The Culture of Poverty: Do Neighborhood Racial Composition and Poverty Matter?

Jibum Kim, NORC

Diane S. Lauderdale, University of Chicago

Jeong-Han Kang, Yonsei University

GSS Topical Report 43

Acknowledgments: This research was supported by a grant from NICHD to Jibum Kim, Diane Lauderdale, and Tom W. Smith (R03 HD50355). We acknowledge the valuable comments from Tom W. Smith and Eric Hedberg.

Recently, social scientists have reemphasized the role of the community or neighborhood context on individual well-being (Brooks-Gunn, Duncan, and Aber 1997; Booth and Crouter 2001; Kawachi and Berkman 2003). Massey and Denton's work focused attention on segregation as a key feature of the urban environment (1993), underlying racial disparities (Farley 1997; Charles 2003). Although residential segregation for Blacks declined from 1980 to 2000, Blacks still show the highest residential segregation among racial and ethnic groups in the US (Iceland, Weinberg, and Steinmetz 2002). Americans continue to see "American Apartheid" (Massey and Denton 1993) and become "Streetwise" (Anderson 1990). Massey and Denton (1993:8) argue that "residential segregation has been instrumental in creating a structural niche within which a deleterious set of attitudes and behaviors – a culture of segregation – has arisen and flourished." The "culture of segregation" recalls the earlier idea of a "culture of poverty" (Lewis 1968), but with an emphasis on structural conditions.

Racial composition is not the only neighborhood feature hypothesized to affect racial disparities. Wilson (1996) argues that class segregation, resulting from the decline in manufacturing jobs and the exodus of middle class Blacks to more affluent areas, shapes the urban black underclass. In this process, according to Anderson (1990), residents in areas segregated by race and class not only lose middle-class role models but also witness the fading role of "old heads", who believe in hard work and guide young people in the community. In place of "old heads," new "old heads", who do not follow traditional values and look for quick profits in drugs, become role models. As Wilson wrote, "the residents of these jobless black poverty areas face certain social constraints on the choices they can make in their daily lives. These constraints, combined with restricted

opportunities in the larger society, have led to ghetto-related behaviors and attitudes – that is, behaviors and attitudes that are found more frequently in ghetto neighborhoods than in neighborhoods that feature even modest levels of poverty and local employment" (1996: 52). Similar to Massey and Denton, Wilson invokes the "attitudes and behaviors" that recall the culture of poverty hypothesis.

Different transmission mechanisms have been hypothesized for the culture of poverty. Massey and Denton (1993) and Wilson (1987) emphasize structural characteristics of neighborhoods: racial or class segregation. In contrast, Lewis (1968), while mentioning structural characteristics, emphasizes transmission through families. People who develop the culture of poverty are poor, more likely to be migrant workers, unemployed, low wage-earning, illiterate, and with little wealth. Regardless of the different mechanisms of transmission (social isolation vs. intergenerational transfer), a culture of poverty is present for both Lewis (1968) and Wilson (1987, 1996). Empirical studies that examine whether this complex of attitudes varies among communities after taking into account individual and other community characteristics would help identify the more likely transmission mechanisms.

However, few empirical studies have directly tested whether the attitudes and behaviors ascribed to a culture of poverty actually vary with neighborhood characteristics. Most studies have focused on limited geographic areas and exclusively on Blacks (Burton and Jarrett 2000; Rankin and Quane 2000), and so we do not know whether neighborhood characteristics such as concentrated poverty affect the attitudes and behaviors of all social and demographic groups similarly (South 2001: 87).

Many studies of adolescents assume a collective socialization model (adult influence), which could be one of the mechanisms through which neighborhoods influence adolescents' outcomes (Jencks and Mayer 1990; Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn 2000), but these studies do not provide empirical data about the adults, and the mechanisms underlying neighborhood effects on adults themselves seem harder to sort out (Tienda 1991: 250). It is possible that adults in impoverished, segregated communities may hold attitudes similar to mainstream ones, although their behaviors may be incongruent with their attitudes. Studies that have combined neighborhood and individual information have had data limitations, most often being confined to a single metropolitan area, such as the important series of studies examining Chicago, based on the 1994-1995 Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN) (e.g. Browning and Olinger-Wilbon 2003; Browning et al. 2006; Sharkey 2006; Swaroop 2006); the 1995 Community, Crime, and Health Survey (CCH) (e.g., Ross 2000; Ross, Reynolds, and Geis 2000; Ross and Mirowsky 2008); the 1992-1994 Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality (MCSUI) (e.g. Oliver and Wong 2003) and the 1990 decennial census data (which are somewhat mismatched temporally).

Our aim in this paper is to examine the effect of neighborhood poverty and racial/ethnic segregation on attitudes nationally. We focus on attitudes that may tap into the hypothesized "culture of segregation" or "culture of poverty," specifically trust in institutions, trust in people, hopelessness and despair, and we examine whether these attitudes vary with neighborhood (and individual) characteristics. These analyses will use a newly-created dataset that linked the General Social Survey, a national probability sample, (GSS; 1998, 2000, 2002) by address to the 2000 Census.

A CULTURE OF POVERTY: Neighborhood Structures vs. Individual Characteristics

Neighborhood Structures

Social disorganization theory is a valuable framework for understanding communities and neighborhoods; it holds that structural conditions such as urbanicity and economics affect social relations. Wirth (1938) posits that population size, density, and heterogeneity accompanied by urbanization weaken individual, family, neighborhood, and social ties. The findings of Shaw and McKay (1969) show an association between certain structural conditions, such as neighborhood poverty, residential stability, and ethnic heterogeneity, and the concentration of social ills such as delinquency. They attribute the higher prevalence of social ills in disadvantaged areas to the differences in community social organization.

Testing the effect of social disorganization on crime, Sampson and Groves (1989) elaborate on how three neighborhood structural characteristics are associated with social disorganization. Neighborhood poverty is related to a lack of organizations that support social control. Residential mobility is related to weak social ties, and ethnic heterogeneity is associated with weak interactions. Collective efficacy, rooted in trust among neighbors and a willingness to intervene on behalf of the common good, has been identified as a mechanism that mediates the effects of socially disadvantaged areas on delinquency (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997: 918). Although social disorganization theory

was not put forward to explain how structural characteristics led to a culture of poverty, this perspective underscores the importance of where people live.

Wilson (1987, 1996) and Massy and Denton (1993)**,** while emphasizing the community, also describe processes that recall the culture of poverty. Wilson (1987) argued that structural conditions are related to social disorganization in the inner city because the flight of middle-class Blacks from the inner city not only reduces the institutions in the community but also removes role models who sustain mainstream values. As a result, conflicting norms flourish in the inner city. Thus, the behaviors of the lower class are not the internalization of norms in the specific community, but an adaptation to restricted opportunities (Wilson 1996). Massey and Denton (1993) emphasized the detrimental effects of residential segregation on the life chances of inner city Blacks due to social isolation from whites. Isolation from whites leads to a limited network for jobs and the construction of black culture "*in opposition to the basic ideals and values of American society*" (p. 167). This culture of segregation has solidified with poverty.

Although their arguments link segregation or poverty at the neighborhood level with the culture of poverty, the underlying mechanisms – the role of institutions and the middle-class – seem uncertain. For instance, the church is recognized as a central institution for Blacks (Lincoln & Mamiya 1991), with black congregations differing in their roles from white congregations. Black congregations provide guidance in secular activities, such as how to think, talk, and act (Pattillo-McCoy 1998) and provide socio-emotional support (Taylor and Chatters 1991; Chatters et al. 2002; Krause 2003; Nieghbors et al. 1998). Thus, for Blacks, the more congregations in the neighborhood, the

more sources of non-religious support and services are available. However, McRoberts (2003) shows that a greater number of churches in a poor black neighborhood do not necessarily mean more services for residents, for some congregations may take advantage of low land values in these neighborhoods even though many church members live elsewhere.

Similarly, Pattillo-McCoy (1999) shows that frequent contact by middle-class Blacks with lower-class Blacks through kinship and proximity are more likely to lead to negative experiences for the black middle-class. Her study is at odds with Wilson's argument in that she argues for a negative influence of the lower class on middle class. Wilson, however, suggests the importance of omitted influence of the middle class. Thus there is no consensus about how social structures influence attitudes associated with a culture of poverty.

Individual Characteristics

According to Lewis (1968), those with a culture of poverty have "a critical attitude toward some of the basic institutions of the dominant classes: hatred of the police, mistrust of government and those in high position, a cynicism that extends even to the church" (p.8), and "a strong sense of resignation and fatalism" (p. 21). They are like "aliens" in their own country, convinced that the existing institutions do not serve their interests and needs (Lewis 1998: 7). For Lewis (1968), a culture of poverty is "both an adaptation and reaction of the poor to their marginal position in a class-stratified, highly individuated, capitalistic society," and "once it comes into existence, it tends to perpetuate itself from generation to generation because of its effect on the children" (p. 5-

6). Even if the lower class holds majority values and attitudes, “it is important to distinguish what they say and what they do,” Lewis (1968 p.8) writes.

