Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Property Tax Disparities: Evidence from Multiple Florida Jurisdictions

Keith Ihlanfeldt & Luke P. Rodgers

July, 2022

Abstract

Property tax disparities among groups have long been of interest to social scientists. In recognition that the property tax is administered locally, we analyze these disparities at the jurisdictional level. Using a unique data set that identifies the race/ethnicity and gender of the homeowner, we measure group differences in key tax ratios affecting tax bills for a large number of taxing jurisdictions in Florida. Where gaps exist, we provide evidence identifying their source. Significant heterogeneity exists across jurisdictions, but there are important commonalties not previously documented. Following prior studies we study disparities between blacks, Hispanics, and whites, but we broaden our analysis to consider differences between male and female home buyers, and between Asian and white home buyers. Controlling for house value, female homeowners have lower tax burdens than male owners, which are largely driven by women more frequently taking the homestead exemption. In comparison to whites, Asians have higher tax burdens, because of their lower take-up of the homestead exemption and higher assessments.

I. Introduction

Recent research on the property tax suggests that errors in the administration of the tax results in minority homeowners being over assessed in comparison to white homeowners (Avenancio-León & Howard, 2021a; Berry, 2021; Amornsiripanitch ,2021). This may lead to minorities having a higher effective tax rate, where the latter is defined as the ratio of taxes paid to the fair market value of the home. However, there are exemptions that create a wedge between the assessed and taxable values of a home, and it is the latter value that determines the homeowner's tax liability (after multiplying by the millage rate of the jurisdiction). How these exemptions, and other factors (as identified below), impact taxable values will vary across jurisdictions. Hence, the tax burdens of a group may be comparatively high in one jurisdiction and lower in another. Ideally,

national assessments of the property tax would be based on the results of a large numbers of case studies of individual taxing jurisdictions, where an attempt is made to understand differences across jurisdictions. (For example, how frequently is the effective tax rate higher for one group in comparison to another and in how many cases can this be attributed to errors in assessments?) In this paper we take an important first step in this direction. While we do not use national data, we do provide evidence on racial, ethnic and gender disparities in property taxation separately for a large number of the taxing jurisdictions within the state of Florida. Most importantly, we provide evidence on the factors that explain differences across jurisdictions.

Our contributions to the literature are fourfold. First, because the tax is administered locally, we study the property tax for a large number of separate taxing jurisdictions. Second, we focus on racial/ethnic/gender differences in taxable value to house value ratios. Regardless of state or taxing jurisdiction, there are three values that relate to the administration of the property tax. Labels vary depending on the state. Because we use Florida data, we adopt its labels. The three values are the just value, the assessed value, and the taxable value. The just value is the assessors estimate of the fair market value (FMV) of the home.[1] Assessed value may equal just value, but for some properties assessed value may be less than just value due to a statutory cap on the growth in assessed value.[2] Taxable value is obtained from subtracting from assessed value any exemptions that may apply. Prior studies have focused on racial differences in the just value to FMV ratio (labeled the "assessment gap" by Avenancio-León & Howard, 2020). While it is of interest to determine whether there are racial/ethnic disparities in this ratio, it is the assessed value to FMV ratio and the taxable value to FMV ratio that are central to evaluating the impact of the tax on the burdens of minority homeowners. Third, where we find that disparities exist, we explore their source. Specifically, to what extent do gaps in the taxable value to FMV ratio result from errors in assessors' estimation of just value, differences in cap induced tax savings transferred to the new home, and differences in the tax savings provided by various tax exemptions. Finally, to our knowledge, only disparities in property taxes among white, black, and Hispanic home buyers have

[1] What Florida labels just value is generally referred to as assessed value in the literature.

[2] Florida caps the growth in assessed value at 3 percent or the rate of inflation, whichever is smaller. The cap applies only to homesteaded homeowners. Greater detail is provided below.

received attention in prior studies. In addition to studying differences among these same groups, we broaden our analysis to consider differences in the taxable value to FMV ratio between male and female home buyers, and between Asian and white home buyers.

We have established a unique ten-year panel data base covering the years 2010 to 2019 for Florida containing thousands of sales transactions of homes where we know the race, ethnicity, and gender of the home buyer. Also known is the recent sales price and the just, assessed, and taxable values assigned to the home by the tax assessor, allowing us to investigate by jurisdiction racial/ethnicity/gender gaps in the just value, assessed value and taxable value ratios. Most importantly, where we find the taxable value ratio is significantly higher for a particular group, our data allows us to determine its source. Possibilities include assessment error, a cap on assessment growth, and different types of exemptions.

