Neighborhood Attachment in the Multiethnic Metropolis: The Intersection of Race, Nativity, and Racial Composition

Meredith J. Greif

Department of Sociology
211 Oswald Tower
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16803

email: mjg270@psu.edu
office: (814) 865-4563
fax: (814) 863-7216

According to population projections, European Americans' majority status in the United States may be endangered by the disproportionate growth of the black, Latino, and Asian populations while, concurrently, the proportion of native-born Americans continues to drop (Alba, 1999). Many Americans feel concerned about how these changes in race, ethnicity, and nativity will alter the resources, culture, and collective identity of their nation and their neighborhoods (Espenshade and Hempstead, 1996; Espenshade and Calhoun, 1993). Will this influx of diverse newcomers alter current residents' neighborhood attitudes and interactions? Will the new residents form meaningful attachments to their neighborhoods and defend them from threat, or will lingering homeland ties and lack of citizenship diminish their local interest? These questions essentially point to the same issue, namely whether growing complexity in racial and ethnic composition will jeopardize neighborhood attachment and perhaps neighborhoods themselves.

Americans are not equally affected by increased diversity. Since immigrants are highly concentrated in specific regions, metropolitan areas, and neighborhoods, diversity at the national level does not assure diversity at the local level (Alba et al, 2000). However, the proportion of the American population that will personally witness surges in racial diversification should continue to grow, as the proportion of the population that is foreign-born -- now at 11 percent -- steadily escalates (Bean and Stevens, 2003). Whites in particular may view these changes with apprehension, fearing the loss of numerical and social dominance and the introduction of unfamiliar customs (Espenshade and Hempstead, 1996). Given that culture is rarely static, even native-born minorities may express anxiety about how the distinctive characteristics and neighborhood orientations of recently-arrived coethnics will impact their communities. In short, this new diversity has the potential to stir uncertainty among a significant portion of U.S. residents.

The arrival and implementation of new neighborhood attitudes and behaviors should not significantly impact Americans' lives if neighborhoods themselves no longer matter. Decline of community theorists point to a gradual deterioration of neighborhood significance, via loosened interpersonal connections, the replacement of primary ties with

secondary ones, and a diminution of social action and organization (see Chaskin, 1994, for a review). Conversely, many community scholars insist that neighborhoods remain vital sites for obtaining resources, engaging in social interaction, and forging collective identity (Fischer et al, 1977; Guest and Wierzbicki, 1999; Hunter, 1974; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Lee and Campbell, 1999). The accuracy of these competing views bears on how strongly neighborhood diversity and other accompanying changes will influence Americans' lives.

Due to the dearth in attachment studies that address the link between diversity and attachment, it is unclear whether an eclipse of community lies ahead, and if so, whether certain racial groups or neighborhood types will be most affected. As a result, I explore the interplay between neighborhood vitality and racial and ethnic origins more deeply using the 2000 Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Survey (LAFANS). Until scholars sufficiently address Asians' and Hispanics' (and immigrants') community engagement, as well as the effect of their presence on current residents' attachment, the contemporary significance and vitality of U.S. communities will remain unknown. I pose several principle questions relevant to neighborhood attachment in a multiethnic society. First, do various racial and ethnic groups diverge in their neighborhood attitudes and behaviors? If so, do race and ethnicity per se influence attachment, or are differences traceable to intergroup variations in factors like competing obligations, social statuses, or neighborhood context?

Neighborhood Attachment and Race

Neighborhood attachment encompasses residents' knowledge of, feelings about, and involvement in their neighborhoods. I treat neighborhood attachment as an individual manifestation of community composed of three distinct (though potentially interrelated) dimensions: cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral. *Cognitive attachment* is knowledge of a neighborhood's characteristics, including its name, geographical boundaries, and history. *Attitudinal attachment* consists of two separate dimensions: *evaluation* and *sentiment*. The former is an assessment of the extent to which the community meets a resident's needs and goals, while the latter is less rational and pertains to a deeper emotional feeling of connection (Guest and Lee, 1983). Finally, *behavioral attachment* is

direct social involvement in the community, expressed through activities like neighboring and collective problem-solving (Woldoff, 2002).

Americans are rightly concerned about the impact of these racial and ethnic transformations on neighborhood significance and structure, in part because neighborhood attachment can influence qualities like residential stability and collective efficacy that are vital to the deterrence of crime, disorder, and threat (Brown et al, 2003; Silver and Miller, 2004). Additionally, attachment has been shown to boost individuals' well-being and life satisfaction (Adams, 1992; Riger and Lavrakas, 1981; Sirgy and Cornwell, 2002; Theodori, 2001), and reduces their desire to relocate (Lee et al, 1994; Speare, 1974). These findings suggest that residents benefit a great deal from their own personal neighborhood attachment as well as from residence in a neighborhood with highly attached residents.

The recent movement towards a multiethnic American society demands that neighborhood attachment studies move beyond the frequently-employed black/white framework. There is ample evidence to suggest attachment differences between whites and blacks. Though many studies point to more frequent neighboring and local participation among blacks (Barnes, 2003; Bobo and Gilliam, 1990; Ellison and Gay, 1989; Lee and Campbell, 1999; Lee et al, 1991; Olsen, 1970; Verba et al, 1993; Woldoff, 2002), other scholars uncover just the opposite (Ahlbrandt, 1984; Hunter, 1975; Wittberg, 1984). Further, whites frequently indicate greater satisfaction with their neighborhood environment than do blacks (Ahlbrandt, 1984; Campbell et al, 1976, Fried, 1982; Hunter, 1974; Lee et al, 1991), though blacks' local sentiment appear stronger, particularly when controlling for other factors (Ahlbrandt, 1984; Hunter, 1974; Lee et al, 1991; Wittberg, 1984; Woldoff, 2002).

Few researchers have examined the local neighboring and participation patterns of Asians and Hispanics. A handful of relevant studies show that Asians partake in formal organizations less often than whites, as do Hispanics (Antunes and Gaitz, 1975; Stoll, 2001). Barnes (2003) points out subgroup differences, indicating that Mexicans engage in local associations less frequently than whites or blacks, though Puerto Ricans' participation rates match that of the latter two groups. Similarly, the community

attachment literature lacks important information about Asians' and Hispanics' attitudinal attachment.

Since the growth of the Asian and Hispanic populations has resulted primarily from immigration, a study of attachment would also be incomplete without attention to nativity status. Though some community scholars and the American public question how neighborhoods will change with the growing presence of foreign-born residents, their concerns most often relate to economic outcomes, including employment, education, and services and amenities (e.g., Borjas, 1996; Garvey et al, 2002; Tienda and Jensen, 1986). Frequently overlooked are changes in less tangible, though equally important local resources such as the ones addressed here, including the strength of local social ties and loyalty. These outcomes may be jeopardized by recent developments in transportation and communication technology that have vastly improved newly-arrived immigrants' ability to maintain former homeland connections. Thus, any inverse relationship between nativity and neighborhood attachment may be more pronounced than ever.

An Explanatory Framework

What factors may contribute to interracial and interethnic differences in neighborhood attachment? Though race is a social construction with little biological meaning, its social significance has resulted in differential group treatment, and consequently, intergroup variations in resources and experiences that shape attachment. Therefore, the influence of race on attachment should primarily be indirect, operating through other direct predictors discussed below. However, cultural variations are also plausible contributors to a link between race and attachment.

Individual-level Predictors

I present several perspectives that address factors that, due to their influence on attachment and their differential distribution across racial groups, may contribute to intergroup attachment differences. First, it is important to consider the presence of various *competing obligations*. Although important social ties are frequently severed during the immigration process, many immigrants (especially recent ones) exhibit lingering connections and active involvement with the people and places in the former

country. In fact, opportunities to remain connected to the homeland have become significantly more widespread as a result of communication and transportation technology (Zelinsky and Lee, 1998). Consequently, the resulting growth in transnationalism -- the process by which immigrants fuse the social worlds of their country of origin and country of settlement by frequent visits to home country, monetary remittances, community aid, or frequent home communication -- could preempt or interrupt the development of local sentiment and informal ties (Foner et al, 2000; Guarnizo et al, 1999).

Further, another tie to their former country may inhibit U.S. immigrants' attachment: citizenship. A significant proportion of the foreign-born population remains unnaturalized or awaits naturalization (U.S Bureau of the Census 2000). Since citizenship augments residents' ability to take full advantage of local services, non-citizens are less able to use their neighborhood space in ways that meet their needs and goals, potentially detracting from their neighborhood satisfaction. Inability to take part in political activities such as voting can also weaken formal neighborhood participation (Cassel, 1999). In addition, fears of deportation may reduce illegal immigrants' interest in a community that they may be forced to leave, hindering membership in neighborhood associations and similar groups.

Conversely, some aspects of the immigration experience mentioned above may boost local attachment. A *compensatory perspective* implies that immigrants root themselves in their receiving country, seeking to reestablish social ties and place attachments to compensate for the ones they have lost. Thus, immigrants may attach more quickly and strongly to local people and places in the receiving country. Further, lack of citizenship could also boost immigrants' neighboring frequency by heightening their dependence on local ties for survival purposes. This perspective may also apply to length of neighborhood residence, as Hunter (1975) and Oropesa (1992) demonstrate that residents who have arrived recently in their neighborhoods gravitate towards local organizational membership in order to replenish severed social ties.

