In: Shaw-Taylor, Y., Tuch, SA., editors. *The Other African Americans: Contemporary African and Caribbean Immigrants in the United States*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc; 2007. p. 49–68.

- Logan JR, Zhang W, et al. Immigrant Enclaves and Ethnic Communities in New York and Los Angeles. *American Sociological Review*. 2002; 67(2):299–322.
- Long, JS. *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 1997.
- McLaren LM. Anti-Immigrant Prejudice in Europe: Contact, Threat Perception, and Preferences for the Exclusion of Migrants. *Social Forces*. 2003; 81(3):909–36.
- Mequanent G. The Role of Informal Organizations in Resettlement Adjustment Process: A Case Study of Iqubs, Idirs and Mahabers in the Ethiopian Community in Toronto. *Refuge*. 1996; 15(3):30–39.
- Murdie RA. Pathways to Housing: The Experiences of Sponsored Refugees and Refugee Claimants in Accessing Permanent Housing in Toronto. *Journal of International Migration & Integration*. 2008; 9:81–101.
- Myers D, Lee SW. Immigrant Trajectories into Homeownership: A Temporal Analysis of Residential Assimilation. *International Migration Review*. 1998; 32(3):593–625. [PubMed: 12293993]
- O'Connor N, Hammack FM, Scott MA. Social Capital, Financial Knowledge, and Hispanic Student College Choices. *Research in Higher Education*. 2010; 51(3):195–219.
- Owusu TY. To Buy or Not to Buy: Determinants of Home Ownership among Ghanaian Immigrants in Toronto. *The Canadian Geographer*. 1998; 42(1):40–52.
- Owusu TY. Residential Patterns and Housing Choices of Ghanaian Immigrants in Toronto, Canada. *Housing Studies*. 2010; 14(1):77–97.
- Painter G, Gabriel S, Myers D. Race, Immigrant Status, and Housing Tenure Choice. *Journal of Urban Economics*. 2001; 49:150–67.
- Painter GS, Yu Z. Immigrants and Housing Markets in Mid-Size Metropolitan Areas. *International Migration Review*. 2010; 44(2):442–76.
- Ratner M. *Ethnographic Studies of Homeownership and Home Mortgage Financing: An Introduction*. Cityscape. 1997; 3(1):1–11.
- Reitz JG. Less Discrimination in Canada, or Simply Less Racial Conflict?: Implications of Comparisons with Britain. *Canadian Public Policy*. 1988; 14(4):424–41.
- Rosenbaum E. Racial/Ethnic Differences in Home Ownership and Housing Quality, 1991. *Social Problems*. 1996; 43(4):403–26.
- Ross SL, Turner MA. Housing Discrimination in Metropolitan America: Explaining Changes between 1989 and 2000. *Social Problems*. 2005; 52(5):152–80.
- Ruggles, S., Alexander, JT., Genadek, K., Goeken, R., Schroeder, MB., Sobek, M. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 5.0 [Machine-Readable Database]*. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Population Center; 2010.
- Rustenbach E. Sources of Negative Attitudes toward Immigrants in Europe: A Multi-Level Analysis. *International Migration Review*. 2010; 44(1):53–77.
- Schneider SL. Anti-Immigrant Attitudes in Europe: Outgroup Size and Perceived Ethnic Threat. *European Sociological Review*. 2008; 24(1):53–67.
- Segal, A. The Caribbean Exodus in a Global Context: Comparative Migration Experiences. In: Levine, BB., editor. *The Caribbean Exodus*. New York: Praeger; 1987. p. 44–64.
- Singer DA. Migrant Remittances and Exchange Rate Regimes in the Developing World. *American Political Science Review*. 2010; 104(2):307–23.
- Turner, MA., Ross, SL., Galster, GC., Yinger, J., Godfrey, EB. *Discrimination in Metropolitan Housing Markets: National Results from Phase I HDS 2000*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute; 2002.
- United States Department of Homeland Security. *Yearbook of Immigration Statistics: 2010*. Washington, DC: Department of Homeland Security, Office of Immigration Statistics; 2011.
- US Census Bureau. *Homeownership Rates by Race and Ethnicity of Householder: 1994 to 2011*. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau; 2012.
- US Immigration and Naturalization Service. *Statistical Yearbook of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, 2000*. Washington, DC: US Immigration and Naturalization Service; 2002.
- Yu Z, Myers D. Convergence or Divergence in Los Angeles: Three Distinctive Ethnic Patterns of Immigrant Residential Assimilation. *Social Science Research*. 2007; 36(1):254–65.