There have been a couple of studies that tested whether individuals hold the set of attitudes and behaviors described as the culture of poverty (Irelan, Moles et al. 1969; Rokeach and Parker 1970). Based on an area-probability sample conducted by the National Opinion Research Center in 1968, Rokeach and Parker (1970) found that the value differences between Blacks and whites after controlling income and education almost disappeared, while value differences were larger between poor and affluent persons. These findings show that, in 1968, class was more influential than race on values, which undermines the idea that a culture of poverty is only relevant for the black lower class. The culture of poverty hypothesis is ideologically controversial, and has received little empirical research attention over the past thirty years, although the urban and political environment has changed dramatically. Analyzing articles published in the Journal of Marriage and the Family from 1939 to 1987, Demos (1990) showed that the culture of poverty is a major theme for research about the black family substantially decreased in the 1980s.

A few small ethnographic studies (e.g., Duneier 1992) have explored whether impoverished Blacks hold the attitudes of a culture of poverty. While they did not find that the persons they studied did hold these attitudes, their findings had limited generalizability (Small and Newman 2001). Using the 1987-1993 GSS, Jones and Luo (1999) found that poor blacks are more likely to oppose work for welfare and welfare reduction compared with non-poor whites. However there is little difference between the

poor blacks and non-poor whites in terms of work ethic and family values, but they did not examine the community context.

Multilevel approaches to Culture of Poverty: Previous Findings

While there have been multilevel studies examining community context and attitudes and behaviors, studies that address attitudes associated specifically with a culture of poverty are few, and they mainly focus on trust. Using the 1995 Community, Crime, and Health Survey (CCH) in Illinois residents, Ross et al. (2001) found that neighborhood disadvantage was associated with greater mistrust. Likewise, using the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey, Putnam (2007) showed a negative relationship between poverty rate and trust at the census tract level, net of age, gender, race/ethnicity, citizenship, average monthly working hours, commuting time, home ownership, education, household income, and years of residence. However, based on the Seattle neighborhoods and Crime Survey (SNACS), Guest et al. (2008) found no statistically significant relationship between community socio-economic status and trust or helpfulness after controlling for home ownership, years of residence, and education. A few studies have examined ethnic heterogeneity and trust. Putnam (2007) found a positive association between ethnic homogeneity and trust, and Guest et al. (2008) found that Whites who live in heterogeneous communities or in residentially less stable areas are less likely to believe that people can be trusted or are helpful in their neighborhood. However, based on the 1976 Detroit Area Study, Marschall and Stolle (2004) found no relationship between racial heterogeneity and trust among Whites net of gender,

education, number of children, length of residence, anti-integration, interracial contact, and perceptions of neighborhood problems.

In sum, surprisingly, there are few multilevel studies examining the relationship between racial/ethnic heterogeneity and attitudes of the culture of poverty, and the findings are inconsistent. Based on our theoretical perspective rather than on previous empirical findings, we expect that people living in poor or segregated areas are more likely to have negative attitudes toward government, people, and generally pessimistic feelings, after controlling for individual characteristics.

DATA AND METHODS

GSS: Since 1972, the GSS, the largest and longest-term project supported by the Sociology program of the National Science Foundation, has conducted 26 cross-sectional surveys annually or biannually (Davis, Marsden, and Smith 2007). The GSS produces a high-quality, representative sample of the adult population of the US by using a strict, full-probability sample design, rigorous field efforts, and extensive quality control. Since 1972, a total of 51,020 adult respondents who speak English or (since 2006) Spanish have been interviewed in-person. The sample size and response rate for the years used in this analysis are as follows: 2,832 with 75.6% in 1998, 2,817 with 70% in 2000, and 2,765 with 70.1% in 2002. The three year (1998, 2000, 2002) GSS includes 6,642 whites, 1,239 Blacks, and 532 with other races. Because of the study design and the continuity in the sample design and core questions, the GSS is considered a leading source of data to measure attitude changes in America for the past 36 years (Davis, Marsden, and Smith 2007).

We first pooled the three years of the GSS (1998, 2000, 2002, N=8,414) and linked individual address records to Census tracts in the Census 2000 Summary File 3. From the 2000 US Census Summary Tape File SF3, aggregate information about poverty or racial composition at the census tract level was obtained. The total number of census tracts for our data is 575, and mean number of respondents per census tract is about 15, but ranges from 1 to 85. About 9% of Census tracts have just 1 case, and about 10% have more than 26 cases per tract. Due to the GSS split-ballot design, respondents were randomly asked to answer different questions, which resulted in variation in the numbers of cases and tracts for different questions. For all questions, the number of tracts is 466 for whites; the number of tracts ranges from 289 to 313 for nonwhites. The number of cases ranges from 2,977 to 3,898 for whites and from 991 to 1,203 for nonwhites.

GSS and Census Tract Linkage

Linking the GSS to the 2000 Census posed challenges. The GSS 1998, 2000, and 2002 were based on the 1990 NORC sampling frame. To append 2000 aggregate Census tract information to the GSS, it was necessary to match the 1990 GSS census blocks to the 2000 census blocks. However, due to splitting of some Census tracts from 1990 to 2000 and many new and altered blocks, there is no table that directly links the 1990 Census block to the 2000 Census block. For this conversion, we decided to use the listed address to drive geographical joins. We first used the MapMarker software (http://www.empower.com/pages/products_mapmarker.htm) to geocode each specific address, which was successful in approximately 50% of cases. For those addresses, we joined them to a file in MapInfo Professional containing each 2000 census block (8.6

million) and assigning them a block ID in that manner. For the remaining lines with incomplete addresses, we used the centroid of their 1990 block (in latitude and longitude) to assign them to a 2000 block. Errors in this procedure resulted from discrepancies in the address geocoding (e.g. putting an address on the wrong side of the street, and thus a different block) and from spatial errors in the 1990 and 2000 block files. In addition, the original listing contained many partial addresses, which were difficult to geocode with certainty. Consequently, a high degree of interaction was required to properly examine the data, by overlaying both the 1990 and 2000 block files. Unfortunately, issues encountered when matching the necessary files, such as our need to translate 1990 Census geography to 2000 Census geography data, are unavoidable whenever translating between mapping databases. To verify the geocoding based on mapping databases, we entered 8,414 addresses into the American Fact Finder Census data search <http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/AGSGeoAddressServlet?_programYear=50&_treeId=420&_lang=en&_sse=on>. The discrepant cases between mapping databases and individual searches were then corrected based on comparisons between the 1990 block layer, the street layer, and the 2000 block layer in MapInfo Professional.

The appropriate boundary for a neighborhood is often ill-defined (Keller 1968: 87-88, Lee 2001: 32-33), and Census tract may be deficient for defining segregation (Lee et al. 2008). As Hipp shows (2007), different boundaries for neighborhoods, such as blocks or tracts, lead to different aggregate characteristics of the neighborhood and elicit different neighborhood effects. However, given that the hypothesized mechanism of neighborhood influence on individual attitudes relates to socialization, we chose the Census tract as the smallest feasible level for hierarchical analysis (compared to zip codes

or counties). In addition, since the Census tract has been widely used as a geographic boundary of neighborhoods (see Dietz 2002 for the review of empirical studies in Table 1), our results can be more easily compared to previous results.

Variables

Dependent Variables

Table 1 shows the key GSS questions that will be used to construct the outcome variables. By order, the first column is the GSS mnemonic, the second is the actual question, and the third shows how we recode the original variable to create a binary dependent variable. Based on Lewis's extensive list of culture of poverty indicators, we limit our indicators to those related to confidence in government, misanthropy items, and personal disposition such as values or morale. These items were selected not only because they seem to have face validity, but also because they were asked in all three years of the GSS. We recognize that different indicators may be used to operationalize the culture of poverty (e.g., Coward, Feagin, and Williams 1974; Jones and Luo 1999).

All dependent variables were coded as dummy variables. For the questions of confidence in executive branch of the federal government and Congress, a definitive positive answer ("a great deal") was coded 1, and 0 in all other cases ("only some" and "hardly any"). Also, the positive answer for the misanthropy items (TRUST, FAIR, HELPFUL) were coded as 1 compared with 0 in all other cases. Again, optimistic views of family or themselves (GOODLIFE) and children's future (KIDSSOL) are coded 1 for positive answers and 0 for all other cases.

<Table 1. Dependent Variables>

Independent Variables

Our two independent variables are poverty rate and segregation in the neighborhood. We used the log of the percentage of people living below the poverty level in 1999.[1] Our measure of how much a racial/ethnic group is segregated from other racial/ethnic groups has two components: (1) the overall level of racial/ethnic concentration in a neighborhood and (2) the probability of intra-racial/intra-ethnic interactions within the racial/ethnic group. First, different racial groups will be segregated from one another if a neighborhood is not heterogeneous but dominated by a single racial/ethnic group. In other words, clearly visible distinctions between the majority and minorities will hinder social interactions and integrations among groups.