Regardless of whether immigrants maintain previous ties or form new ones, recent residence in a foreign country could also temporarily boost immigrants' attachment for other reasons. In particular, satisfaction may be higher among recent

immigrants, regardless of any undesirable conditions in their local U.S. environment. Since neighborhood standards and expectations are strongly based on the societal norm (Campbell et al, 1976), previous residence in a less advantaged society with lower standards for success could reduce the gap between immigrants' expectations and actual conditions in their U.S. neighborhoods, in turn boosting satisfaction. This effect should persist until foreign-born residents internalize American standards of evaluation. Accordingly, longer residence should inhibit immigrants' local attachment if expectations remain unmet. Discrimination is likely responsible for failed expectations, as the ability of financially well-situated immigrants to translate their human and social capital into desirable residential outcomes has declined.

The competing obligations framework also weighs in on the impact of another factor relevant to attachment: extralocal associational memberships. Here, memberships outside the local space should divert residents' time, energy, and interest away from their local environment. Further, social ties that form as a result of such activities can hinder the ability or desire to socialize with nearby residents. Alternatively, a *spillover perspective* suggests that "joiners are joiners", implying that individuals with an inclination or dedication to social integration will accumulate various memberships and social experiences rather than being torn between them. A spillover dynamic may offer a bridge between the compensatory and competing obligations perspectives for immigrants' attachment. Foreign-born residents may attach strongly to the people and places in their new country, as suggested by the former framework, while also remaining connected to previous people and places. Thus, some immigrants may manage to simultaneously devote their physical and psychological presence to both contexts, implying that their old and new attachments do not compete with one another in a zero-sum scenario. This is supported by the findings of Marcelli and Lowell (2005) that demonstrate a positive link between monetary remittance activities (a form of lingering ties) and community meeting attendance in the U.S. among a sample of Los Angeles Mexicans. These results are also consistent with those of Massey and Basem (1992), who uncover that remittances boost U.S. social club membership.

Local investment, evidenced by length of neighborhood residence, proximate kin, homeownership, and local facility use, can augment attachment. Longer neighborhood

residence, perhaps less common among Asians and Hispanics due to their nativity status, enhances satisfaction, sentiment, and neighboring, since an extended stay in a locale grants more opportunities to form local emotional and social connections that also translate into positive feelings about the environment (Ahlbrandt, 1984; Campbell et al, 1976; Hunter, 1974; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Lee et al, 1991; Woldoff, 2002). Longer residence may also promote local associational participation by heightening interest and investment in the neighborhood (Kang and Kwak, 2003). Conversely, as suggested earlier, a compensatory framework may explain an inverse relationship between length of neighborhood residence and local associational membership. Here, recently arrived residents may view involvement in local organizations as a means to rebuild social relations.

Prior research also points to the contribution of another type of local investment to attachment: local kin. Satisfaction (Fischer et al, 1977; Parkes et al, 2002; Speare, 1974), sentiment (Hunter, 1974; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Logan and Spitze, 1994) and neighboring (Logan and Spitze, 1994) benefit with the presence of local kin. Its impact on local formal participation has not received much empirical attention, nor have interracial differences in the proximity to local kin. Logic suggests that since the immigration process often demands that individuals leave family members behind, immigrants (i.e., Asians and Hispanics) should live near fewer kin than natives. Further, blacks may be more likely to have kin nearby because their spatial concentration and isolation increases the likelihood that kin are also neighbors (Lee et al, 1991). But, kin reunification among Asian and Hispanic immigrants occurs frequently, motivated by survival purposes and an emphasis on familism in Asian and Hispanic culture (Baca Zinn and Wells, 2000; Kibria, 1993; Zhou, 2000).

Homeownership also serves to root residents in their neighborhoods, boosting local evaluation and sentiment (Ahlbrandt, 1984; Lee and Campbell, 1999; Loo, 1986) as well as neighboring (Ahlbrandt, 1984; Hunter, 1975; Ziersch et al, 2005). Homeowners' desires to protect their investments also fuel their participation in local organizations such as neighborhood block meetings (Brown, et al., 2003; Fischer et al, 1977; Hunter, 1975). Interracial disparities in homeownership are quite evident; 70% of whites own their

homes, compared with 55% of Asians, 49% of Hispanics, and 46% of blacks (Krivo and Kaufman, 2004).

An additional indication of local investment is local facility use, as demonstrated by local activities like work and shopping. Though this set of variables exhibits some overlap with behavioral attachment, they differ in their reflection of interest in the community. Residents' neighboring relations and associational involvement convey active interest in the local people and quality of life, while local facility use may simply result from convenience or constrained external opportunities. Local use fosters neighboring by bringing residents in contact with one another, while those who make greater use of the neighborhood space exhibit stronger sentiment and satisfaction (Ahlbrandt, 1984; Guest and Lee, 1983; Hunter, 1974). Local church attendance is, however, the form of local facility use that should most strongly influence attachment, encouraging membership in local organizations by enhancing personal leadership skills, creating social contacts, providing organizational resources for collective action, and strengthening solidarity (Barnes, 2003; Harris, 1994; Liu et al, 1998; Min, 1992; Stoll, 2001). The superior quality of whites' neighborhood amenities may improve local facility use (Ahlbrandt, 1984), but blacks' and Hispanics' constraints on extralocal activities caused by low socioeconomic status, transportation limitations, and racial discrimination could enhance their local facility use, regardless of quality.

Feelings of *danger* within the community space also present an obstacle to the development of strong attachment. Residents' fear of local crime, along with actual victimization, reduces residents' satisfaction and sentiment (Adams, 1992; Baba and Austin, 1989; Brown et al, 2003; Guest and Lee, 1983; Loo, 1986; Sampson, 1989; Taylor, 1995). Informal socializing among neighbors also suffers from concerns over crime, as fearful residents feel most secure behind locked doors (Woldoff, 2002). Local fear may not, however, take a toll on formal participation, as feelings of unsafety augment local organizational engagement, likely due to efforts towards mobilization (Taylor; 1996; Woldoff, 2002). Research on interracial differences in fear of crime mostly compares whites and blacks and produces inconsistent findings (Houts and Kassab, 1997; Ortega and Myles, 1987), though whites and Asian generally inhabit the

safest neighborhoods, while blacks and, to a lesser extent, Hispanics are most exposed to local disorder (Alba et al, 1994; Morenoff and Sampson, 1997).

Interracial differences across a number of *social statuses* may also result in intergroup attachment differences. Higher-SES residents' frequency of neighboring and formal participation is enhanced by their motivations to guard their investments as well as abundant opportunities for leisure time (Ahlbrandt, 1984; Fischer et al, 1977; Hunter, 1974; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Lee and Campbell, 1999; Stoll, 2001; Woldoff, 2002; Ziersch et al, 2005). Affluent residents also show greater satisfaction with their locale, although SES may operate indirectly through neighborhood quality (Fried, 1982; Hunter, 1974; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Lee and Campbell, 1999; Woldoff, 2002). Whites and Asians tend to attain higher socioeconomic status, followed by Hispanics, and finally blacks (Bean and Stevens, 2003), leading to my prediction that whites and Asians will experience the strongest satisfaction, neighboring, and participation.

Other statuses related to the life cycle should also merit attention. First, previous attachment literature has highlighted the influence of *age* (Ahlbrandt, 1984; Hunter, 1975; Lee et al, 1991; Stoll, 2001; Woldoff, 2002; Ziersch et al, 2005), *presence of children* (Ahlbrandt, 1984; Fischer et al, 1977; Hunter, 1974; Lee and Campbell, 1999; Richmond, 2003; Stoll, 2001), *gender* (Lee et al, 1991; Woldoff, 2002) and *marital status* (Fischer et al, 1977; Glynn, 1986; Hunter, 1974). Interracial differences exist across all above statuses. Hispanics' and blacks' fertility levels exceed those of whites and Asians, (Forste and Tienda, 1996), while the black and Hispanic populations are more youthful (U.S. Bureau of the Census 2000). Further, whites and Asians more often live in marital unions compared to blacks or Hispanics (U.S. Bureau of the Census 2000), though the latter two groups frequently partake in marriage-like cohabiting relationships (Forste and Tienda, 1996).

Neighborhood Context

Although the preceding discussion has primarily focused on individual-level characteristics, it is evident that the *neighborhood context* also matters for attachment. Contemporary attachment studies must highlight recent changes in neighborhood composition, conditions and expectations. In particular, the consequences of the growing

neighborhood presence of Asians, Hispanics, and immigrants must be addressed, as well as changing expectations for mainstream assimilation into desirable communities.

The classic model of assimilation once accurately assumed that immigrants' cultural and economic disadvantages will diminish over time, resulting in their acculturation, socioeconomic and residential mobility, and eventually, full incorporation (Alba and Nee, 2003). Though assimilation is still pertinent for some groups and individuals, the classic assimilation model has recently been overshadowed by the more socially relevant segmented assimilation model, which recognizes that assimilation is not universally desired by all newcomers, and that immigrant group size, origins, geography, language, and skills, as well as U.S. economic and social conditions, will prohibit full assimilation for some. Consequently, immigrants may follow a variety of residential pathways: mainstream incorporation (i.e., into white neighborhoods), incorporation into ethnic neighborhoods, and assimilation into underclass (black) neighborhoods (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001).