APPENDIX 1

TABLE A1

Multivariate Models Predicting Homeownership and House Value–New York and Washington, DC

	Probability of Homeownership			Natural Log of Homeownership		
	1990	2000	2005–2007	1990	2000	2005–2007
Race/Ethnicity (ref. US-born white)						
US-born black	−0.43 ***	−0.32 ***	−0.35 ***	−0.29 ***	−0.22 ***	−0.21 ***
African-born black (all)	−0.76 ***	−0.73 ***	−0.62 ***	−0.12 *	−0.22 ***	−0.10 *
Caribbean-born black (all)	−0.22 ***	−0.05	−0.17 **	−0.08 *	−0.12 ***	−0.13 ***
Major Immigrant Sending Countries (ref. US-born white)						
Nigerian-born black	−0.92 ***	−0.55 ***	−0.33 ***	−0.26 **	−0.27 ***	−0.28 ***
All Other African-born black	−0.70 ***	−0.81 ***	−0.72 ***	−0.07	−0.21 ***	−0.02
Jamaican-born black	−0.15 **	0.05	−0.04	−0.07	−0.13 ***	−0.16 ***
Haitian-born black	−0.27 **	−0.18 **	−0.31 ***	−0.08	−0.11 **	−0.12 **
Trinidad and Tobago-born black	−0.23 **	−0.12 *	−0.25 ***	−0.10 *	−0.07 *	−0.11 *
All Other Caribbean-born black	−0.28 ***	−0.09	−0.21 **	−0.03	−0.13 ***	−0.12 **
Female	−0.02 *	−0.03 **	0.04 ***	0.02 **	−0.003	−0.01 **
Age	0.08 ***	0.09 ***	0.09 ***	0.01 ***	0.001	−0.01 **
Age ²	−0.001 ***	−0.001 ***	−0.001 ***	-6.3×10^{-5} ***	-4.10×10^{-6}	2.37×10^{-5}
Marital Status (ref. Married, Spouse Present)						
Married, Spouse Absent	−0.52 ***	−0.53 ***	−0.68 ***	0.01	−0.04 *	0.04
Never Married/Single	−0.68 ***	−0.63 ***	−0.64 ***	−0.16 ***	−0.21 ***	−0.11 ***
Divorced	−0.56 ***	−0.59 ***	−0.59 ***	−0.10 ***	−0.15 ***	−0.08 ***
Widowed	−0.24 ***	−0.30 ***	−0.33 ***	−0.03 **	−0.03 ***	−0.02
Separated	−0.73 ***	−0.78 ***	−0.82 ***	−0.001	−0.09 ***	0.04
Speaks English at least very well	−0.26 ***	−0.30 ***	−0.21 ***	0.07	0.07 *	0.06
Foreign Education	0.02	−0.23 ***	−0.11 **	−0.03	0.04 *	0.05
Migration Cohort (ref. US-born/pre-1980)						
1981–1990	−0.60 ***	−0.20 ***	−0.15 ***	0.07	0.03	0.08 **
1991–2000	—	−0.40 ***	−0.31 ***	—	0.05	0.11 **
2001–2007	—	—	−0.77 ***	—	—	0.18 *
Naturalized Citizen	−0.29 ***	−0.36 ***	−0.42 ***	0.04	0.07 **	0.07 *
Educational Attainment (ref. 4+ Years College)						
1–3 Years College	−0.08 ***	−0.04 **	−0.08 ***	−0.13 ***	−0.17 ***	−0.12 ***
High School Diploma/GED	−0.20 ***	−0.17 ***	−0.16 ***	−0.19 ***	−0.24 ***	−0.20 ***
<High School	−0.37 ***	−0.45 ***	−0.51 ***	−0.24 ***	−0.31 ***	−0.26 ***
Household Income	5.93×10^{-6} ***	-3.30×10^{-6} ***	3.44×10^{-6} ***	2.00×10^{-6} ***	2.34×10^{-6} ***	1.42×10^{-6} ***
Public Assistance	−0.60 ***	−0.69 ***	−0.81 ***	0.09 ***	0.02	0.15 ***
Washington, DC	0.64 ***	0.36 ***	0.39 ***	−0.20 ***	−0.21 ***	−0.10 ***

	Probability of Homeownership			Natural Log of Homeownership		
	1990	2000	2005–2007	1990	2000	2005–2007
Suburb	n/a	0.50 ***	0.52 ***	n/a	−0.07 ***	−0.18 ***
Selection Variable						
Number of Children	0.08 ***	0.10 ***	0.09 ***			
Wald χ^2				11,084	22,664	9,338
Prob > χ^2				0	0	0
ρ				−0.46	−0.25	−0.68
Mills λ				−0.27 ***	−0.14 ***	−0.44 ***
Uncensored N				69,312	80,155	56,781

*

$p < 0.05$,

**

$p < 0.01$,

$p < 0.001$.