The level of concentration over different groups can be measured by the Herfindahl index (Hall and Tideman 1967; Hipp et al. 2004: 1345):

$$H = \sum_{j=1}^{N} P_j^{\,2}$$

where P_j stands for race *j*'s proportion among *N* racial groups in a neighborhood. The measure has the largest value, or 1, when a single race completely occupies a neighborhood, and will have the smallest value $1/N$ if *N* racial groups are equally distributed (i.e., $P_j = 1/N$ for all j) in the neighborhood. Trivially, the value $1/N$

[1] We first tried to gauge the nonlinear effect of the concentrated poverty area based on five categories (<5, 5-10, 10-20, 20-30, and >=30). Since we could not find any effect, we decided to use it as a continuous variable. Although a 40 percent poverty rate was prevalently applied to indicate a high-poverty area at the census tract level (Jargowsky 1997: 9), we could not apply it to our study due to small number of cases.

becomes larger when there are fewer racial groups (i.e., smaller *N*). In sum, a level of segregation in a neighborhood will be greater when there are fewer racial groups and when the racial distribution is more uneven across various racial groups. In this study, we measure racial/ethnic concentration across five racial/ethnic groups: non-Hispanic Whites, Blacks, Asians, Hispanics, and others.

The overall level of concentration, however, does not consider different positions between the majority and minorities. Members of the majority group are more likely to interact within their own group than are minorities because they have higher probability of encountering members of the same group by chance (Blau 1977). Therefore, the larger a racial group's proportion in a neighborhood (i.e., the larger P_j), the more frequent are intra-racial interactions. For the minority, isolated interactions within a racial group are an important aspect of residential segregation (see Massey and Denton [1988]; Lee and Ferraro [2007: 136] for details).

We can operationalize segregation of racial/ethnic group *j* in a neighborhood as proportional to both isolation of the group *j* and overall racial concentration:

$$S_j = P_j\left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} P_j^2\right)$$

Consider a hypothetical neighborhood consisting of five racial groups with respective proportions $\left(5\!\diagup\!10, 2\!\diagup\!10, 1\!\diagup\!10, 1\!\diagup\!10, 1\!\diagup\!10\right)$. The neighborhood's overall concentration $\sum_{j=1}^{5} P_j^2$ is 0.32. The first group, however, shows a five times higher segregation level $\left(=\left(5\!\diagup\!10\right)\cdot 0.32\right)$ than the third group $\left(=\left(1\!\diagup\!10\right)\cdot 0.32\right)$ in the same neighborhood because the former is more likely to have intra-group interactions than the latter.

This measure for segregation, S_j, is specific not only to the neighborhood but also to racial/ethnic group. If we divide the total sample by racial/ethnic groups in statistical estimations and conduct a separate analysis for each racial/ethnic group, we can regard segregation as a neighborhood-level variable in multi-level analysis. The sample sizes of racial/ethnic minorities, however, are too small to allow separate analyses, broken by Blacks, Asians, and Hispanics. Since non-Hispanic Whites comprise 76% of our sample, we group all minorities in analysis. Accordingly, segregation S_j within each tract has only two values, one for Whites and one for minorities. We, however, can utilize the original five racial/ethnic categories in calculating concentration, $\sum_{j=1}^{5} P_j^2$. In the above example for racial/ethnic distribution, $\left(5/10, 2/10, 1/10, 1/10, 1/10\right)$, the first element $5/10$ is the proportion of Whites, $\sum_{j=1}^{5} P_j^2$ remains 0.32, S_{Whites} is $\left(5/10\right)\cdot 0.32$, whereas $S_{\text{minorities}}$ is newly defined as $\left(5/10\right)\cdot 0.32$.

Measure of Heterogeneity within Minorities

Since this approach for measuring segregation does not reflect diversity within ethnic minorities, we additionally estimate the effect of heterogeneity within racial minorities. Heterogeneity is the reverse of the concept of concentration and can be measured by:

$$1-\sum_{j=2}^{5} P'_j{}^2$$

where $\sum_{j=2}^{5} P'_j = 1$ and P'_j are the proportion of group *j* within the minority population. Note that the heterogeneity within minorities is independent of overall concentration. Different levels of overall concentration can yield the same level of heterogeneity within minorities and *vice versa*. For the case of $\left(5/10, 2/10, 1/10, 1/10, 1/10\right)$, the distribution within minorities is $\left(2/5, 1/5, 1/5, 1/5\right)$ whose heterogeneity is $1 - 7/25$. A different overall distribution, say, $\left(15/20, 2/20, 1/20, 1/20, 1/20\right)$ yields the same result. In sum, our segregation measure has different meanings for the non-Hispanic Whites and the minorities. For the analysis of non-Hispanic whites, segregation indicates the level of white concentration, but for minorities, segregation indicates the level of minority concentration. Minority heterogeneity measures the distribution among minorities, and higher numbers indicate similar representation among minorities.

Control Variables

Several community and individual characteristics were included as control variables based on previous research (Richardson, Jr., Houston, and Hadjiharalambous 2001 for confidence in government, Alesina and La Ferrara 2002, Simpson 2006, and Smith 1997 for trust). Given that our main focus is the neighborhood context, specifically poverty and race/ethnic composition, and we have several dependent variables, we limited the number of individual-level variables in our analysis to the most influential ones, instead of including all potential individual-level variables.

We also control for region of the country and population density in the tract. Region is divided into four categories with the Northeast being the referent region. Population density is defined as people per square mile at the tract level, and is logged because of the skewed distribution. We also control for an indicator of social disorganization, residential stability. Residential stability is measured as the percentage of the population aged five and over who have lived in the same house for the past five years. This indicator may directly or indirectly influence the culture of poverty; the association (and direction) between this indicator and culture of poverty attitudes is unknown.

The individual characteristic items include age, gender (female =1), marital status (married=1), and race. The race variable has four categories: non-Hispanic white, Black, Hispanic (Mexico, Puerto Rico, Spain, and Other Spanish), and others (primarily Asians and Native Americans). Self-rated health was categorized into three groups: good health, poor health, and those who were not asked about health status due to the GSS sample design. Three socio-economic status indicators include education, employment status, and total household income. Education is a continuous variable (0: no formal schooling to 20 years). Employment status is coded 1 for employed and 0 in all other cases. Total household income was collected as a 24-category variable and recoded into five categories: (1) less than $19,999, (2) $20,000 -39,999, (3) $40,000-74,999, (4) $75,000 or more, (5) income reporting refused or don't know. Since about 11.8% of 1998-2002 samples refused to report, or did not know their household income, we include the missing income category in our analysis.[2] The reference category is $75,000 or more.

[2] We also ran the same analysis with imputed missing income based on age, gender, marital status, employment, education, and subjective class. We found very similar result.

Analysis

We first calculate descriptive statistics for the GSS mnemonics (Table 1), and they are presented in Appendices 1 and 2. Multilevel logistic regression models, using STATA xtlogit, allow us to examine within-neighborhood and between-neighborhood variation and simultaneously estimate individual-level (level 1) and neighborhood-level (level 2) effects. We model non-Hispanic Whites and minorities separately. In each analysis, we first show the model with community characteristics, and then the model with both community and individual characteristics. Among the individual level characteristics, we focus on household income variables because these are most relevant to the culture of poverty debate. Although we have examined interactions between the neighborhood-level variables for segregation and logged poverty, we do not need to include the interaction effects in the table because most of them were not statistically significant. The interaction is -.462 with p-value=.098 for GOODLIFE in the White sample. The negative segregation effect is stronger when poverty rate is higher in the White sample. Other than this case, all the interactions are non-significant.

RESULTS

<Table 2 about here>

CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

Tables 2, 3, and 4 show the multilevel logistic regression models for each of the seven dependent variables, separately for Non-Hispanic Whites and minorities and grouped into three areas: confidence in government (Table 2), trust in people (Table 3), and outlook (Table 4). For each dependent variable, the first column includes only neighborhood-level variables, and the second column adds individual-level variables.

As shown in Table 2, confidence in the executive branch of the federal government and legislature has little neighborhood-level variability. Confidence in the federal government does vary by region of the country and population density. Among Non-Hispanic Whites, people who live in denser areas are more likely to be confident in the federal government, and people who live in the South are much more likely to express confidence in the federal government (compared with the East). However, people in the West are much less likely to express confidence in the legislature compared to the East. Among minorities, people in the Midwest are less likely to be confident in the federal government.

For the individual characteristics, we found differing patterns of household income on confidence in government by race. Among Whites, lower-income persons are less likely to be confident in the federal government, but among minorities, lower income groups are more likely to be confident in the federal government. For confidence in the legislature, the effects of household income among minorities, although positive, are not statistically significant. Among minorities, compared to Blacks, Hispanics and other racial groups are more likely to be confident in the federal government and in the legislature.