Community scholars have primarily directed attention towards residents' experiences in white mainstream and black underclass neighborhoods. Previous studies have highlighted the ability of a larger *white presence* to elicit positive neighborhood assessments due to its association with better-quality services and amenities and higher home values (Taylor, 1996). These benefits drive minorities' desire to integrate with whites, as does their desire for status attainment (Charles, 2000; Clark, 1992), though the gradual decoupling of neighborhood socioeconomic status and race makes integration with whites less crucial to the attainment of a pleasant residential environment (Logan et al, 2002; Zhou and Logan, 1991). For whites, residence in a majority-white neighborhood should continue to bear strongly on their neighborhood attitudes, due in part to racial avoidance (Charles, 2000; Clark, 1992). Though whites are not alone in their ability to attain residence in more advantaged areas, they are more likely to do so than other racial groups (Alba et al, 2000; Alba and Logan, 1991; Logan et al, 1996). Presently, Asians and Hispanics each face a mixed bag of progress and barriers to their integration with whites, though Hispanics' residential situation is more precarious.

A heavy *black presence*, on the other hand, can dampen residents' local attachment. All groups are somewhat averse to residence near sizeable black populations

(Charles, 2000: Clark, 1992; Farley et al, 1994), suggesting that whites, Asians, and Hispanics would be dissatisfied by residence in black neighborhoods and may withdraw from local social interactions. Their racial aversion may not be entirely based on racial prejudice, but on concerns about possible declines in neighborhood quality, home values, and safety (Ellen, 2000; Harris; 1999; Krysan; 2002; Taub et al, 1984). Residence in black underclass neighborhoods is not common among whites or Asians, and is only moderately more so among Hispanics, especially those who are darker skinned (Alba and Nee, 2003). Because many blacks desire residential integration (Charles, 2000; Clark, 1992), they too may be dissatisfied by residence in black underclass neighborhoods, due to the above factors as well as to the frustration of blocked mobility. However, some blacks still maintain high attachment levels in black neighborhoods, due to ingroup loyalty or to a reluctance to endure outgroups' hostility (Krysan and Farley, 2002).

Regrettably, residence in Asian or Hispanic ethnic communities has not been given sufficient attention by community scholars. Since several studies reveal that *Asians'* and *Hispanics' neighborhood presence* is less threatening than blacks' presence though less desirable than a white one (Charles, 2000; Clark, 1992), the impact of a larger Asian or Hispanic population on residents' attachment should fall between that of a black and white population. In particular, Asians' model minority status may result in stronger attachment among residents who reside near them.

Distinct populations' needs and social histories imply that the local racial composition will not consistently affect all residents. Whites should be most interested in maintaining their dominance by living among ingroup members, though Asians and Hispanics also strongly prefer residence among coethnics (Charles, 2000; Clark, 1992). The latter groups' penchant for own-group proximity is in part an expression of recent immigrant status. The economic, social, and cultural opportunities available in ethnic communities make them particularly appealing to recently-arrived immigrants (Fried, 2000; Zubrinsky and Bobo, 1996).

Further, unique intergroup rivalries suggest that the effects of racial composition on attachment will vary across groups. For example, blacks' and Hispanics' competition for low-skilled jobs should erode both groups' attachment when they reside in the same neighborhood. Similarly, growing tensions surrounding economic and cultural disparities

between blacks and Asians in many metropolitan areas should also hinder both groups' local attachment when they reside in close proximity to one another (Fong and Shibuya, 2005; Morawska, 2001).

Despite the fact that a significant portion of the ethnic neighborhood population – and, increasingly, all neighborhood populations – is foreign-born, attachment scholars have paid little attention to the influence of *immigrant concentration*. Growing national (and local) backlash against foreign-born residents based on concerns about resources and cultural assimilation (Espenshade and Hempstead, 1996) suggests that a local immigrant presence will dampen many residents' neighborhood attachment, particularly those who are native-born and similarly, black or white. However, since anxiety surrounding resource availability is common to all segments of the population, any attachment-dampening qualities of a larger immigrant population could also extend equally to Asians, Hispanics, and immigrants.

The neighborhood use and systemic models summarize information about the influence of other key neighborhood characteristics on residents' attachment. As suggested above, *neighborhood affluence* should elicit greater attachment from residents of all racial groups as a result of higher quality services and amenities, though some findings points to more frequent socializing among residents of impoverished communities for instrumental and social purposes (Chaskin, 1994). Neighborhood affluence also boosts formal local participation (Ahlbrandt, 1984; Stoll, 2001) by providing greater organizational opportunities for all residents (Stoll, 2001). *Residential stability* should foster all racial groups' social and emotional connections to their neighborhood by making the development of fulfilling local ties and connections easier and more appealing (Ahlbrandt, 1984; Farrell et al, 2004; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Taylor, 1996) and by allowing residents to realize common values and consequently to work together to solve problems via formal participation (Kang and Kwak, 2003; Taylor, 1996).

Despite the many reasons that I anticipate interracial differences in attachment, my results may also show that few, if any, intergroup differences exist. Based on findings from previous research, this is most likely to occur in relation to neighborhood evaluation. Evidence suggests that most residents are relatively satisfied with their

neighborhoods, regardless of objective local conditions (Michelson, 1977). Insofar as aspirations diminish in times of adversity and increase in times of prosperity, the gap between current conditions and aspirations (i.e., satisfaction) should remain relatively constant (Campbell et al, 1976). As a result, residents of less desirable neighborhoods may show more satisfaction than objective conditions warrant, while residents of affluent neighborhoods may be less satisfied than current conditions would imply.

Data and Methods

I explore the link between race and neighborhood attachment among Los Angeles County residents. L.A. County, which includes the city of Los Angeles as well as the islands of San Clemente and Santa Catalina, is bordered on the east by Orange and San Bernardino Counties, on the north by Kern County, on the west by Ventura County, and on the south by the Pacific Ocean (www.lacounty.info). L.A. was the most populous county as of 2005, with 10, 226, 506 residents.

L.A. is an ideal setting for my research agenda for a number of reasons. First, it serves as a significant port of entry for many new immigrants, as 36.2% of the L.A. population is foreign-born (U.S Bureau of the Census 2000). A great majority of these immigrants hail from Asian and Latin American countries, boosting Asians' and Hispanics' countywide presence in 2000, at 11.9% and 44.6%, respectively (U.S Bureau of the Census 2000). That Los Angeles is considered the "prototype" for the modern metropolis due to its decentralized geographic structure (Dear, 2002) also makes it an especially appealing site for my study of neighborhood attachment. Most research on the urban neighborhood environment has focused on older cities along the East Coast and in the Midwest, including New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Baltimore, and Philadelphia. Los Angeles differs from these cities in its decentralized spatial structure and sprawling land use (Sastry et al, 2003). Thus, my study will consider whether neighborhood attachment operates similarly in younger, freeway-age metropolitan areas compared to more established ones.

Data Sources

The Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Survey (LAFANS) provides the individual-level information to address my research questions. LAFANS is a multistage probability sample of all neighborhoods and households in Los Angeles County, with an oversample of poor neighborhoods and families with children (Sastry et al, 2003). I employ the only currently available wave of data, collected in 2001, though a second wave of data collected in 2005 will permit a longitudinal study in the future. LAFANS is both a panel study, recording individuals' information at multiple time points, and a repeated cross-sectional neighborhood survey, as neighborhoods will also be examined at multiple time points with new respondents added in each wave.

LAFANS is well-suited to address my research objectives in a number of ways. First, the survey captures diversity in race, ethnicity, and place of origin, providing an opportunity to revisit neighborhood attachment within an interracial and interethnic framework. My sample consists of 1,365 Hispanics and 161 Asians, in addition to 652 whites and 233 blacks. Additionally, there is substantial diversity in country of origin, as 1,303 respondents are foreign-born while 1,108 were born in the U.S. Compared to the L.A. County population, the LAFANS sample strongly overrepresents foreign-born residents, while the proportion of Hispanics is somewhat higher as well. Conversely, the white and Asian populations are slightly underrepresented by LAFANS (see Table 1).

[Table 1 about here]

The 2000 U.S. Census provides neighborhood-level (census tract) information for the 90 Los Angeles County tracts represented in the LAFANS sample. A census tract is "small, relatively permanent, homogenous subdivision of metropolitan areas and selected non-metropolitan counties, delineated for the purpose of presenting census data" (U.S Bureau of the Census 2000). I link census tract information to LAFANS respondent data, allowing me to investigate how contextual factors, in conjunction with individual-level ones, shape neighborhood attachment.

Dimensions of Neighborhood Attachment

Previous studies have operationalized neighborhood attachment in divergent ways. Many scholars focus primarily on one attachment dimension, such as satisfaction,

leaving an incomplete picture of residents' neighborhood orientations. I propose the existence of five distinct dimensions -- satisfaction, sentiment, neighboring, formal participation in neighborhood organizations, and cognition -- as supported in recent work by Woldoff (2002). Factors analysis and an exploration of scale alphas and correlations (see Table 2) affirm that these variables are semi-independent, nonredundant aspects of attachment. Since the quality of the measurement instrument for cognition is inferior to that of the former dimensions, I focus here on satisfaction, sentiment, neighboring, and participation.

[Table 2 about here]

Satisfaction is represented by a single measure that taps respondent's overall evaluation of their neighborhood. Categories range from 1 through 5, with 1 indicating that a respondent is "very dissatisfied" and 5 that a respondent is "very satisfied." While this is the only satisfaction measure available in this dataset, I consider this single, global measure superior to satisfaction constructs that aggregate discrete evaluations of unique features of the neighborhood, such as school quality and leisure opportunities, since the latter may not accurately weigh the contribution of each neighborhood characteristic to residents' satisfaction.