From a policy perspective of central concern is whether racial/ethnic gaps in taxable value ratios are due to assessment errors or differential savings from assessment caps, which may result in a level of unfairness associated with property tax policy or its administration. If gaps are driven by exemptions, the issue is whether the exemption is having an equitable effect on all targeted groups. For example, is the take-up rate of the exemption among eligible homeowners uniform across groups.

Our results show that group differences in taxable value ratios vary a great deal across groups and jurisdictions. The two groups with significantly higher taxable value ratios across large numbers of the jurisdictions are Asian homeowners relative to white homeowners and men relative to women, where each gender is the sole owner of the home. For black and Hispanic homeowners, the results are mixed, but for the majority of jurisdictions there is not a statistically significant difference in the taxable value ratio in comparison to white homeowners. With the exception of Asians, assessment errors are found to explain group differences in the taxable value ratio for only a small number of jurisdictions. More important are differences in the take-up rate of the homestead exemption, and to a lesser extent the frequency of receiving an assessment reduction transfer from a homestead at the prior residence. In Florida, the tax savings from the cap on the

growth in assessed value can be ported to the new home if the homeowner held a homestead exemption at the prior address.

II. Literature Review

Racial and ethnic disparities in property taxation have long been a social justice issue of interest to social scientists (Hendon, 1868; Margo, 1984; Kahre, 2016; Rothstein, 2017). There has been a recent uptake in research, which stems from newly available data at the property level covering the entire United States.[4] The fundamental question addressed is whether the property tax is an unfair tax, assessing it's worth at the national level.

Avenancio-León & Howard (2021a) combine nationwide data on home sales and assessments from ATTOM with the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data in order to measure assessment gaps across racial groups. Using detailed location fixed effects, they find that black homeowners, on average, receive assessment to price ratios around 10 percent higher than white homeowners in comparable homes and locations. One explanation supported by the authors for the assessment gaps is that assessors do not accurately account for positive local amenities of white homeowners. They also present evidence that property tax appeals disproportionately favor white homeowners using data from Cook County, IL.

In a second paper Avenancio-León & Howard (2021b) use the nationwide data and basic methodology as in their first paper to show that caps on the growth in assessed values reduce racial assessment gaps. This belies conventional wisdom, in that the presumption would be that the homes of white homeowners would appreciate more rapidly than those of black homeowners, resulting in a cap causing larger reductions in the assessment ratios of whites. Avenancio-León & Howard's results suggest that the reverse is actually true; hence, price appreciation under the cap benefits blacks more. However, they argue that the more salient explanation for why caps reduce racial assessment gaps is that caps appear to discipline assessor errors by reducing the correlation between neighborhood amenities and erroneously high assessments.

[4] There are two commercially available data bases that provide property tax data on individual homes nationwide: ATTOM, which is used by Avenancio-León & Howard (2020, 2021) and CoreLogic, which is used by Berry (2021) and Amornsiripanitch (2020).

Berry (2021) uses nationwide data from CoreLogic to regress the assessment ratio of individual homeowners against Census tract descriptors, including race and ethnicity. His primary finding is that property tax assessment is regressive: lower-priced houses are over-assessed relative to their sale price when compared to more expensive houses. He also finds that the percent of the Census tract that is black is positively correlated with assessment regressivity but finds no significant relationship with the percentage of Hispanics. Since blacks live in less expensive homes than whites, these assessment gaps will generate higher property tax burdens for black homeowners. Atuahene (2017) and Atuahene & Berry (2019) are two related studies which use data from Wayne County, MI, to provide evidence that areas with more black homeowners received higher assessments than comparable white homeowners, in this case leading to higher property tax bills and significant increases in foreclosures

As introduced above, a stylized fact from the assessment literature is that assessment rates tend be lower for higher-priced homes. Hodge et al. (2017) summarizes prior work on this subject. In addition to Berry (2021), there are numerous recent studies, which documents similar patterns using improved methodologies and data (McMillen & Singh, 2020a, 2020b; Ihlanfeldt & Rodgers, 2022; Amornsiripanitch ,2021). As noted, in comparison to whites, minorities tend to live in lower-priced homes; hence, regressivity in assessment practices may result in racial disparities. The relationship between race and housing price may also play a role in differential appeal outcomes if homeowners of higher priced homes are more successful appealing their initial assessments (McMillen & Weber, 2010).