<Table 3 about here>

MISANTHROPY

Table 3 presents the results of multilevel models for the three misanthropy items. When only community characteristics are in the models, greater poverty rate is significantly associated with less belief that others are trustworthy and fair, for both Whites and minorities. When individual characteristics are added to the models, the associations are greatly attenuated and no longer statistically significant. However, greater segregation is significantly associated with believing others are more helpful and fair among non-Hispanic Whites, after controlling for individual factors. The association is not significant among minorities. In other words, non-Hispanic Whites who live in higher proportion White census tracts are more likely to consider people are generally helpful and fair. Whites in areas of higher residential stability are somewhat less likely to trust people. For Non-Hispanic Whites, those who live in the South are less likely to feel that others are trustworthy. This is similar to Simpson's findings (2006). In both non-Hispanic Whites and minorities, people in the West are more likely to think people are fair.

Several individual variables have strong associations with responses. For both non-Hispanic Whites and minorities, older age and higher educational attainment are associated with greater belief in the trustworthiness, fairness, and helpfulness of others. Again, compared with the higher household income group, the lowest income group had lower levels of agreement that others were trustworthy, fair and helpful. Respondents

who refused to answer the household income question or did not know their income were also less likely to have higher ratings for these variables.

<Table 4 about here>

OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

Table 4 present the results of the models for outlook for the future, for both self and one's children. For the models with only the neighborhood-level variables, among Whites, higher census tract poverty rate is associated with less optimism for oneself, but the effect is much weaker when individual characteristics are added. Segregation has opposite effects for Whites and minorities: living with one's own racial group increases optimism about one's own future and one's children's future for minorities and decreases it for Whites. Minorities living in the South are more likely to believe that their children's futures will be better than their lives.

Individual characteristics explain much of the variability for Whites, but not for minorities. For Whites, having lower household income, being female, being older, and having poor health have a less positive outlook for their family and for themselves. Higher education is associated with a more positive outlook for oneself, but a less positive outlook for one's children. Few individual level covariates are statistically significant for minorities: Hispanics are more likely to have positive outlooks for themselves, and women are less likely to have a positive outlooks for their children.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

We carried out a rigorous empirical test of attitudes associated with the culture of poverty using a nationally representative sample of adults, the multi-year GSS linked to the 2000 Census at the tract level. Previous studies about the culture of poverty have emphasized structural characteristics (Massey and Denton 1993; Wilson 1987, 1996) or individual characteristics (Lewis 1968), while both perspectives have recognized the importance of the other. Our linked data allowed us to examine both levels at the same time. This study found that the culture of poverty, represented as confidence in government, misanthropy, and outlook, is more likely associated with individual characteristics, especially socio-economic status, and less clearly associated with community-level factors.

Drawing on social disorganization theory, we expected to find an association between poverty at the community level and confidence in government, misanthropy, and outlook, particularly given the many studies showing the deleterious effects of community poverty on attitudes and behaviors. Contrasted with these null findings of poverty at the community level, we did find some effects for racial/ethnic homogeneity, but they differed by race. Whites segregated from minorities are more likely to think that people are helpful and fair. However, Whites segregated from minorities are less likely to have a positive outlook for themselves and their family. In contrast, minorities segregated from Whites are more likely to think that they have a bright future for themselves and for their children. However, our findings do not support a broad role for segregation and poverty in shaping attitudes related to the “culture of poverty.”

Contrasted with the null associations of community level poverty, the significant associations between individual socio-economic status (education and household income) and misanthropy operate similarly regardless of race/ethnicity. In other words, the poor are more likely to have misanthropic attitudes toward others. This finding suggests that the culture of poverty is not limited to minority groups, and that qualitative and quantitative studies of poverty-related attitudes should include all racial groups.

However, we should be cautious in interpreting the null association between neighborhood poverty rate and culture of poverty since there are some limitations to these data. First, the seven survey-based dependent variables we include may not well or fully measure the concept of culture of poverty. Second, our findings may over-control for individual characteristics. However, in a sensitivity analysis when we only controlled total household income (and not employment status or education), we had very similar findings (data not shown). Third, the use of administrative geographic units is a problem for almost all analysis of contextual variables. The geographic unit of analysis, the Census tract, does not correspond to natural geographic divisions (i.e., "neighborhood"), and it would be nearly impossible to identify natural neighborhoods across the entire U.S. Fourth, our neighborhood factors derived from the Census, the aggregates of individuals in the census tract, are not directly measured indicators. Finally, while the "culture of poverty" literature began with studies of Hispanic populations and later for inner city Blacks, due to small sample sizes for these groups, we could not separate the minority racial and ethnic groups.

With these limitations in mind, our findings are broadly inconsistent with the social disorganization perspective, because community level poverty and residential

stability do not seem to vary with attitudes related to the culture of poverty. Further, racial/ethnic concentration matters more clearly for Whites than minorities. The attenuation of the association between poverty rate and the misanthropy variables suggests the importance of individual level controls to sort out the community level context. Also, because our study is not based on a single location, we could identify the importance of region of the country on some dimensions of the culture of poverty. Compared with people in the Northeast, Southern Whites are less likely to trust people but more likely to have confidence in the federal government. Both White and minority races in the West are more likely to think that people are fair, but Whites in the West are less likely to have confidence in the legislature. Because there are so few prior studies focused on questions like our misanthropy items (Guest et al. 2008), it is difficult to compare our findings with previous studies.

Further linkages of the GSS with data from the American Community Survey or the 2010 decennial census would allow us to assess whether changing communities shape attitudes and behaviors. While other important social science data sets, such as the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, have been used to examine the community context, the GSS – with its unusually rich battery of attitude questions – has not been widely used. With our newly developed census linkage, there is the potential to address gaps in community studies in order to better understand diverse communities and explore the mechanisms through which the neighborhood influences the individual.

In short, our results generally suggest that, contrary to the equating culture of poverty with minorities, “culture of poverty” or “culture of segregation” clearly prevails among whites. However, the culture of poverty for minorities was more evident only in

misanthropic attitudes toward others, rather than confidence in government or outlook attitudes. Also, contrary to familiar arguments about the importance of structural characteristics of neighborhood on culture of poverty (Massey and Denton 1993; Wilson 1987, 1996), our results are broadly in accord with the importance of individual characteristics, as Lewis (1968) noted.

REFERENCES

Alesina, Alberto and Eliana La Ferrara. 2002. "Who trusts others?" *Journal of Public Economics* 85:207-234.

Allen, Walter R. 1995. "African American Family Life in Societal Context: Crisis and Hope." *Sociological Forum* 10:569-592.

Anderson, Elijah. 1990. *Streetwise*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Baumer, Eric P., Steven F. Messner, and Richard Rosenfeld. 2003. "Explaining Spatial Variation in Support for Capital Punishment: A Multilevel Analysis." *The American Journal of Sociology* 108:844-75.

Blau, Peter M. 1977. Inequality and Heterogeneity: A Primitive Theory of Social Structure. New York: Free Press.

Brooks-Gunn, Jeanne, Greg J. Duncan, and J. Lawrence Aber. 1997. *Neighborhood Poverty*. vol. II. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Browning, Christopher R. and Matisa Olinger-Wilbon. 2003. "Neighborhood Structure, Social Organization, and Number of Short-Term Sexual Parterships." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65:730-745.

Browning, Christopher R., Danielle Wallace, Seth L. Feinberg, and Kathleen A. Cagney. 2006. "Neighborhood Social Processes, Physical Conditions, and Disaster-Related Mortality: The Case of the 1995 Chicago Heat Wave." *American Sociological Review* 71:661-678.

Burton, Linda M. and Robin L. Jarrett. 2000. "In the Mix, Yet on the Margins: The Place of Families in Urban Neighborhood and Child Development Research." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62:1114-1135.

Census 2000 Summary File 3. 2002. U.S. Census Bureau.

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

Chatters, Linda M., Robert Joseph Taylor, Karen D. Lincoln, and Tracy Schroepfer. 2002. "Patterns of Informal Support from Family and Church Members among African Americans." *Journal of Black Studies* 33:66-85.

Coward, Barbara E., Joe R. Feagin, and Allen Williams, Jr. 1974. “The Culture of Poverty Debate: Some Additional Data.” *Social Problems* 21:621-634.

Davis, James A., Peter V. Marsden, and Tom W. Smith. 2007. General Social Surveys, 1972-2002: Cumulative Codebook. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.

Demos, Vasilikie. 1990. "Black Family Studies in the Journal of Marriage and the Family and the Issue of Distortion: A Trend Analysis." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 52:603-612.

Dietz, Robert D. 2002. “The Estimation of Neighborhood Effects in the Social Sciences: An Interdisciplinary Approach.” *Social Science Research* 31:539-575.

Duneier, M. 1992. *Slim’s Table: Race, Respectability, and Masculinity*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Farley, Reynolds. 1997. "Racial Trends and Differences in the United States 30 Years after the Civil Rights Decade." *Social Science Research* 26:235-262.