Since a number of questions measure respondent's sentimental attachment to their neighborhoods, I employ a *sentiment* scale. Four questions assess how emotionally connected respondents feel towards their neighborhood, represented by emotional closeness towards neighbors and feelings that neighbors are close knit, helpful, and trustworthy. All four items are coded from 1 to 5, with higher values indicating greater sentiment. The sentiment scale, which represents respondents' mean score across the four items, achieves an alpha value of .68.

Despite the importance of behavioral attachment, most studies of neighborhood attachment focus primarily on residents' attitudes. To compensate for this imbalance, I devote considerable attention to neighboring and formal local participation. A handful of LAFANS questions address neighboring relations, allowing for the creation of a *neighboring* scale. The scale represents the mean of respondents' answers to four questions that measure how often they talk to neighbors and how often neighbors do favors for each other, watch each others' property, and give advice to one another. These

variables range from 1 to 4, with four indicating more frequent neighboring relations. The alpha value for this scale is .73.

Finally, I represent the second behavioral attachment dimension, *formal local participation*, with one dichotomous variable that determines whether a respondent has ever participated in a neighborhood block meeting in their current community. A high value affirms local participation.

Individual-level Variables

Table 3 describes the individual-level predictors of attachment employed in this analysis. My primary independent variable is *race*, measured with four mutually exclusive dummy variables: *non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black, non-Hispanic Asian*, and *Hispanic* (non-Hispanic white serves as the reference category).

I address nativity-based factors with *competing obligations* and *compensatory* frameworks. First, information on respondents' country of birth and citizenship status is combined to create three dummy variables: *native-born citizen* (reference), *immigrant citizen*, and *immigrant non-citizen*. *Percentage of lifetime in U.S.* measures the proportion of a respondent's life spent in the United States. Thus, all native-born residents receive a value of 1 on this variable. Finally, a *lingering ties* scale represents the sum of six dichotomous measures that indicate whether any close family members, such as a mother, father, stepmother, stepfather, or spouse remain in the respondent's (non-U.S.) home country and whether the respondent has returned to their former country in the last five years. Scores range from 1 through 6.

[Table 3 about here]

Extralocal organizational participation may also compete with local attachments or may relate positively to them. The *voluntary associations* scale sums the scores of six dichotomous variables that tap membership in the following groups: business, ethnic pride, political, discussion group, volunteer, or fraternity. Higher values on the scale, which has an alpha value of .66, indicate greater associational commitment.

As guided by the systemic model, I consider factors that indicate local investment. The presence of *local kin* is represented by a four-category variable which taps the proportion of a respondent's family that lives in their neighborhood; 1 indicates that no

members live in the neighborhood, 2 that a few reside nearby, 3 that many reside locally, and 4 that most or all members live in the neighborhood. *Length of neighborhood residence* is a continuous variable measured in years, while *homeownership* is a dichotomous variable that indicates whether respondents own or rent their homes, with ownership coded high. The ability of the local environment to elicit facility use for important life activities is represented by four dichotomous variables with local use coded high: *local employment, local grocery shopping, local churchgoing*, and *local health care*. In the case of local employment, the "local neighborhood" is represented by an area under two miles, for shopping and local churchgoing it is an area of less than one mile, and the receipt of health care is considered "local" when within a vicinity of less than half a mile.

Residents should exhibit greater attachment, with the potential exception for participation, when they perceive *danger* in the local space. Thus, I measure whether respondents feel *unsafe* walking in their neighborhood, using a four-point scale with 4 indicating strong fear and 1 indicating low fear. Victimization is represented by *robbed*, a dichotomous variable that indicates whether the respondent has been robbed in their current neighborhood.

Various *social and demographic statuses* are examined here; *household income* is a logged measure of household income (in dollars),while *respondent education* is represented by four dummy variables: *less than high school degree* (reference), *high school degree*, *some college/vocational experience/ associate's degree*, and *college degree/postgraduate work or degree*. *Married/cohabiting* and *children in household* are also dichotomous; the former assigns a high value to respondents who are currently married or living with their partner, while respondents who have children under 18 in the household receive a high score on the latter. I also examine a handful of other demographic characteristics; *age* is a continuous variable measured in years and *gender* is a dichotomous variable with male coded high.

Finally, I address residents' *cognition* of their neighborhood boundaries with one four-category question, where 1 represents the size of one street block, 2 an area of several blocks on either side, 3 an area within a 15-minute walk, and 4 an area beyond a

15-minute walk. The inclusion of this variable reduces some concerns about the influence of residents' varying conceptualization of their neighborhood size.

Neighborhood-level Variables

In addition to considering individual-level predictors, my analysis focuses on the role of racial composition in shaping neighborhood attachment and in conditioning the relationship between race and attachment. I use 2000 Census data to explore the *percentage of non-Hispanic blacks, non-Hispanic Asians,* and *Hispanics* in the populations of a respondent's census tract. I also assess the respondent's exposure to *immigrant concentration*, as measured by the percent of foreign-born residents in the tract (see Table 4). Several other neighborhood-level variables are anticipated to impact attachment, including *neighborhood socioeconomic status* and *residential stability*. The former is measured by a z-scored scale of three items: median household income, percent college-educated, and percent of residents that own their homes. I represent neighborhood stability by the portion of the population that has resided in the tract since 1995.

[Table 4 about here]

Research Methods

I investigate levels of neighborhood attachment among whites, blacks, Asians, and Hispanics, and among native-born residents and immigrants. T-tests are conducted to determine whether any intergroup attachment differences are statistically significant. I then explore the individual-level processes that may contribute to interracial differences in satisfaction, sentiment, and neighboring with ordinary least squares regression, and, in the case of participation, logistic regression. Consequently, I employ HLM, which is a particular regression technique that accounts for the greater similarity found among residents in the same neighborhood (Bryk and Raudensbush, 1992), to address contextual attachment predictors. Since I employ a fixed effects model, I do not allow variables' impact on neighborhood attachment to vary across neighborhoods. All variables with non-meaningful zero values (age, local kin, cognition, and unsafe) are grand-mean

centered, producing scores that represent deviations from the overall population mean on that variable.

Results

Patterns of Neighborhood Attachment

My analysis reveals notable differences in attachment between racial groups. According to the top half of Table 5, groups vary meaningfully in their *attitudes* toward their neighborhoods. In general, Hispanics and blacks exhibit weaker attitudinal attachment compared to whites and Asians. Satisfaction means range from 4.195 for whites to 3.458 for blacks, with the strength of Asians' and Hispanics' local evaluations falling in between. Further, whites experience a stronger sentimental connection with their communities. Asians' local sentiment falls below that of whites, though not meaningfully so, but blacks and Hispanics do show notably lower sentiment compared to both whites and Asians.

[Table 5 about here]

Informal socializing with neighbors, on the other hand, is most frequently undertaken by whites and blacks. Hispanics embark upon informal interactions with their neighbors less frequently than whites or blacks, though Hispanics still outpace Asians along this dimension. A clear divide emerges between Hispanics and all other racial groups in patterns of local formal participation, as the only statistically significant disparities that exist are between Hispanics and each of the other groups. Only 7.1% of Hispanics affirmed their participation in a local block meeting, contrasted with 13.5% of Asians, 14.2% of blacks, and 18.6% of whites. This pattern is fairly consistent with the handful of studies that also explore Hispanics' local participation (Antunes and Gaitz, 1975; Stoll, 2001), and may find basis in this group's disproportionate possession of several plausible detractors of local participation, including low SES, foreign birth, and neighborhood poverty.

The results in Table 6 also indicate that natives' attachment across all dimensions exceeds that of immigrants in a statistically significant way. These disparities are not large, however, as mean differences between the groups' attachment never exceeds three-tenths of a point for satisfaction, sentiment, or neighboring. Though measured on a

different scale than the other dimensions, it is clear that intergroup disparities in formal participation are most noteworthy; almost twice as many natives have participated in a neighborhood block association as have immigrants.

[Table 6 about here]

Overall, whites and natives consistently exhibit deeper community attachment across all dimensions, while blacks', Asians', and Hispanics' attachment varies relative to one other depending on the dimension. Each minority group demonstrates particularly weak attachment along at least one dimension; blacks are least satisfied with their neighborhoods, Asians engage with their neighbors less frequently, and Hispanics are least likely to join formal neighborhood organizations.

Explaining Intergroup Differences in Attachment (Individual Level)

Results in Table 7 echo those of Table 5, pointing to the power of race in shaping neighborhood attachment. However, racial identity alone does not explain a substantial portion of the variance in any type of attachment. Race best accounts for the variability in satisfaction, explaining 7.0%, while only 4.2% of the variability in the other attitudinal dimension, sentiment, is explained by race. R-square values are significantly smaller for both behavioral attachment dimensions; 1.2% for neighboring and 2.4% for participation.

[Table 7 about here]

Race loses some explanatory power with the addition of individual-level factors in the neighboring and participation models, its effect diminishing or dropping to insignificance, as documented in Table 8. Hispanics' inferior local involvement relative to other groups is fully explained by other significant predictors, although the gap between whites' and Asians' neighboring frequency persists, albeit slightly smaller. A handful of other intergroup attitudinal attachment disparities also linger; blacks and Hispanics continue to feel less sentimental relative to whites, though coefficient sizes have declined considerably (from -.290 to -.106 for blacks, and from -.326 to -.131 for Hispanics), while blacks and Hispanics exhibit greater dissatisfaction relative to whites even when controlling for all individual-level variables.