The italics denotes the analyses for major immigrant sending countries from the analyses for the larger regional groups.

APPENDIX 2

Table A2

Fairlie and Oaxaca–Blinder Decompositions of Homeownership and House Value Gaps between whites and blacks in New York and Washington, DC

	Homeownership			House Value		
	Total	Endowments	Coefficients	Total	Endowments	Coefficients
1990						
US-born white/US-born black	0.24	0.11	0.13	0.49 ***	0.18 ***	0.31 ***
US-born white/African (all)	0.46	0.18	0.28	0.03	0.11	−0.08
US-born white/Nigerian	0.48	0.16	0.28	1.53	0.43	1.10
US-born white/all other African	0.45	0.18	0.27	0.03	0.11	−0.08
US-born white/All Caribbean (all)	0.26	0.18	0.08	0.09	−0.02	0.07
US-born white/Jamaican	0.20	0.16	0.04	0.06	−0.03	0.10
US-born white/Haitian	0.34	0.18	0.16	0.13	0.17	−0.14
US-born white/Trinidad and Tobago	0.29	0.22	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.02
US-born white/all other Caribbean	0.26	0.20	0.06	0.08	0.17	−0.08
2000						
US-born white/US-born black	0.25	0.12	0.13	0.55 ***	0.21 ***	0.34 *
US-born white/African (all)	0.43	0.13	0.30	0.20	0.01	0.19
US-born white/Nigerian	0.32	0.06	0.26	0.13	0.23	−0.10
US-born white/all other African	0.48	0.16	0.28	0.20	0.01	0.19
US-born white/Caribbean (all)	0.26	0.17	0.09	0.15	−0.04	0.19 *
US-born white/Jamaican	0.19	0.17	0.02	0.13	−0.06	0.19

	Homeownership			House Value		
	Total	Endowments	Coefficients	Total	Endowments	Coefficients
US-born white/Haitian	0.31	0.14	0.17	0.11	0.02	0.10
US-born white/Trinidad and Tobago	0.29	0.21	0.08	0.29	0.01	0.28
US-born white/all other Caribbean	0.29	0.21	0.08	0.08	-0.03	0.11
2007						
US-born white/US-born black	0.25	0.12	0.13	0.24***	0.15***	0.09
US-born white/African (all)	0.36	0.12	0.24	0.15	-0.05	0.19
US-born white/Nigerian	0.18	0.04	0.14	0.33***	-0.02	0.34
US-born white/all other African	0.41	0.14	0.26	0.15	-0.05	0.19
US-born white/Caribbean (all)	0.21	0.17	0.04	-0.004	-0.03	0.03
US-born white/Jamaican	0.15	0.16	-0.01	0.004	-0.06	0.07
US-born white/Haitian	0.25	0.13	0.12	0.16	0.16	-0.0003
US-born white/Trinidad and Tobago	0.26	0.20	0.06	-0.07	-0.09	0.02
US-born white/all other Caribbean	0.26	0.22	0.04	0.06	-0.08	0.14

* $p < 0.05$,

**

$p < 0.01$,

$p < 0.001$.

TABLE 1
Head of Household Characteristics (Adults Age 25+, Not in School, All Identifiable Metropolitan Areas)