Guest, Avery M., Charis E. Kubrin, and Jane K. Cover. 2008. "Heterogeneity and Harmony: Neighbouring Relationships among Whites in Ethnically Diverse Neighborhoods in Seattle." *Urban Studies* 45:501-526.
Hall, Marshall, and Nicolaus Tideman. 1967. "Measures of Concentration." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 62:162-8.
Hipp, John R., Daniel J. Bauer, Patrick J. Curran, and Kenneth A. Bollen. 2004. “Crimes of Opportunity or Crimes of Emotion? Testing Two Explanations of Seasonal Change in Crime.” *Social Forces* 82:1333-1372.
Hipp, John R. 2007. “Block, Tract, and Levels of Aggregation: Neighborhood Structure and Crime and Disorder as a Case in Point.” *American Sociological Review* 72:659-680.
Iceland, John, Daniel H. Weinberg, and Erika Steinmetz. 2002. "Racial and Ethnic Residential Segregation in the United States: 1980-2000." U.S. Census Bureau, Series CENSR-3.
Irelan, Lola M., Oliver C. Moles, and Robert M. O'Shea. 1969. "Ethnicity, Poverty, and Selected Attitudes: A Test of the "Culture of Poverty" Hypothesis." *Social Forces* 47:405-413.
Jargowsky, Paul A. 1997. Poverty and Place. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
Jencks, Christopher and Susan E. Mayer. 1990. "The Social Consequences of Growing Up in a Poor Neighborhood." Pp. 111-186 in nner-City Poverty in the United States, edited by L. E. Lynn and M. G. H. McGeary. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
Jones, Rachel K. and Ye Luo. 1999. “The Culture of Poverty and African-American Culture: An Empirical Assessment.” *Sociological Perspectives*. 42: 439-458.
Kawachi, Ichiro and Lisa F. Berkman. 2003. *Neighborhoods and Health*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Keller, Suzanne. 1968. *The Urban Neighborhood*. New York: Random House.
Krause, Neal. 2003. "Exploring Race Differences in the Relationship between Social Interaction with the Cleargy and Feelings of Self-Worth in Later Life." *Sociology of Religion* 64:183-205.
Lee, Barrett A. 2001. “Taking Neighborhood Seriously.” Pp. 31-40 in *Does it Take a Village*?, edited by A. Booth and A. C. Crouter. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Lee, Barrett A., Sean F. Reardon, Glenn Firebaugh, Chad R. Farrell, Stephen A. Matthews, David O'Sullivan. “Beyond the Census Tract: Patterns and Determinants of Racial Segregation at Multiple Geographic Scales” *American Sociological Review* 73: 766-791.
Lee, Min-Ah, and Kenneth F. Ferraro. 2007. "Neighborhood Residential Segregation and Physical Health among Hispanic Americans: Good, Bad, or Benign?" *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 48:131-148.
Leventhal, Tama and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 2000. "The Neighborhood They Live in: The Effects of Neighborhood Residence on Child and Adolescent Outcomes." *Psychological Bulletin* 126:309-337.
Lewis, Oscar. 1968. *A Study of Slum Culture: Backgrounds for La Vida*. New York: Random House.
Lewis, Oscar. 1998. “The Culture of Poverty.” *Society* 35:7-9.

Lincoln, Charles Eric and Lawrence H. Mamiya. 1990. *The Black Church in the African American Experience*. Durham: NC: Duke University Press.
Marschall, Melissa J. and Dietlind Stolle. 2004. “Race and the City: Neighborhood Context and the Development of Generalized Trust.” *Political Behavior* 26:125-153.
Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy A. Denton. 1988. "The Dimensions of Residential Segregation." Social Forces 67:281-315.
-----1993. *American Apartheid*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Oliver, Eric J. and Janelle Wong. 2003. "Intergroup Prejudice in Multiethnic Settings." *American Journal of Political Science* 47:567-582.
Pattillo-McCoy, Mary. 1998. "Church Culture as a Strategy in the Black Community." *American Sociological Review* 63:767-784.
-----1999. *Black Picket Fences: Privelege and Peril Among the Black Middle Class.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Putnam, Robert D. 2007. “E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century: The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture.” *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30:137-174.
Rankin, Bruce H. and James M. Quane. 2000. “Neighborhood Poverty and the Social Isolation of Inner-City African American Families.” *Social Forces* 79:139-164.
Richardson, JR., Lilliard E., David J. Houston, and Chris Sissie Hadjiharalambous. 2001. "Public Confidence in the Leaders of American Governmental Institutions.” Pp. 83-97 in What Is It About Government that Americans Dislike?, edited by John R. Hibbing and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rokeach, Milton and Seymour Parker. 1970. "Values as Social Indicators of Poverty and Race Relations in America." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 388:97-111.
Rosenfeld, Richard, Steven F. Messner, and Eric P. Baumer. 2001. "Social Capital and Homicide." *Social Forces* 80:283-309.
Ross, Catherine E.. 2000. “Neighborhood Disadvantage and Adult Depression.” *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 7:163-179.
Ross, Catherine E. and John Mirowsky. 2008. “Neighborhood Socioeconomic Status and Health: Context or Composition?” *City & Community* 7:163-179.
Ross, Catherine E.,John R. Reynolds, and Karlyn J. Geis. 2000. “The Contingent Meaning of Neighborhood Stability for Residents’ Psychological Well-Being” *American Sociological Review* 65:581-597.
Ross, Catherine E.,John Mirowsky, and Shana Pribesh 2001. “Powerlessness and the Amplification of Threat: Neighborhood Disadvantage, Disorder, and Mistrust” *American Sociological Review* 66:568-591.
Sampson, Robert J. 2002. "Transcending Tradition: New Directions in Community Research, Chicago Style." *Criminology* 40:213-230.
Sampson, Robert J. and Dawn Jeglum Bartusch. 1998. "Legal Cynicism and (Subcultural?) Tolerance of Deviance: The Neighborhood Context of Racial Differences." *Law & Society Review* 32:777-804.
Sampson, Robert J. and W. Byron Groves. 1989. "Community Structure and Crime: Testing Social-Disorganization Theory." *The American Journal of Sociology* 94:774-802.

Sampson, Robert J., Jeffrey D. Morenoff, and Thomas Gannon-Rowley. 2002. "Assessing "NEIGHBORHOOD EFFECTS": Social Processes and New Directions in Research." *Annual Reviews of Sociology* 28:443-78.
Sampson, Robert J., Stephen W. Raudenbush, and Felton Earls. 1997. "Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy." *Science* 277:918-924.
Small, Mario Luis and Katherine Newman. 2001. "Urban Poverty after the Truly Disadvantaged: The Rediscovery of the Family, the Neighborhood, and Culture" *Annual Review of Sociology* 27:23-45.
Sharkey, Patrick T. 2006. “Navigating Dangerous Streets: The Sources and Consequences of Street Efficacy.” *American Sociological Review* 71:826-846.
Shaw, Clifford R. and Henry D. McKay. 1969. *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Simpson, Brent. 2006. “The Poverty of Trust in the Southern United States." *Social Forces* 84:1625-1638.
Smith, Tom W. 1997. “Factors Relating to Misanthropy in Contemporary American Society." *Social Science Research* 26:170-196.
South, Scott J. 2001. "Issues in the Analysis of Neighborhoods, Families, and Children." Pp. 87-93 in Does It Take a Village?, edited by A. Booth and A. C. Crouter. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Swaroop, Sapna. 2006. “Building Community: The Neighborhood Context of Social Organization." *Social Forces* 84:1665-1695.
Taylor, Robert Joseph and Linda M. Chatters. 1991. "Life in Black America." Pp. 105-123 in Life in Black America, edited by J. S. Jackson. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Tienda, Marta. 1991. “Poor People and Poor Places: Deciphering Neighborhood Effects on Poverty Outcomes.” Pp. 244-262 in Macro-Micro Linkages in Sociology, edited by J. Huber. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Weakliem, David L. and Robert Biggert. 1999. "Region and Political Opinion in the Contemporary United States." *Social Forces* 77:863-886.
Wilson, William J. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Wilson, William J. 1996. *When Work Disappears*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
Wirth, L. 1938. Urbanism as a Way of Life. *American Journal of Sociology* 44:3-24.