Although immigration-based variables by themselves do not explain a substantial portion of the variance in any dimension of attachment (evidenced by a previous model

not shown), Table 8 demonstrates that variations in citizenship, percent lifetime spent in the U.S., and lingering ties matter for attitudinal attachment when controlling for other individual-level characteristics. Immigrants who have acquired U.S. citizenship feel less satisfied and sentimental compared with native citizens, while unnaturalized immigrants also evaluate their neighborhoods more poorly than natives. The internalization of American norms and values, which is a common product of naturalization, may foster higher standards and expectations that result in neighborhood dissatisfaction and emotional disconnection when they remain unmet.

[Table 8 about here]

Interestingly, longer U.S. residence also detracts from satisfaction. This may also result from immigrants' residential expectations that do not come to fruition. Foreign-born residents frequently possess lower residential standards upon their arrival in the U.S. which may rise in time yet remain unmatched by comparable improvements in local conditions. Even more surprising is that lingering homeland ties not only fail to compromise satisfaction, neighboring, or participation, but they actually enhance local sentiment, supporting a compensatory perspective.

The introduction of contextual variables in the individual-level model does explain some previous race effects. According to Table 9, blacks' and Hispanics' lower attitudinal attachment relative to whites that lingered in the individual-level model has been accounted for here by these groups' less desirable neighborhood context. Asian racial identity, however, remains a potent detractor from neighboring frequency. The size of this coefficient remains essentially unchanged by the inclusion of contextual variables (-.233 in the earlier model and -.232 in the current one). By alternating the racial reference category, I discover that Asians interact with their neighbors less frequently than *all* other racial groups. The emphasis of Asian culture on kin obligations may explain this finding, as family loyalty and involvement may hinder the ability or desire to form connections with nearby residents.

[Table 9 about here]

A noteworthy racial disparity also emerges in this full HLM model. Here, blacks significantly outpace whites in their formal neighborhood participation; previously the link between black identity and local engagement was positive but did not achieve

statistical significance. My examination further reveals that, when other racial groups are employed as the reference category, blacks participate in neighborhood block associations more than Hispanics, though not Asians (results not shown). Blacks' greater entrenchment in impoverished neighborhoods with fewer available organizational opportunities may contribute to the emergence of this relationship. Additionally, both compensatory and ethnic community models may address these findings. The former suggests that blacks seek to compensate for their subordinate status in a white-dominated society by exerting their influence in local organizations (Stoll, 2001). Meanwhile, the ethnic community model highlights blacks' sense of group unity and pride, which compels their engagement in local organizations, particularly in black communities. These explanations are speculative, however, since LAFANS does not provide information about respondents' racial attitudes or group consciousness.

Moderate support is found for a compensatory perspective and essentially no support for a competing obligations one, and also hints at the possibility of downward mobility among foreign-born residents. Longer U.S. residence no longer diminishes attitudinal attachment, suggesting that its earlier influence was not attributable to longer residence per se but to the less desirable neighborhood characteristics that accompany the downward assimilation increasingly experienced by some immigrant groups. Perhaps more unexpected is the support for a compensatory framework, as residents' indications of enduring homeland connections *heighten* their sentiment in a statistically significant way (previously its effect was positive though not significant). Evidently, once other factors are considered, immigrants grow more sentimental towards their neighborhood space after leaving behind important kin ties.

The model also continues to affirm that U.S. citizenship erodes immigrants' neighborhood affect, refuting the notion that citizenship in a *different* country competes with attachment to their current one. U.S. citizenship may weaken attachment due to the internalization of higher American norms and standards that frequently accompany naturalization, suggesting that in some instances it is more worthwhile to question the ability and commitment of the receiving country to helping newcomers reach parity with natives' quality of life and not immigrants' loyalty to their current home.

The moderate contribution of racial identity and nativity to the development of neighborhood attachment is overshadowed by that of several other individual-level variables in the final model. Local investment is quite important to the strengthening of community attachment, particularly sentiment, while the spillover hypothesis, which suggests that socially involved people engage in activities inside and outside the neighborhood, finds support here has well, since involvement in extralocal activities enriches every attachment dimension but satisfaction. Further, residents' sense of danger within the local space remains dominant, with satisfaction and sentiment suffering most from fear and victimization. Interestingly, earlier evidence that danger encourages mobilization against threat via formal participation has disappeared. Additionally, higher socioeconomic status exerts a direct impact on satisfaction, refuting the notion that it affects attachment indirectly through neighborhood characteristics, while it also increases neighboring.

Explaining Intergroup Attachment Differences (Neighborhood Level)

Does the race and place of origin of the local population matter for residents' attachment? The current model indicates so, as blacks' local presence diminishes neighborhood satisfaction, sentiment, and neighboring, even in the presence of all individual- and neighborhood-level factors. Similarly, Hispanics' local proximity also dampens these three attachment dimensions. Since these variables' unstandardized coefficients reflect changes in attachment with a one-unit (or one percentage point) change in the local presence of each population, the size of the coefficients in Table 9 may appear negligible. However, the impact of each groups' presence on attachment quickly accumulates as their concentration grows. For example, the satisfaction level of residents who inhabit a neighborhood where 10% of the population is Hispanic is .32 higher than those who reside in a tract where 90% of residents are Hispanic (of which there are 10 in this sample).

Earlier models (not shown) demonstrated that immigrant concentration eroded all types of attachment at the bivariate level, but this relationship was not driven by aversion to foreign-born neighbors alone, but by other neighborhood characteristics that accompany their presence, particularly economic disadvantage, residential instability and

a larger Hispanic population. Further, Asians' presence exerted a positive influence on satisfaction and sentiment at the bivariate level, but additional analyses demonstrated that this effect was attributable to the greater affluence and lower black and Hispanic concentrations in Asian neighborhoods.

By running equations separately for the various racial groups, I uncover little consistent evidence that own-group presence boosts any groups' attachment. In fact, not only does a larger Asian presence have little influence on Asians' attachment (according to the final model), but a larger black and Hispanic presence detracts from these groups' attachment, implying that the dampening effect of these less-advantaged groups' presence on attachment is not wholly based on residents' racial aversion but perhaps on concerns about property values, stigma, and poorer local services (Harris, 1999; Yinger, 1995). Additionally, though I had presumed that a larger black population would most detract from Asians' attachment, results show that blacks' presence universally diminished *all* groups' local attitudes and involvement, including those of blacks.

Immigrant presence also exerts a uniform effect on all groups' attachment. That Asians and Hispanics belong to the only populations that consist primarily of immigrants would suggest their greater tolerance of foreign-born residents, or conversely, blacks' reduced tolerance, but immigrant concentration exhibited a consistent effect on all groups. This may suggest that some concerns surrounding immigrants' local presence are shared by all populations.

Conclusion

At the street level, an individual's racial identity does provide important clues regarding their neighborhood attitudes and social interactions. Attachment not only varies between blacks and whites but among all four racial groups examined here; whites demonstrate the strongest attachment across all dimensions, while blacks, Asians, and Hispanics each exhibit relatively low attachment on at least one dimension. I reiterate that while these group differences are meaningful, they are also modest, suggesting that members of the expanding Asian and Hispanic populations may not stand out markedly from established groups in their neighborhood-oriented attitudes and behaviors.

Asians' and Hispanics' attachment is inherently intertwined with nativity status, as both populations consist predominantly of foreign-born members. Results indicate that immigrants feel less positively about their neighborhoods and interact less within them when compared to native-born residents, though these intergroup disparities are not striking. These patterns may quell some Americans' concerns about dramatically weaker neighborhood loyalty and engagement among foreign-born residents. Further, these minor disparities may very well dissipate with continued U.S. residence as a result of greater opportunities to feel invested in the local space, to form connections that facilitate formal and informal social engagement, and to achieve the human capital that confers more desirable residential outcomes and thus satisfaction.

However, a different attachment trajectory may await some immigrants, as well as selected Asians and Hispanics. New immigrants (especially those of Hispanic descent) increasingly experience downward mobility, winding up trapped in deteriorating neighborhoods that produce dissatisfaction, emotional disconnect, and social mistrust. Further, even in the presence of controls, naturalization diminishes foreign-born residents' attitudinal attachment, suggesting that regardless of their advancements in human, social, and cultural capital, immigrants' expectations for their neighborhoods are not fully achieved. Although difficult to test, discrimination in the housing market, economic sphere, and other social realms may be likely culprits.

Also of concern are the attachment-eroding qualities of several groups' neighborhood presence, namely blacks, Hispanics, and immigrants. These groups' local proximity elicits negative reactions that are based in part on their correlation with neighborhood disadvantage, but residual racial composition effects suggest racial prejudice and stereotyping may be at work. Consequently, an upsurge in flight from neighborhoods that contain such groups may occur, particularly among residents who possess the human and social capital to live elsewhere. This could further fuel local disadvantage, social disorganization, and other factors that would inhibit the community attachment of remaining residents. Thus, even residents whose current attachment does not suffer as a result of local diversity may find their attachment weakened down the line as a result of neighborhood deterioration.