	US-Born White	US-Born Black	African-Born Black		Caribbean-Born Black			
			All	Nigeria	All	Jamaica	Haiti	Trinidad and Tobago
1990								
Mean Age	51	49	37	36	46	47	43	46
% Married	61.0	38.2	59.3	66.4	52.5	53.0	55.5	49.9
% Female	29.6	51.1	18.0	11.1	42.6	45.7	35.7	44.2
% College Degree+	27.2	11.9	54.9	71.5	14.2	15.3	12.2	13.7
Migration Cohort (%)								
Pre-1980	—	—	46.3	46.8	68.9	69.9	56.0	77.8
1981–1990	—	—	53.8	53.2	31.1	30.6	44.0	22.2
1991–2000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2001–2007	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
% US Citizen	—	—	72.4	76.2	54.9	51.5	65.6	61.7
% Speaks English at least very well	—	—	83.3	91.5	84.7	98.7	42.1	98.7
Mean Number in Household	2.5	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.7	3.1
Mean Number of Children	0.8	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.7	1.3
Mean Number of Working Adults in Household	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.8	1.7	1.9	1.7
Mean Household Income	44,914	28,089	34,581	34,019	36,580	38,022	32,968	37,595
N	1,967,458	257,481	2,026	660	10,066	4,238	2,404	1,256
2000								
Mean Age	52	49	42	42	48	48	46	49
% Married	57.2	34.8	57.1	66.1	49.1	46.9	55.3	48.6
% Female	32.2	53.7	28.1	19.8	48.6	51.4	43.1	49.8
% College Degree+	31.2	14.8	45.1	69.2	16.6	17.0	14.3	18.0
Migration Cohort (%)								
Pre-1980	—	—	24.8	30.5	51.5	51.5	45.8	55.6
1981–1990	—	—	36.3	38.7	33.6	34.4	36.4	30.6
1991–2000	—	—	38.9	30.8	14.9	14.2	17.8	13.8
2001–2007	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

	US-Born White	US-Born Black	African-Born Black		Caribbean-Born Black			
			All	Nigeria	All	Jamaica	Haiti	Trinidad and Tobago
% US Citizen	—	—	57.6	49.4	38.0	35.2	43.0	40.6
% Speaks English at least very well	—	—	78.0	92.8	83.1	98.6	45.1	98.5
Mean Number in Household	2.3	2.6	3.0	3.3	3.1	2.9	3.6	2.9
Mean Number of Children	0.7	1.0	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.1	1.6	1.1
Mean Number of Working Adults in Household	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.8	1.7	1.9	1.7
Mean Household Income	67,540	41,678	51,474	61,561	49,662	51,969	44,922	51,047
<i>N</i>	2,309,300	356,607	7,424	2,059	21,641	9,186	6,143	2,675
2005–2007								
Mean Age	54	52	44	46	51	52	49	51
% Married	57.4	33.5	60.8	67.3	47.9	45.8	56.8	45.6
% Female	42.3	59.8	34.4	27.3	54.8	58.2	46.6	57.8
% College Degree+	36.5	19.2	46.2	74.0	21.7	21.8	20.0	22.3
Migration Cohort (%)								
Pre-1980	—	—	16.7	25.4	44.4	43.9	38.1	45.9
1981–1990	—	—	24.2	27.1	31.2	32.3	33.8	28.5
1991–2000	—	—	40.5	32.9	19.7	19.1	22.7	21.6
2001–2007	—	—	18.6	14.6	4.7	4.7	5.4	4.0
% US Citizen	—	—	49.5	37.4	31.2	28.0	35.9	35.6
% Speaks English at least very well	—	—	72.3	90.0	84.0	98.9	45.4	99.1
Mean Number in household	2.3	2.3	3.1	3.2	2.8	2.6	3.3	2.6
Mean Number of Children	0.6	0.8	1.3	1.5	1.0	0.9	1.4	0.9
Mean Number of Working Adults in Household	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.9	1.7
Mean Household Income	82,562	48,292	62,066	79,092	59,762	61,212	57,145	60,718
<i>N</i>	1,601,436	218,254	6,570	1,558	14,502	6,037	3,919	1,830

All tables are based on the 5% samples of 1990 and 2000 census data and the pooled 2005–2007 American Community Survey data.

TABLE 2
Homeownership and House Value Characteristics (Adults age 25+, Not in School, All Identifiable Metropolitan Areas)