Table 1. Dependent Variables: Mneumonic, Question wording, and Recoding

GSS Mneumonic	GSS question wording	recoding
I am going to name some institutions in this country. As far as the people running these institutions are concerned, would you say you have a great deal of confidence, only some confidence, or hardly any confidence at all in them?		
CONFED (N=4,541, Final N=4,513)	Executive branch of the federal government	A great deal vs. Only some, hardly any
CONLEGIS (N=4,537, Final N=4,507)	Congress	A great deal vs. Only some, hardly any
TRUST (N=5,135, Final N=5,101)	Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in life.	Most people can be trusted vs. Can't be too careful & other, depends
FAIR (N=4,661, Final N=4,631)	Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance, or would they try to be fair?	Would try to be fair vs. Would take advantage of you & depends
HELPFUL (N=4695, Final N=4,664)	Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful, or that they are mostly just looking out for themselves?	Try to be helpful vs. Just look out for themselves & depends
GOODLIFE (N=4,666, Final N=4,639)	The way things are in America, people like me and my family have a good chance of improving our standard of living -- do you agree or disagree?	Strongly agree, agree vs. Neigher agree or disagree, disagree, strongly disagree
KIDSSOL (N=3,990, Final N=3,968)	When your children are at the age you are now, do you think their standard of living will be much better, somewhat better, about the same, somewhat worse, or much worse than yours is now?	Much better, somewhat better vs. About the same, somewhat worse, much worse,

Table 2. Effects of Neighborhood and Individual Factors on Confidence in Government

	CONFED				CONLEGIS			
	Whites		Minorities		Whites		Minorities	
Poverty rate[1]	-0.0032	0.0659	0.0465	-0.1060	-0.0710	-0.0726	0.1116	0.0435
	(0.0923)	(0.0980)	(0.1498)	(0.1698)	(0.1075)	(0.1150)	(0.1595)	(0.1802)
Segregation	0.0727	0.0904	0.4059	0.6513	-0.1368	-0.1685	-0.1285	0.2004
	(0.2838)	(0.2862)	(0.6055)	(0.6212)	(0.3386)	(0.3449)	(0.6506)	(0.6637)
Minority Heterogeneity	0.1786	0.2081	0.1285	0.1602	0.2781	0.4161	0.4900	0.6195
	(0.3370)	(0.3413)	(0.6390)	(0.6532)	(0.4102)	(0.4196)	(0.6791)	(0.6895)
Residential Stability	0.0074	0.0067	-0.0116	-0.0118	-0.0071	-0.0061	-0.0008	-0.0017
	(0.0052)	(0.0053)	(0.0080)	(0.0082)	(0.0059)	(0.0059)	(0.0087)	(0.0088)
Population Densisty[1]	**0.1024****	**0.0925****	-0.0147	-0.0309	0.0619	0.0657	0.0663	0.0365
	(0.0350)	(0.0353)	(0.0675)	(0.0682)	(0.0415)	(0.0425)	(0.0721)	(0.0722)
Midwest	0.1816	0.2141	-0.6408	-0.6676	-0.0566	-0.0421	-0.3763	-0.3071
	(0.1542)	(0.1557)	(0.3431)	(0.3501)	(0.1722)	(0.1761)	(0.3366)	(0.3431)
South	**0.4030****	**0.4052****	0.3880	0.4258	-0.0610	-0.0189	0.1580	0.2442
	(0.1556)	(0.1572)	(0.2758)	(0.2820)	(0.1774)	(0.1824)	(0.2907)	(0.2963)
West	0.1656	0.1820	-0.1522	-0.3077	-0.5674**	**-0.4763***	-0.3006	-0.4308
	(0.1715)	(0.1737)	(0.2866)	(0.2974)	(0.2056)	(0.2098)	(0.2972)	(0.3074)
Age		0.0009		0.0043	-1.9677*	-0.0170**	-2.6056*	-0.0025
		(0.0031)		(0.0058)	(0.7932)	(0.0037)	(1.0332)	(0.0062)
Female		-0.1276		-0.1768	3472	-0.0414	1065	-0.1427
		(0.0961)		(0.1684)	463	(0.1147)	303	(0.1808)
School completed		0.0060		-0.0075		**-0.0596****		-0.0152
		(0.0180)		(0.0332)		(0.0217)		(0.0345)
Married		-0.1737		-0.0710		0.0839		0.1249
		(0.1044)		(0.1913)		(0.1245)		(0.2037)
Employed		**-0.3646****		-0.1363		**-0.3093***		-0.3930
		(0.1169)		(0.2037)		(0.1363)		(0.2107)
Poor health		-0.2303		-0.2959		-0.2629		-0.3550
		(0.2774)		(0.3894)		(0.3367)		(0.4236)
Not applicable Health		0.1229		-0.2635		-0.4255**		-0.1801
		(0.1167)		(0.2168)		(0.1564)		(0.2255)
Household income 1st quartile		**-0.5882****		**1.0417***		-0.3857		0.2802
		(0.1820)		(0.4310)		(0.2112)		(0.3987)
Household income 2nd quartile		**-0.4211****		**1.1221****		**-0.4341***		0.4069
		(0.1528)		(0.4097)		(0.1821)		(0.3720)
Household income 3rd quartile		**-0.4649****		0.5917		**-0.6704****		-0.2732
		(0.1450)		(0.4154)		(0.1807)		(0.3923)
Household income DK/NA		-0.3137		1.0259*		0.0581		0.5153
		(0.1839)		(0.4496)		(0.2053)		(0.4202)
Latino				**0.5004***				**0.6181****
				(0.2194)				(0.2272)
Others				0.5915*				0.5012
				(0.2540)				(0.2724)
Constant	-3.1461**	-2.6075**	-1.1078	-1.5365		0.0445		-2.1205
	(0.6922)	(0.7887)	(0.9563)	(1.2386)		(0.9127)		(1.3090)
Observations	3479	3460	1062	1053		3452		1055
Number of group[2]	463	461	305	304		461		302

Notes: The number of cases may vary due to split-ballot design and missing cases.
Standard errors in parentheses.

[1]data logged; [2]census tract; *p < .05; **p < .01

Table 3. Effects of Neighborhood and Individual Factors on Misanthropy

	TRUST				HELPFUL				FAIR			
	Whites		Minorities		Whites		Minorities		Whites		Minorities	
Poverty rate[1]	-0.2875**	0.0027	-0.3416**	-0.0460	-0.0946	0.0749	-0.1847	0.0444	-0.2079*	0.0165	-0.3202**	0.0562
	(0.0763)	(0.0740)	(0.1323)	(0.1508)	(0.0741)	(0.0763)	(0.1147)	(0.1315)	(0.0812)	(0.0805)	(0.1241)	(0.1380)
Segregation	0.1688	0.2309	-0.0334	-0.3225	0.5343*	**0.5512***	0.2638	-0.2177	0.4609	**0.5181***	0.0182	-0.4443
	(0.2383)	(0.2214)	(0.5390)	(0.5573)	(0.2310)	(0.2266)	(0.4566)	(0.4757)	(0.2517)	(0.2384)	(0.4973)	(0.5034)
Minority Heterogeneity	0.1993	0.3040	0.4652	0.3520	-0.0873	-0.0624	0.2442	0.1303	0.1148	0.1772	-0.0644	-0.1187
	(0.2827)	(0.2615)	(0.5753)	(0.5911)	(0.2717)	(0.2661)	(0.4956)	(0.5100)	(0.2972)	(0.2809)	(0.5317)	(0.5327)
Residential Stability	-0.0080	-0.0084*	-0.0032	0.0025	-0.0012	-0.0036	-0.0003	0.0018	-0.0062	-0.0077	-0.0034	0.0014
	(0.0042)	(0.0040)	(0.0074)	(0.0078)	(0.0041)	(0.0041)	(0.0063)	(0.0066)	(0.0045)	(0.0043)	(0.0069)	(0.0070)
Population Densisty[1]	-0.0204	-0.0434	-0.0326	-0.0335	-0.0068	-0.0235	-0.0477	-0.0354	-0.0279	-0.0494	-0.0294	-0.0079
	(0.0285)	(0.0265)	(0.0588)	(0.0598)	(0.0277)	(0.0273)	(0.0504)	(0.0521)	(0.0303)	(0.0289)	(0.0543)	(0.0550)
Midwest	-0.0017	0.0296	0.1141	0.2390	0.0935	0.1238	-0.1904	-0.0486	0.0595	0.1023	-0.0429	0.1449
	(0.1232)	(0.1136)	(0.2721)	(0.2815)	(0.1203)	(0.1181)	(0.2322)	(0.2403)	(0.1318)	(0.1247)	(0.2533)	(0.2555)
South	-0.1733	**-0.2734***	0.0298	0.1600	0.0324	-0.0516	-0.3595	-0.2285	-0.1001	-0.1677	-0.2077	-0.0228
	(0.1280)	(0.1188)	(0.2538)	(0.2618)	(0.1240)	(0.1217)	(0.2149)	(0.2234)	(0.1350)	(0.1281)	(0.2378)	(0.2401)
West	0.1658	0.0056	0.1906	0.1386	0.2884*	0.1789	-0.2450	-0.2095	0.4127**	0.2915*	0.3700	0.3956
	(0.1377)	(0.1287)	(0.2479)	(0.2567)	(0.1346)	(0.1332)	(0.2130)	(0.2217)	(0.1481)	(0.1418)	(0.2294)	(0.2327)
Age		**0.0221****		**0.0155****		**0.0199****		**0.0171****		**0.0216****		**0.0217****
		(0.0024)		(0.0056)		(0.0024)		(0.0046)		(0.0024)		(0.0049)
Female		-0.1138		0.0625		0.3609**		0.3342*		0.1255		0.0860
		(0.0705)		(0.1574)		(0.0721)		(0.1356)		(0.0740)		(0.1396)
School completed		**0.1480****		**0.1192****		**0.0752****		**0.0567***		**0.1182****		**0.0644***
		(0.0140)		(0.0321)		(0.0138)		(0.0261)		(0.0145)		(0.0274)
Married		0.1429		-0.0192		0.0619		-0.1551		0.0233		0.1209
		(0.0768)		(0.1730)		(0.0779)		(0.1530)		(0.0803)		(0.1545)
Employed		0.2356**		0.1897		-0.0270		-0.0940		-0.0197		0.2926
		(0.0908)		(0.1962)		(0.0904)		(0.1629)		(0.0931)		(0.1748)
Poor health		-0.4245*		0.1023		-0.3554		-0.2782		-0.3060		-0.2344
		(0.2009)		(0.3602)		(0.1983)		(0.3053)		(0.2009)		(0.3308)
Not applicable Health		-0.3136**		-0.2507		0.1479		0.0859		0.1342		-0.0110
		(0.0926)		(0.2010)		(0.0894)		(0.1579)		(0.0930)		(0.1653)
Household income 1st quartile		**-0.5726****		-0.1901		**-0.5656****		**-0.6149***		**-0.5533****		**-0.6739***
		(0.1376)		(0.3219)		(0.1401)		(0.2855)		(0.1455)		(0.2931)
Household income 2nd quartile		**-0.4215****		-0.0830		**-0.2528***		-0.3995		**-0.4532****		-0.3019
		(0.1166)		(0.2956)		(0.1205)		(0.2644)		(0.1266)		(0.2692)
Household income 3rd quartile		-0.1705		0.1040		-0.1859		-0.2114		-0.2559*		-0.1216
		(0.1081)		(0.2832)		(0.1132)		(0.2579)		(0.1201)		(0.2620)
Household income DK/NA		**-0.6485****		0.0022		**-0.5267****		**-0.4540**		**-0.8115****		**-0.7318***
		(0.1424)		(0.3426)		(0.1445)		(0.3022)		(0.1498)		(0.3148)
Latino				0.2098				0.0856				-0.0037
				(0.2044)				(0.1743)				(0.1823)
Others				0.5320*				0.2954				0.3370
				(0.2191)				(0.1999)				(0.2060)
Constant	0.6617	-2.6589**	-0.3111	-3.7329**	-0.0253	-2.0311**	0.4153	-1.4891	0.9075	-1.6941**	0.7173	-2.3390*
	(0.5591)	(0.5983)	(0.8794)	(1.1444)	(0.5444)	(0.6103)	(0.7461)	(0.9663)	(0.5934)	(0.6393)	(0.8165)	(1.0189)
Observations	3921	3898	1214	1203	3572	3551	1123	1113	3550	3530	1111	1101
Number of group[2]	468	466	314	313	464	462	309	308	464	462	306	305