Nonetheless, several results prove encouraging. First, the magnitude of these race and racial composition effects is rather small. Further, that their influence is strongly based on correlations with more important predictors of attachment, such as neighborhood SES, suggests that reducing intergroup disparities in these key characteristics should also significantly narrow interracial gaps in attachment. However, eliminating inequalities in various racial groups' personal and neighborhood qualities and experiences is not a straightforward task. First, intergroup discrepancies in some factors, such as kin proximity, are in part the result of personal choice and will not likely change in the near future. Further, other conditions that hold universal appeal to all groups, such as homeownership in a desirable, safe residential environment, may be increasingly hard to come by for certain groups. Blacks, some Hispanic subgroups, and, increasingly, certain Asian subpopulations experience persistent difficulty in accumulating adequate resources to procure neighborhood conditions that inspire their satisfaction and engagement.

Evidently, it is essential that future attachment studies extend their focus beyond blacks, whites, and natives to include Asians, Hispanics, and immigrants in order to capture the nuances of neighborhood life for a larger segment of American society. Rapidly changing spatial patterns, evidenced by the expansion of ethnic and racially integrated communities and the decline in all-white and all-black neighborhoods, further justifies an exploration into the complexity of contemporary neighborhood life within the multiethnic metropolis. Upcoming examinations of the role of context must consider the influence of various racial subgroups' presence in neighborhoods, as well as neighborhood change. Though the effects of racial composition are modest in this cross-sectional study, they may become stronger in a longitudinal study, since minority population growth may be of greater concern to most residents than the current size of various populations (Ellen, 2000). Attachment scholars should also continue to pay close attention to the economic and social trajectories of various racial populations and subpopulations, and additionally, how they may vary across metropolitan areas. Given that regions frequently differ in local concentrations of various racial groups, as well as the unique history between groups, attachment patterns in Los Angeles may diverge slightly from those in New York City, for example.

In sum, though the current size of attachment disparities among blacks, whites, Asians, and Hispanics, and among natives and immigrants, does not merit severe alarm at this point, the direction and pace of each group's attachment trajectory is uncertain. Unlike earlier immigrants, recent newcomers should not expect similarly desirable outcomes within a comparable time span, or perhaps ever. They currently enter a very changed society, where some residents' residential chances and aspirations are deflated as easily as others' are enhanced. Further, studies, including the current one, have only begun to understand the complex implications of various groups' local presence for neighborhoods. In short, conditions are ripe for considerable change in the American neighborhood experience.

References

Adams, R.E. 1992. "A Tale of 2 Cities: Community Sentiments And Community Evaluation In Indianapolis And Pittsburgh." *Sociological Focus* 25 (3): 217-240.

Ahlbrandt, R.S. 1984. *Neighborhoods, People, and Community*. New York: Plenum.

Alba, R.D. and J.R. Logan. 1991. "Variations on 2 Themes: Racial and Ethnic Patterns in the Attainment of Suburban Residence." *Demography* 28 (3): 431-453.

Alba, RD, J.R. Logan and P.E. Bellair. 1994. "Living With Crime - The Implications Of Racial Ethnic-Differences In Suburban Location." *Social Forces* 73 (2): 395-434.

Alba, R.D., J.R. Logan and B.J. Stults. 2000. "The Changing Neighborhood Contexts of the Immigrant Metropolis." *Social Forces* 79(2):587-621.

Alba, R.D. and V. Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Alba, R.D. 1999. "Immigration and the American Realities of Assimilation and Multiculturalism." *Sociological Forum* 14 (1): 3-25.

Antunes, G. and C.M. Gaitz. 1975. "Ethnicity and Participation: A Study of Mexican-Americans, Blacks and Whites." *American Journal of Sociology* 80 (5): 1192-1211.

Baba Y. and D.M. Austin. 1989. "Neighborhood Environmental Satisfaction, Victimization, and Social Participation as Determinants of Perceived Neighborhood Safety." *Environment and Behavior* 21 (6): 763-780.

Baca Zinn, M. and B. Wells. 2000. "Diversity Within Latino Families: New Lessons for Family Social Science." From Demo, D.H., K.R. Allen and M.A.. Fine (eds.), *The Handbook of Family Diversity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Barnes, S.L. 2003. "Determinants of Individual Neighborhood Ties and Social Resources in Poor Urban Neighborhoods." *Sociological Spectrum* 23 (4): 463-497.

Bean, F. and G. Stevens. 2003. *America's Newcomers and the Dynamics of Diversity.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bobo L. and F.D. Gilliam. 1990. "Race, Sociopolitical Participation, and Black Empowerment." *American Political Science Review* 84 (2): 377-393.
Bobo, L. and C.L. Zubrinsky. 1996. "Attitudes on Residential Integration: Perceived Status Differences, Mere In-group Preference, or Racial Prejudice?" *Social Forces* 74(3): 883-909.
Borjas, G.J., R.B. Freeman and L.F. Katz. 1996. "Searching for the Effect of Immigration on the Labor Market." *American Economic Review* 86 (2): 246-251.
Brown B., D.D. Perkins and G. Brown. 2003. "Place Attachment in a Revitalizing Neighborhood: Individual and Block Levels of Analysis." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 23 (3): 259-271.
Bryk, A.S. and S.W. Raudenbush, S.W. 1992. *Hierarchical Linear Models*. Sage Publications.
Bryk, A.S, S.W. Raudenbush and R.T. Congdon, Jr. 1994. *Hierarchical Linear Modeling*. Chicago, IL: Scientific Software International.
Buckner, J.C. 1988. "The Development of an Instrument to Measure Neighborhood Cohesion." *American Journal Of Community Psychology* 16 (6): 771-791.
Campbell, A., P.E. Converse and W.L. Rodgers. 1976. *The Quality of American Life: Perceptions, Evaluations, and Satisfactions*. New York: Russell Sage.
Cassel, C.A. 1999. "Voluntary Associations, Churches, and Social Participation Theories of Turnout." *Social Science Quarterly* 80 (3): 504-517.
Charles, C.Z. 2000. "Neighborhood Racial-Composition Preferences: Evidence from a Multiethnic Metropolis." *Social Problems* 47(3):379-407.
Chaskin, R.J. 1994. "Defining Neighborhood: History, Theory, and Practice." Report for The Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago.
Clark, W.A.V. 1992. "Residential Preferences and Residential Choices in a Multiethnic Context." *Demography* 29(3):451-466.
Cook, C.C. 1988. "Components of Neighborhood Satisfaction: Responses from Urban and Suburban Single-Parent Women." *Environment and Behavior* 20 (2): 115-149.
Dear, M. 2002. "Los Angeles and the Chicago School: An Invitation to Debate." *City & Community* 1(1):5-32.
Ebaugh, H.R. and M. Curry. 2000. "Fictive Kin as Social Capital in New Immigrant Communities." *Sociological Perspectives* 43: 189-209.
Ellen, I.G. 2000. *Sharing America's Neighborhoods: The Prospects for Stable Racial Integration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Ellison C.G. and D.A Gay. 1989. "Black Political-Participation Revisited: A Test of Compensatory, Ethnic-Community, and Public Arena Models." *Social Science Quarterly* 70 (1): 101-119.
Espenshade, T.J. and C.A. Calhoun. 1993. "An Analysis of Public Opinion Toward Undocumented Immigration." *Population Research and Policy Review* 12 (3): 189-224.
Espenshade T.J. and K. Hempstead. 1996. "Contemporary American Attitudes Toward U.S. Immigration." *International Migration Review* 30 (2): 535-570.
Farley, R., C. Steeh, M. Krysan, T. Jackson and K. Reeves. 1994. "Stereotypes and Segregation: Neighborhoods in the Detroit Area." *American Journal of Sociology* 100(3):750-780.

Fischer, C.S. 1982. *To Dwell Among Friends: Personal Networks in Town and City.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Fischer, C.S., R.M. Jackson, C.A. Stueve, K. Gerson, L. and M.C. Jones, with M. Baldassare. 1977. *Networks and Places: Social Relations in the Urban Setting.* New York: Free Press.
Foner, N. 1999. "The Immigrant Family: Cultural Legacies and Cultural Changes." From Hirschman, C., P. Kasnitz and J. DeWind (eds.), *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
Fong, E. and K. Shibuya. 2005. "Multiethnic Cities in North America." *Annual Review of Sociology* 31: 285-304.
Forste R. and M. Tienda. 1996. "What's Behind Racial and Ethnic Fertility Differentials?" *Population and Development Review* 22: 109-133.
Fried, M. 2000. "Continuities and Discontinuities of Place." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 20(3): 193-205.
Fried, M. 1982. "Residential Attachment: Sources of Residential and Community Satisfaction." *Journal of Social Issues* 38: 107-119.
Garvey D.L., T.J. Espenshade and J.M. Scully. 2002. "Are Immigrants a Drain on the Public Fisc? State and Local Impacts in New Jersey." *Social Science Quarterly* 83 (2): 537-553.
Glynn, T.J. 1986. "Neighborhood and Sense of Community." *Journal of Community Psychology* 14 (4): 341-352.
Guarnizo, L.E., A.I. Sanchez, and E. Roach. 1999. "Mistrust, Fragmented Solidarity, and Transnational Migration: Colombians in New York City and Los Angeles." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22 (2): 367-396.
Guest, A.M. and B.A. Lee. 1983. "Sentiment and Evaluation as Ecological Variables." *Sociological Perspectives* 26: 159-84.
Guest, A.M. and S.K. Wierzbicki. 1999. "Social Ties at the Neighborhood Level: Two Decades of GSS Evidence." *Urban Affairs Review* 35: 92-111.
Harris, D.R. 1999. "Property Values Drop When Black Move In Because…: Racial and Socioeconomic Determinants of Neighborhood Desirability." *American Sociological Review* 64: 461-79.
Harris, F.C. 1994. "Something Within: Religion as a Mobilizer of African-American Political Activism." *Journal of Politics* 56 (1): 42-68.
Helling, A. and D.S. Sawicki. 2003. "Race and Residential Accessibility to Shopping and Services." *Housing Policy Debate* 14 (1-2): 69-101.
Houts, S. and C. Kassab. 1997. "Rotter's Social Learning Theory and Fear of Crime: Differences by Race and Ethnicity." *Social Science Quarterly* 78 (1): 122-136.
Hunter, A. 1974. *Symbolic Communities: The Persistence and Change of Chicago's Local Communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Hunter, A. 1975. "The Loss of Community: An Empirical Test Through Replication." *American Sociological Review* 40: 537-52.
Kang, N. and N. Kwak. 2003. "A Multilevel Approach to Civic Participation: Individual Length of Residence, Neighborhood Residential Stability, and Their Interactive Effects with Media Use." *Communication Research* 30 (1): 80-106.
Kasarda, J. and M. Janowitz. 1974. "Community Attachment in Mass Society." *American Sociological Review* 39:328-39