	US-Born White		African-Born Black		Caribbean-Born Black			
	US-Born White	US-Born Black	All	Nigeria	All	Jamaica	Haiti	Trinidad and Tobago
1990								
% Own Home	73.3	47.8	25.8	23.3	45.4	51.2	37.0	42.3
% Homeownership by Immigration Cohort								
Pre-1980	—	—	39.5	35.3	54.2	59.0	50.4	48.1
1981–1990	—	—	14.0	12.8	25.9	33.1	19.9	21.9
1991–2000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2001–2007	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mean House Value	127,717	75,641	133,780	125,431	134,915	131,339	133,170	143,637
2000								
% Own Home	76.2	50.0	32.7	44.1	50.6	56.8	44.9	46.7
% Homeownership by Immigration Cohort								
Pre-1980	—	—	52.6	57.7	60.6	66.3	56.5	55.7
1981–1990	—	—	38.3	49.9	44.9	51.5	40.9	38.7
1991–2000	—	—	14.9	23.3	29.3	35.2	23.0	28.3
2001–2007	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mean House Value	173,822	104,105	160,297	164,124	154,726	151,152	150,505	166,627
2005–2007								
% Own Home	80.6	54.7	45.1	62.2	59.5	65.6	55.5	54.3
% Homeownership by Immigration Cohort								
Pre-1980	—	—	67.6	73.7	69.3	75.0	67.7	62.9
1981–1990	—	—	58.3	73.0	59.6	65.9	57.5	55.7
1991–2000	—	—	40.8	59.3	45.1	52.4	40.9	40.0
2001–2007	—	—	16.9	28.6	25.1	30.0	18.4	24.3
Mean House Value	295,897	190,407	308,251	309,678	325,634	313,032	331,520	343,612

TABLE 3

Heckman Selection Model Predicting Homeownership and House Value

	Probability of Homeownership			Natural Log of House Value		
	1990	2000	2005–2007	1990	2000	2005–2007
Race/Ethnicity (ref. US-born white)						
US-born black	–0.31**	–0.37***	–0.39***	–0.28***	–0.26***	–0.18***
African-born black (all)	–0.78***	–0.81***	–0.63***	–0.11***	–0.22***	–0.02
Caribbean-born black (all)	–0.18***	–0.24***	–0.21***	0.03	–0.01	0.12**
Major Immigrant Sending Countries (ref. US-born white)						
Nigerian-born black	–0.94***	–0.76***	–0.47***	–0.15***	–0.24***	–0.09**
All Other African-born black	–0.70***	–0.85***	–0.70***	–0.09*	–0.19***	0.03
Jamaican-born black	–0.11**	–0.11***	–0.06	0.04*	0.003	0.13***
Haitian-born black	–0.27***	–0.42***	–0.38***	0.07*	0.02	0.20***
Trinidad and Tobago-born black	–0.23***	–0.32***	–0.28***	–0.002	–0.06**	0.07*
All other Caribbean-born black	–0.22***	–0.29***	–0.25***	0.01	–0.05*	0.09***
Female	–0.004	–0.03***	–0.01***	0.02***	–0.001	–0.003**
Age	0.10***	0.10***	0.09***	0.02***	0.02***	0.003***
Age ²	–0.001***	–0.001***	–0.001***	–0.0001***	–0.0001***	–3.24 × 10 ^{–5} ***
Marital Status (ref. Married, Spouse Present)						
Married, Spouse Absent	–0.60***	–0.66***	–0.67***	–0.05***	–0.12***	–0.04***
Never Married/ Single	–0.73***	–0.77***	–0.73***	–0.21***	–0.29***	–0.19***
Divorced	–0.71***	–0.73***	–0.71***	–0.19***	–0.27***	–0.19***
Widowed	–0.34***	–0.39***	–0.39***	–0.08***	–0.11***	–0.08***
Separated	–0.87***	–0.92***	–0.96***	–0.12***	–0.27***	–0.15***
Speaks English at least very well	–0.28***	–0.32***	–0.25***	0.08**	0.06***	0.15***
Foreign Education	0.03	–0.13***	–0.09***	0.01	0.06***	0.03*
Migration Cohort (ref. US-born/Pre-1980)						
1981–1990	–0.51***	–0.12***	–0.07**	0.03	–0.001	0.05**

	Probability of Homeownership			Natural Log of House Value		
	1990	2000	2005–2007	1990	2000	2005–2007
1991–2000	—	–0.42***	–0.22***	—	–0.04	0.01
2001–2007	—	—	–0.73***	—	—	0.06
Naturalized Citizen	–0.22***	–0.36***	–0.39***	0.01	–0.01	0.02
Educational Attainment (ref. 4+ Years College)						
1–3 Years college	–0.07***	–0.09***	–0.12***	–0.19***	–0.23***	–0.20***
High School Diploma/GED	–0.13***	–0.16***	–0.20***	–0.35***	–0.40***	–0.38***
<High School	–0.28***	–0.36***	–0.42***	–0.55***	–0.64***	–0.64***
Number of Working Adults in Household				–0.02***	–0.01***	
Household Income	8.36×10^{-6} ***	5.14×10^{-6} ***	6.62×10^{-6} ***	4.20×10^{-6} ***	3.54×10^{-6} ***	3.44×10^{-6} ***
Public Assistance	–0.57***	–0.60***	–0.66***	–0.18***	–0.27***	–0.23***
Selection Variables						
Median House Value/Median Household Income	–0.06***	–0.08***	–0.03***			
Number of Children	0.06***	0.07***	0.06***			
Proportion Single Family Homes in Metro Area	0.50***	0.42***	0.59***			
Wald χ^2				1,020,000	946,513	893,283
Prob > χ^2				0	0	0
p				–0.10	0.13	0.56
Mills λ				–0.06***	0.09***	0.43***
Uncensored N				1,282,161	1,950,399	1,420,926

Notes: All models include the following geographic characteristics: region, state, city population, and suburb.