Notes : The number of cases may vary due to split-ballot design and missing cases.

Standard errors in parentheses, '[1]data logged; [2]census tract; *p < .05; **p < .01

Table 4. Effects of Neighborhood and Individual Factors on Outlook

	GOODLIFE				KIDSSOL			
	Whites		Minorities		Whites		Minorities	
Poverty rate[1]	-0.2615**	-0.0876	-0.2013	0.0530	0.1028	-0.0055	0.0258	0.1884
	(0.0834)	(0.0878)	(0.1327)	(0.1504)	(0.0806)	(0.0824)	(0.1427)	(0.1626)
Segregation	-0.6966**	**-0.5612***	0.6851	0.9133	-0.3167	-0.3043	0.7649	1.0526
	(0.2540)	(0.2560)	(0.5124)	(0.5359)	(0.2551)	(0.2486)	(0.5806)	(0.6040)
Minority Heterogeneity	0.4635	0.4152	0.5989	0.7614	0.3807	0.3001	0.5317	0.6481
	(0.2963)	(0.2983)	(0.5596)	(0.5798)	(0.2973)	(0.2896)	(0.6057)	(0.6243)
Residential Stability	-0.0030	-0.0018	-0.0012	0.0048	0.0075	0.0075	-0.0012	0.0015
	(0.0047)	(0.0047)	(0.0072)	(0.0075)	(0.0045)	(0.0044)	(0.0079)	(0.0082)
Population Densisty[1]	0.0043	-0.0052	0.0683	0.0362	0.0259	0.0333	0.1019	0.0861
	(0.0302)	(0.0307)	(0.0563)	(0.0595)	(0.0305)	(0.0298)	(0.0618)	(0.0649)
Midwest	0.2146	0.2111	-0.1288	-0.0182	-0.0796	-0.1231	0.1677	0.1575
	(0.1314)	(0.1328)	(0.2631)	(0.2713)	(0.1314)	(0.1281)	(0.2910)	(0.2991)
South	0.0911	0.0652	0.1817	0.3126	0.1274	0.1317	0.4561	0.4867
	(0.1346)	(0.1355)	(0.2479)	(0.2579)	(0.1371)	(0.1341)	(0.2761)	(0.2860)
West	0.0161	-0.0569	0.2061	-0.0021	-0.1298	-0.1131	0.1290	-0.0693
	(0.1472)	(0.1495)	(0.2500)	(0.2585)	(0.1498)	(0.1476)	(0.2654)	(0.2746)
Age		**-0.0083****		-0.0095		**-0.0056***		-0.0058
		(0.0026)		(0.0052)		(0.0026)		(0.0056)
Female		**-0.2564****		-0.1961		**0.1887***		**-0.3493***
		(0.0825)		(0.1568)		(0.0791)		(0.1730)
School completed		**0.0481****		0.0375		**-0.0448****		0.0353
		(0.0155)		(0.0293)		(0.0155)		(0.0321)
Married		-0.0311		0.1223		-0.0842		0.4478*
		(0.0890)		(0.1811)		(0.0864)		(0.1971)
Employed		-0.1646		0.0446		-0.0270		0.0293
		(0.1027)		(0.1831)		(0.0992)		(0.2010)
Poor health		-0.5581**		-0.3993		0.4344		-0.4930
		(0.2002)		(0.3094)		(0.2317)		(0.3424)
Not applicable Health		-0.3268**		-0.1628		0.0019		0.0221
		(0.0983)		(0.1790)		(0.0983)		(0.2005)
Household income 1st quartile		**-0.7996****		-0.1893		0.1309		0.1315
		(0.1649)		(0.3403)		(0.1511)		(0.3616)
Household income 2nd quartile		**-0.4938****		0.0789		**0.2805***		0.0595
		(0.1481)		(0.3236)		(0.1298)		(0.3384)
Household income 3rd quartile		**-0.3687****		0.1988		0.1486		0.0841
		(0.1421)		(0.3238)		(0.1200)		(0.3317)
Household income DK/NA		-0.6739**		-0.1299		-0.1391		0.0337
		(0.1691)		(0.3596)		(0.1570)		(0.3931)
Latino				0.6045**				0.3270
				(0.2147)				(0.2255)
Others				0.2186				0.0917
				(0.2355)				(0.2513)
Constant	1.9105**	2.0825**	0.7530	-0.2684	-0.3054	0.6130	-0.1940	-1.0504
	(0.6122)	(0.7008)	(0.8559)	(1.1043)	(0.5965)	(0.6601)	(0.9355)	(1.2046)
Observations	3551	3533	1115	1106	2993	2977	997	991
Number of group[2]	463	461	308	307	448	446	289	289

Notes: The number of cases may vary due to split-ballot design and missing cases.
Standard errors in parentheses.
[1]data logged; [2]census tract; *p < .05; **p < .01

Appendix A: Descriptive Statistics for Variables in the Analysis (Mean and Standard Deviation)