Kibria, N. 1993. *Family Tightrope: The Changing Lives of Vietnamese Americans. Princeton*. N.J.: Princeton University Press.
Klobus-Edwards, P.; Edwards, J.N..; Klemmack, David L. 1978. "Differences in Social Participation: Blacks and Whites." *Social Forces*, 56: 1035-52.
Krivo, L.J. and R.L. Kaufman. 1999. "How Low Can It Go? Declining Black-White Segregation in a Multiethnic Context." *Demography* 36(1): 93-109.
Krysan, M. 2002. "Community Undesirability in Black and White: Examining Racial Residential Preferences through Community Perceptions." *Social Problems* 49(4):521- 543.
Krysan, M. and R. Farley. 2002. "The Residential Preferences of Blacks: Do They Explain Persistent Segregation?" *Social Forces* 80(3):937-980.
Leal, D.L. 2002. "Political Participation by Latino Non-citizens in the United States." *British Journal of Political Science* 32: 353-370.
Lee, B.A. and K.E. Campbell. 1999. "Neighbor Networks of Black and White Americans." Pp. 119-46 in B. Wellman (ed.), *Networks in the Global Village: Life in Contemporary Communities*. Boulder: Westview Press.
Lee, B.A. and K.E. Campbell. 1997. "Common Ground? Urban Neighborhoods as Survey Respondents See Them." *Social Science Quarterly* 78: 922-36.
Lee, B.A., R.S. Oropesa, B.J. Metch and A.M. Guest. 1984. "Testing the Decline-of-Community Theses: Neighborhood Organizations in Seattle, 1929 and 1979." *American Journal of Sociology* 89: 1161-88.
Lee, B.A., R.S. Oropesa and J.W. Kanan. 1994. "Neighborhood Context and Residential Mobility." *Demography* 31(2):249-270.
Lee, B.A., K.E. Campbell and O. Miller. 1991. "Racial Differences in Urban Neighboring." *Sociological Forum* 6(3): 525-550.
Light, I.H. and S.J. Gold. 2000. *Ethnic Economies*. Academic Press.
Liu, Q.A., V. Ryan, H. Aurbach and T. Besser. 1998. "The Influence of Local Church Participation on Rural Community Attachment." *Rural Sociology* 63 (3): 432-450.
Logan, J.R. and G.D. Spitze. 1994. "Family Neighbors." *American Journal of Sociology* 100 (2): 453-476.
Logan, J.R., R.D. Alba, T. McNulty and B. Fisher. 1996. "Making a Place in the Metropolis: Locational Attainment in Cities and Suburbs." *Demography* 33(4):443-453.
Logan, J.R., R.D. Alba, and W. Zhang. 2002. "Immigrant Enclaves and Ethnic Communities in New York and Los Angeles." *American Sociological Review* 67: 299-322.
Logan, J.R., B.J. Stults, and R. Farley. 2004. "Segregation of Minorities in the Metropolis: Two Decades of Change." *Demography* 41 (1): 1-22 0.
Loo, C. 1986. "Neighborhood Satisfaction and Safety: A Study of a Low-income Ethnic Area." *Environment and Behavior* 18(1): 109-131.
Marcelli, E.A. and B.L. Lowell. 2005. "Transnational Twist: Pecuniary Remittances and the Socioeconomic Integration of Authorized and Unauthorized Mexican Immigrants in Los Angeles County." *International Migration Review* 39(1): 69-102.

Massey, D.S. and L.C. Basem. 1992. "Determinants of Savings, Remittances, and Spending Patterns Among United States Migrants in 4 Mexican Communities." Sociological Inquiry 62(2): 185-207.

Michelson, W. 1977. *Environmental Choice, Human Behavior, and Residential Satisfaction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Miller, F.D., S. Tsemberis, G.P. Malia, et al. 1980. "Neighborhood Satisfaction Among Urban Dwellers." *Journal of Social Issues* 36 (3): 101-117.

Min, P.G. 1992. "The Structure and Social Functions of Korean Immigrant Churches in the United States." *International Migration Review* 26 (4): 1370-1394.

Morawska, E. 2001. "Immigrant-Black Dissensions in American Cities: An Argument for Multiple Explanations." Pp. 47-96 in E. Anderson and D.S. Massey (eds.), *Problem of the Century: Racial Stratification in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Morenoff, J.D. and R.J. Sampson. 1997. "Violent Crime and the Spatial Dynamics of Neighborhood Transition: Chicago, 1970-1990." *Social Forces* 76(1):31-64.

Olsen, M.E. 1970. "Social and Political Participation of Blacks." *American Sociological Review* 35 (4): 682-697 1970

Oropesa, R.S. 1992. "Social Structure, Social Solidarity and Involvement in Neighborhood Improvement Associations." *Sociological Inquiry* 62 (1): 107-118.

Ortega, S.T. and J.I. Myles. 1987. "Race and Gender Effects on Fear of Crime: An Interactive Model with Age." *Criminology* 25 (1): 133-152.

Pantoja, A.D. 2005. "Transnational Ties and Immigrant Political Incorporation: The Case of Dominicans in Washington Heights, New York." *International Migration Review* 43 (4): 123-146.

Parkes A, A. Kearns and R.Atkinson. 2002. "What Makes People Dissatisfied with Their Neighborhoods?" *Urban Studies* 39 (13): 2413-2438.

Portes, A. And R. Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Richmond, D.A. 2003. "Embeddedness in Voluntary Associations and the Timing of Geographic Moves." *Sociological Forum* 18 (2): 295-322.

Riger, S. and P.J. Lavrakas. 1981. "Community Ties: Patterns of Attachment and Social Interaction in Urban Neighborhoods." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 9 (1): 55-66.

Sampson, R.J. and W.B. Groves. 1989. "Community Structure and Crime: Testing Social Disorganization Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (4): 774-802.

Sanders, J.M. 2002. "Ethnic Boundaries and Identity in Plural Societies." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 327-357.

Sastry, N., B. Ghosh-Dastidar, J. Adams and A.R. Pebley. 2003. "The Design of a Multilevel Survey of Children, Families, and Communities: The Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Survey," RAND Working Paper.

Silver, E., and L.L. Miller. 2004. "Sources of Informal Social Control in Chicago Neighborhoods." *Criminology* 42 (3): 551-583.

Sirgy, M.J. and T. Cornwell. 2002. "How Neighborhood Features Affect Quality of Life." *Social Indicators Research* 59 (1): 79-114.

Speare, A. 1974. "Residential Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable in Residential Mobility." *Demography* 11: 173-88.

Stoll, M.A. 2001. "Race, Neighborhood Poverty, and Participation in Voluntary Associations." *Sociological Forum* 16 (3): 529-557.
Taub, R.P., D.G. Taylor and J.D. Dunham. 1984. *Paths of Neighborhood Change: Race and Crime in Urban Chicago*: University of Chicago Press.
Taylor, Ralph B. 1996. "Neighborhood Responses to Disorder and Local Attachments: The Systemic Model of Attachment, Social Disorganization, and Neighborhood Use Value." *Sociological Forum* 11: 41-74.
Theodori, G.L. 2001. "Examining the Effects of Community Satisfaction and Attachment on Individual Well-being." *Rural Sociology* 66 (4): 618-628.
Tienda, M. and L. Jensen. 1986. "Immigration and Public Assistance Participation: Dispelling the Myth of Dependency." *Social Science Research* 15 (4): 372-400.
Verba S., K.I. Schlozman, H. Brady, et al. 1993. "Race, Ethnicity and Political Resources: Participation in the United States." *British Journal Of Political Science* 23: 453-497.
Waters, M.C. 2001. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
Wittberg, P. 1984. "The Effects of Local Activity on Neighborhood Attitudes: A Comparison of Black and White Urbanites." *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 20: 185-200.
Woldoff, R.A. 2002. "The Effects of Local Stressors on Neighborhood Attachment." *Social Forces* 81: 87-116.
Yinger, J. 1995. *Closed Doors, Opportunities Lost: The Continuing Costs of Housing Discrimination*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
Zelinsky, W. and B.A. Lee. 1998. "Heterolocalism: An Alternative Model of the Sociospatial Behavior of Immigrant Ethnic Communities." *International Journal of Population Geography* 4: 281-98.
Zhao, B. 2005. "Does the Number of Houses a Broker Shows Depend on a Homeseeker's Race?" *Journal of Urban Economics* 57 (1): 128-147.
Zhou, M. 2000. "Social Capital in Chinatown: The Role of Community-Based Organizations and Families in the Adaptation of the Younger Generation." Pp. 315-335 in Min Zhou and James V. Gatewood (eds.), *Contemporary Asian America*. New York: New York University Press.
Zhou, M. and J.R. Logan. 1991. "In and Out of Chinatown: Residential Mobility and Segregation of New York City's Chinese." *Social Forces* 70: 387-407.