Wald tests for significant differences in homeownership among blacks were conducted on logit regressions rather than the first step probit because of an irregularity in the statistical program; these results show that all homeownership differences among blacks were significant with the exception of the difference between U.S.- and Caribbean-born blacks in 2000.

Wald tests using the 2nd stage of the Heckman selection model determined significant differences in house value among blacks; black immigrants' house values were significantly different from one another and from US-born blacks in all three years.

* $p < 0.05$,

** $p < 0.01$,

*** $p < 0.001$.

The italics denotes the analyses for major immigrant sending countries from the larger regional groups.

TABLE 4
Fairlie and Oaxaca–Blinder Decompositions of Homeownership and House Value Gaps between whites and blacks

	Homeownership			House Value		
	Total	Endowments	Coefficients	Total	Endowments	Coefficients
1990						
US-born white/US-born black	0.25	0.15	0.10	0.68***	0.31***	0.37***
US-born white/African (all)	0.46	0.18	0.28	-0.06	-0.11	0.05**
US-born white/Nigerian	0.48	0.16	0.32	-0.33	-0.27	-0.06
US-born white/All other African	0.44	0.19	0.25	0.03	-0.14	0.17*
US-born white/All Caribbean (all)	0.26	0.17	0.09	-0.03	-0.25***	0.22**
US-born white/Jamaican	0.20	0.15	0.05	0.10	-0.23***	0.33**
US-born white/Haitian	0.34	0.17	0.17	-0.16**	0.003	-0.16
US-born white/Trinidad and Tobago	0.29	0.21	0.08	-0.13	-0.29**	0.16
US-born white/All other Caribbean	0.26	0.20	0.06	-0.18*	-0.29***	0.11
2000						
US-born white/US-born black	0.26	0.14	0.12	0.69***	0.30***	0.38***
US-born white/African (all)	0.43	0.14	0.29	-0.04	-0.07*	-0.04**
US-born white/Nigerian	0.32	0.07	0.25	-0.20**	0.03	-0.23**
US-born white/All other African	0.48	0.17	0.31	0.22*	-0.05	0.26*
US-born white/Caribbean (all)	0.26	0.17	0.09	0.11***	-0.07***	0.19***
US-born white/Jamaican	0.19	0.16	0.03	0.15***	-0.04	0.20**
US-born white/Haitian	0.31	0.13	0.18	0.06	0.03	0.03
US-born white/Trinidad and Tobago	0.29	0.20	0.09	0.09	-0.16**	0.24
US-born white/All other Caribbean	0.29	0.21	0.08	0.01	-0.11*	0.12
2007						
US-born white/US-born black	0.26	0.14	0.12	0.45***	0.32***	0.14***
US-born white/African (all)	0.36	0.12	0.24	-0.12***	-0.18***	0.06
US-born white/Nigerian	0.18	0.04	0.14	-0.20***	-0.20**	0.001

	Homeownership			House Value		
	Total	Endowments	Coefficients	Total	Endowments	Coefficients
US-born white/All other African	0.41	0.14	0.27	-0.01	-0.14 ^{**}	0.13
US-born white/Caribbean (all)	0.21	0.16	0.05	-0.18 ^{***}	-0.18 ^{***}	-0.004 ^{**}
US-born white/Jamaican	0.15	0.15	0.00	-0.11 ^{***}	-0.10 [*]	-0.01
US-born white/Haitian	0.25	0.12	0.13	-0.26 ^{***}	-0.09	-0.17
US-born white/Trinidad and Tobago	0.26	0.20	0.06	-0.30 ^{**}	-0.25 ^{**}	-0.04
US-born white/All other Caribbean	0.26	0.22	0.04	-0.33 ^{***}	-0.15 [*]	-0.19

* $p < 0.05$,

** $p < 0.01$,

*** $p < 0.001$.