	Total sample			Whites-sample			Minorities-sample		
	N	Mean	Std	N	Mean	Std	N	Mean	Std
Dependent Variables									
CONFED	4541	0.17	0.37	3479	0.16	0.37	1062	0.19	0.40
CONLEGIS	4537	0.12	0.32	3472	0.11	0.31	1065	0.16	0.37
TRUST	5135	0.36	0.48	3921	0.41	0.49	1214	0.20	0.40
HELPFUL	4695	0.47	0.50	3572	0.50	0.50	1123	0.37	0.48
FAIR	4661	0.52	0.50	3550	0.57	0.49	1111	0.35	0.48
GOODLIFE	4666	0.75	0.43	3551	0.75	0.43	1115	0.77	0.42
KIDSSOL	3990	0.66	0.47	2993	0.62	0.49	997	0.79	0.41
Independent Variables									
Neighborhood-level Variables									
Poverty rate (logged)	510	2.37	0.73	486	2.32	0.70	366	2.46	0.76
Segregation	510	0.55	0.29	486	0.54	0.29	366	0.46	0.27
Minority Heterogeneity	510	0.49	0.21	486	0.50	0.19	366	0.46	0.22
Residential Stability	510	53.60	12.81	486	53.47	12.93	366	51.93	13.16
Population Densisty (logged)	510	7.20	2.08	486	7.13	2.08	366	7.61	1.94
Northeast	510	0.22	0.41	486	0.22	0.42	366	0.20	0.40
Midwest	510	0.24	0.43	486	0.24	0.43	366	0.19	0.40
South	510	0.34	0.47	486	0.32	0.47	366	0.39	0.49
West	510	0.21	0.40	486	0.21	0.41	366	0.22	0.41
Individual-level Variables									
Age	8388	45.95	17.28	6372	47.51	17.51	2016	41.01	15.52
Female	8414	0.562	0.496	6390	0.55	0.50	2024	0.60	0.49
White	8414	0.759	0.427	6390	1	0	2024		
Black	8414	0.145	0.352	6390			2024	0.60	0.49
Latino	8414	0.059	0.236	6390			2024	0.25	0.43
Other race	8414	0.037	0.188	6390			2024	0.15	0.36
Education	8381	13.29	2.924	6367	13.50	2.90	2014	12.64	2.91
Married	8412	0.463	0.499	6390	0.50	0.50	2022	0.35	0.48
Employed	8413	0.666	0.472	6389	0.66	0.47	2024	0.68	0.46
Poor health	8414	0.043	0.203	6390	0.04	0.20	2024	0.05	0.22
Health (not applicable)	8414	0.169	0.375	6390	0.17	0.37	2024	0.18	0.38
Household income 1st quartile	8414	0.236	0.424	6390	0.20	0.40	2024	0.34	0.47
Household income 2nd quartile	8414	0.256	0.436	6390	0.26	0.44	2024	0.26	0.44
Household income 3rd quartile	8414	0.239	0.426	6390	0.25	0.44	2024	0.19	0.39
Household income 4th quartile	8414	0.152	0.359	6390	0.17	0.38	2024	0.09	0.28
Household income (refused, don't know)	8414	0.118	0.323	6390	0.12	0.32	2024	0.13	0.33

Appendix B. Pairwise Correlations between Variables in Analysis

	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]	[9]	[10]	[11]	[12]	[13]	[14]	[15]
[1] CONFED	1.00														
[2] CONLEGIS	0.38	1.00													
[3] TRUST	0.03	0.00	1.00												
[4] HELPFUL	0.03	0.02	0.33	1.00											
[5] FAIR	0.01	0.00	0.40	0.42	1.00										
[6] GOODLIFE	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.10	1.00									
[7] KIDSSOL	0.08	0.05	-0.03	0.02	-0.01	0.20	1.00								
[8] Poverty rate (logged)	0.02	0.03	-0.15	-0.09	-0.14	-0.03	0.08	1.00							
[9] Segregation	-0.03	-0.04	0.10	0.09	0.11	-0.03	-0.08	-0.31	1.00						
[10] Minority Heterogeneity	-0.01	0.01	0.12	0.06	0.11	0.03	-0.05	-0.39	0.14	1.00					
[11] Residential Stability	-0.02	-0.03	-0.01	0.03	0.00	-0.04	-0.01	-0.25	0.38	-0.23	1.00				
[12] Population Densisty (logged)	0.04	0.06	-0.06	-0.06	-0.07	0.05	0.08	0.21	-0.42	0.10	-0.41	1.00			
[13] Northeast	-0.02	0.03	-0.01	0.00	-0.02	-0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.06	0.14	0.19	0.22	1.00		
[14] Midwest	-0.04	-0.01	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.01	-0.04	-0.14	0.30	0.12	0.08	-0.13	-0.29	1.00	
[15] South	0.06	0.02	-0.06	-0.04	-0.08	0.00	0.04	0.08	-0.14	-0.28	-0.03	-0.20	-0.37	-0.42	1.00
[16] West	-0.01	-0.04	0.04	0.02	0.07	0.01	-0.01	0.07	-0.22	0.07	-0.25	0.16	-0.25	-0.28	-0.37
[17] Age	0.02	-0.06	0.11	0.14	0.14	-0.09	-0.06	-0.06	0.14	-0.03	0.16	-0.11	0.02	-0.01	0.03
[18] Female	-0.02	-0.01	-0.04	0.07	0.01	-0.06	0.03	0.04	0.00	-0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	-0.02	0.01
[19] White	-0.04	-0.07	0.19	0.12	0.19	-0.02	-0.15	-0.35	0.42	0.29	0.08	-0.28	-0.01	0.09	-0.07
[20] Black	0.01	0.03	-0.16	-0.09	-0.16	-0.02	0.10	0.32	-0.23	-0.33	0.00	0.18	-0.02	-0.04	0.15
[21] Latino	0.03	0.07	-0.08	-0.06	-0.08	0.05	0.09	0.12	-0.24	-0.06	-0.08	0.18	0.04	-0.08	-0.06
[22] Other race	0.02	0.03	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02	0.02	0.05	0.05	-0.23	0.02	-0.09	0.09	-0.01	-0.04	-0.05
[23] Education	0.00	-0.04	0.22	0.11	0.18	0.10	-0.06	-0.21	-0.03	0.17	-0.12	0.10	-0.01	-0.01	-0.07
[24] Married	-0.02	-0.01	0.10	0.07	0.09	0.03	-0.04	-0.22	0.11	0.04	0.12	-0.17	-0.02	0.01	0.01
[25] Employed	-0.04	-0.03	0.06	-0.03	0.01	0.07	0.01	-0.09	-0.04	0.05	-0.07	0.03	-0.02	0.00	0.00
[26] Poor health	-0.01	0.00	-0.04	-0.03	-0.04	-0.08	0.02	0.08	-0.02	-0.04	0.03	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.02
[27] Health (not applicable)	0.00	-0.04	-0.05	0.03	0.02	-0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	-0.01
[28] Household income 1st quartile	0.00	0.02	-0.13	-0.08	-0.10	-0.09	0.04	0.28	-0.05	-0.12	-0.05	0.04	-0.01	0.01	0.01
[29] Household income 2nd quartile	0.00	0.00	-0.04	-0.01	-0.02	0.01	0.04	0.06	-0.02	0.00	-0.05	-0.02	-0.04	0.01	0.02
[30] Household income 3rd quartile	-0.04	-0.07	0.08	0.04	0.07	0.04	-0.01	-0.13	0.02	0.05	0.02	-0.03	-0.03	0.02	-0.01
[31] Household income 4th quartile	0.03	0.02	0.14	0.09	0.13	0.08	-0.05	-0.27	0.06	0.11	0.06	0.00	0.02	-0.02	-0.04
[32] Household income (DK/NA)	0.02	0.05	-0.05	-0.03	-0.07	-0.04	-0.03	0.02	0.01	-0.03	0.06	0.02	0.09	-0.02	0.01

<Appendix B Continued>

	[16]	[17]	[18]	[19]	[20]	[21]	[22]	[23]	[24]	[25]	[26]	[27]	[28]	[29]	[30]	[31]
[16] West	1.00															
[17] Age	-0.04	1.00														
[18] Female	0.01	0.05	1.00													
[19] White	-0.01	0.16	-0.05	1.00												
[20] Black	-0.12	-0.06	0.07	-0.73	1.00											
[21] Latino	0.11	-0.12	0.00	-0.45	-0.10	1.00										
[22] Other race	0.10	-0.09	-0.02	-0.35	-0.08	-0.05	1.00									
[23] Education	0.11	-0.15	-0.03	0.13	-0.13	-0.07	0.04	1.00								
[24] Married	0.00	0.06	-0.06	0.12	-0.14	-0.01	-0.01	0.08	1.00							
[25] Employed	0.01	-0.42	-0.15	-0.02	-0.02	0.04	0.02	0.24	0.05	1.00						
[26] Poor health	-0.01	0.17	0.02	-0.03	0.04	-0.01	0.01	-0.14	-0.06	-0.21	1.00					
[27] Health (not applicable)	0.00	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	-0.10	1.00				
[28] Household income 1st quartile	-0.01	0.05	0.10	-0.14	0.15	0.02	0.02	-0.27	-0.31	-0.27	0.16	0.00	1.00			
[29] Household income 2nd quartile	0.00	-0.07	-0.03	0.00	-0.01	0.03	-0.01	-0.03	-0.06	0.06	-0.04	-0.02	-0.33	1.00		
[30] Household income 3rd quartile	0.02	-0.07	-0.04	0.07	-0.07	-0.01	0.00	0.13	0.18	0.17	-0.08	-0.01	-0.31	-0.33	1.00	
[31] Household income 4th quartile	0.05	-0.01	-0.07	0.10	-0.10	-0.02	0.00	0.27	0.25	0.12	-0.06	0.04	-0.24	-0.25	-0.24	1.00
[32] Household income (DK/NA)	-0.08	0.13	0.05	-0.01	0.03	-0.02	-0.01	-0.07	-0.03	-0.10	0.02	0.01	-0.20	-0.21	-0.20	-0.15