Table 1. LA County and LAFANS Population Size

	LA County	LAFANS
% White	31.09	27.04
% Black	9.47	9.66
% Asian	11.81	6.67
% Hispanic	44.56	56.61
% Immigrant	36.20	54.04

Table 2. Intercorrelations Among Attachment Dimensions

	Satisfaction		Sentiment		Neighboring		Participation	
Satisfaction	-		-		-		-	
Sentiment	.461	***	-		-		-	
Neighboring	.194	***	.534	***	-		-	
Participation	.122	***	.144	***	.165	***	-	

***p<.001 **p<.01 *p<.05 N=2,411

Table 3. Description of Individual-level Independent Variables

Variable	Mean	
Racial identity		
Black (1=yes)	9.7	(%)
Asian (1=yes)	6.7	(%)
Hispanic (1=yes)	5.6	(%)
Competing obligations / Compensatory		
Immigrant citizen (1=yes)	15.5	(%)
Immingrant non-citizen (1=yes)	38.5	(%)
Percent lifetime in U.S. (years)	69.9	(%)
Lingering homeland ties (1=yes)	44.1	(%)
Extralocal voluntary memberships (scale)		
Local investment		
Length of neighborhood residence (years)	7.6	
Homeownership (1=yes)	38.8	(%)
Local kin (1=no members, 4=most or all)	1.4	
Local employment (1=yes)	51.9	%
Local religious worship (1=yes)	10.2	%
Local health care (1=yes)	8.2	%
Local grocery shopping (1=yes)	25.6	%
Danger		
Unsafe (1=very safe, 4= very unsafe)	2.2	
Robbed (1=yes)	42.9	%
Social and demographic statuses		
High school degree (1=yes)	20.1	(%)
Some college/vocational experience/associate's degree (1=yes)	24.2	(%)
College degree/postgraduate work or degree (1=yes)	19.2	(%)
Household Income (logged $)	8.8	
Sex (1 = male)	41	(%)
Age (in years)	39.6	
Marital/cohabiting (1=yes)	61.6	%
Children in household (1=yes)	76.4	%
Cognition		
Neighborhood size perception (1 =1 block, 4 = 15+ minute walk)	2.2	

N=2,411

Table 4. Description of Neighborhood-level Independent Variables

Variable	Mean	
% Non-Hispanic Black	8.0	%
% Non-Hispanic Asian	9.8	%
% Hispanic	54.7	%
% Immigrant	40.1	%
Neighborhood SES (scale)	-.22	
Residential stability (% in tract since 1995)	50.2	%

N = 90

Table 5. Neighborhood Attachment by Racial Identity (Means)

	Full	White		Black		Asian		Hispanic	
Satisfaction	3.772	4.195	b d	3.458	a c d	4.041	b d	3.603	a b c
Sentiment	3.229	3.511	b d	3.227	a c	3.504	b d	3.191	a c
Neighboring	2.578	2.712	b c d	2.602	a c	2.453	a b	2.528	a
Participation	.112	0.186	d	.142	d	.135	d	.071	a b c
N	2411	652		233		161		1365	

a Significantly different than whites at p<.05
b Significantly different than blacks at p<.05
c Significantly different than Asians p<.05
d Significantly different than Hispanics at p<.05

Table 6. Neighborhood Attachment by Nativity (Means)

	Satisfaction	Sentiment	Neighboring	Participation
Natives	3.908 [a]	3.372 [a]	2.657 [a]	0.147 [a]
Immigrants	3.662	3.239	2.515	0.084
N	2411	2411	2411	2411

a Significantly different than immigrants at p<.001

Table 7. Bivariate Effect of Race on Neighborhood Attachment
(Undstandardized OLS and Logistic Coefficients)

	Sat.		Sent.		Neigh.		Part.	
Black [1]	-.747	***	-.290	***	-.113	*	-.299	
Asian [1]	-.178	*	-.012		-.266	***	-.355	
Hispanic [1]	-.595	***	-.326	***	-.185	***	-1.083	***
R-square	.070		.042		.012		.024	

***p<.001 **p<.01 *p<.05 N=2,411
[1] Reference category is Non-Hispanic White

Table 8. Effect of Race on Attachment in Full Individual-level Model (Undstandardized OLS and Logistic Coefficients)

	Sat		Sent		Neigh		Part	
Racial Identity								
Black [1]	--.434	***	-.106	*	-.002		.351	
Asian [1]	-.141		-.010		-.226	**	-.323	
Hispanic [1]	-.210	**	-.131	**	-.073		-.290	
Compensatory/Competing oblig.								
Immicitiz [2]	-.170	*	-.126	*	-.042		.354	
Immnoncitiz [2]	-.225	*	-.112		-.024		.466	
% Lifetime in US	-.170	*	-.150		.044		.280	
Lingering ties	.061		.084	*	.068		.117	
Vol. associations	.054	*	.059	***	.090	***	.666	***
Local Investment								
Homeownership	.319	***	.169	***	.061		.463	*
Residence length	-.001		.006	***	.002		-.009	
Local kin	.034		.078	***	.077	***	.038	
Local shopping	.019		.005		-.056		-.190	
Local church	.011		.098	*	.191	**	.443	*
Local health care	-.045		.013		.075		.247	
Local work	.115	**	-.014		.059		.536	**
Danger								
Unsafe	-.367	***	-.214	***	-.082	***	-.167	[a]
Robbed	-.236	***	-.195	***	.007		.365	*
Social and Demographic Statuses								
High school deg.	-.050		-.035		-.050		-.099	
Some coll/vocat.	.021		.054		.039		.431	
College deg. +	.008		-.066		-.011		.465	
HH income	.003		.005		.009	*	.036	
Age	.002		.004	**	.000		.004	
Male	.052		-.025		.005		-.111	
Married/cohab.	-.043		.027		.065	*	.087	
Children in HH	.060		.006		.052		.052	
Cognition	.020		-.006		.021		.193	**
R-square	.234		.192		.058		.113	

***p<.001 **p<.01 *p<.05 [a] p<.06 N=2,411

[1] Reference category is Non-Hispanic White

[2] Reference category is Native Citizen

Table 9. Effect of Race on Attachment in Full Neighborhood-level Model (Undstandardized HLM Coefficients)

	Sat.		Sent.		Neigh.		Part.	
Individual								
Racial Identity								
Black [1]	-.067		.033		.081		.714	*
Asian [1]	-.041		.009		-.227	***	-.127	
Hispanic [1]	.056		-.016		-.013		-.030	
Compensatory/Competing oblig.								
Immicitiz [2]	-.164		-.130	*	-.049		.255	
Immnoncitiz [2]	-.152		-.071		.002		.429	
% Lifetime in US	-.151		-.143		.055		.316	
Lingering ties	-.083		.111	**	.088		.134	
Voluntary assoc.	.030		.052	***	.091	***	.677	***
Local Investment								
Homeownership	.224	***	.113	**	.031		.387	
Residence length	.000		.006	***	.002		-.007	
Local kin	.047		.077	***	.077	***	.056	
Local shopping	.075		.047		-.033		-.139	
Local church	.041		.100	*	.187	***	.533	*
Local health care	-.042		.003		.075		.278	
Local work	.109	**	-.006		.068	*	.549	*
Danger								
Unsafe	-.277	***	-.164	***	-.060	**	-.093	
Robbed	-.252	***	-.183	***	.014		.387	
Social and Demographic Statuses								
High school deg.	-.078		-.044		-.058		-.108	
Some coll/vocat.	-.073		.016		.019		.405	
College degree +	.216	**	-.125	**	-.020		.327	
HH income	.001		.005	[a]	.008	*	.036	
Age	.001		.003	**	.000		.004	
Male	.071		-.017		.010		-.106	
Married/cohab	-.071		.015		.062		.094	
Children in HH	.019		-.015		.039		.030	
Cognition	.002		.010		.017		.166	

(continued)

(continued)	Sat.		Sent.		Neigh.		Part.
Contextual							
% Black	-.010	***	-.004	*	-.004	*	-.010
% Asian	.002		.001		.000		-.007
% Hispanic	-.004	*	-.003	*	-.003	**	-.004
% Immigrant	-.002		-.002		-.001		.007
Neighborhood SES	.190	*	-.005		-.086		.252
Res. stability	.001		.006	***	.007	**	-.004

***p<.001 **p<.01 *p<.05 N=2,411

1 Reference category is Non-Hispanic White
2 Reference category is Native Citizen

Table 10. Effect of Racial Composition and Immigrant Presence on Neighborhood Attachment (Bivariate Unstandardized HLM Coefficients)

	Sat.		Sent.		Neigh.		Part.	
% Black	-.019	***	-.007	***	-.002		-.010	
% Asian	.015	**	.007	**	.001		.013	
% Hispanic	-.011	***	-.006	***	-.003	***	-.017	***
% Immigrant	-.018	***	-.011	***	-.006	***	-.026	**

***p<.001 **p<.01 *p<.05 N=2,411