A strong advantage of the above studies that use national data is that concerns that typically arise regarding the external validity of the results from studies relying upon sub-national data are mitigated. However, it is important to acknowledge that the property tax is not a national tax. It is a local tax. The administration of the tax, the statutory rules applicable to the tax, and problems surrounding the tax (for example, insufficient comps to obtain reliable assessments) all vary from one taxing jurisdiction to another. Hence, we view our jurisdictional level study as complimentary to the national studies, with each approach providing new evidence on property tax disparities among groups.

III. Background

An overview of Florida's property tax system is necessary before we describe the specifics of our empirical analysis. The property tax is an ad valorem tax and the first step in applying the tax is determining the market value of the property. Each year county property tax assessors estimate the market value as of January 1, which the Florida Department of Revenue (FDOR) labels the "just value" of the property. Assessors estimate the just value using various methods, including recent sales of comparable homes, replacement cost, and mass appraisals.[5] An assessor performs a physical inspection of the exterior of the house upon sale, after an improvement requiring a building permit, and at least once every five years thereafter. Homeowners may appeal to the assessor's office if they feel the just value is inaccurate.

Next, limitations are applied to the just value to generate a Florida property's "assessed value." The most notable limitation since its introduction in 1995 is the Save Our Homes (SOH) cap, which limits the annual growth in assessed value to 3 percent or the change in the Consumer Price Index, whichever is smaller. This benefit is similar to growth caps in other states in that it can compound over time.[6] Less common is the option for homeowners to transfer accrued benefits from one house to another, a feature labeled as "portability." [7] The definition of assessed value in Florida differs from what is commonly referred to in the literature, so it is important to focus on the just value when considering the specific impact of assessors. The SOH cap applies only to homeowners who claim the homestead exemption. In the absence of the cap, the assessed value is identical to the just value.

---

[5] See Title XIV, Chapter 193 for more on assessment practices in Florida. Section 11 lists eight factors (location, size, condition, etc.) that appraisers should use in generating a just valuation, although appraisers have discretion as to how much weight they place on each of these factors.

[6] The Lincoln Institute of Land Policy (2017) lists fourteen states that impose some type of cap on assessment growth.

[7] Another state with portability is California. Homeowners are allowed to move their tax savings from Proposition 13 to a new home as long as the home is in the same county (Proposition 60) or in select counties outside the home county (Proposition 90). Besides their geographical restrictions, these propositions differ from Florida portability in that only homeowner 55 or older qualify for the portability option.

Lastly, exemptions are applied to the current assessed value to produce the "taxable value" of a house. A homeowner's annual property tax bill is simply the taxable value multiplied by the millage rate; the same rate applies to all property types within a jurisdiction. The most significant exemption is that of the homestead exemption, which was first introduced during the Great Depression in response to concerns that homeowners would lose their houses due to failure to pay their property taxes. To qualify for the homestead exemption, a homeowner must provide documentation that the home is their primary residence. The homestead exemption allows homeowners to exempt up to $50,000 from the assessed value of their house in determining the taxable value.[8] Importantly, claiming the homestead exemption automatically enrolls the homeowner in the SOH program; the two programs are effectively bundled together. Additional exemptions are granted to specific groups, most commonly homeowners who are disabled or low-income seniors, though these are much less common and are typically much smaller in size. School districts are synonymous with counties in Florida, so school-specific taxes are constant within a county. For residents living in the unincorporated portion of the county the millage rate is the county rate. For residents in cities the total millage rate is the sum of the county and the city rate, with city rates roughly 20 percent the size of the county rates on average. Roughly half of Florida's population reside in unincorporated areas.

IV. Methodology

As described below, our data include the race/ethnicity/gender of the homeowner, along with variables influential in determining the property taxes owed on the residence. We exploit these data to identify gaps between groups in the taxable value to FMV ratio (henceforth, taxable value ratio) based on a simple regression framework. The main OLS specification is intended to capture the relative difference in taxable value ratios for black, Hispanic, and Asian homeowners as compared to white homeowners:

$$y_i = \beta_1 black_i + \beta_2 Hispanic_i + \beta_3 Asian_i + \tau_t + \epsilon_i \qquad (1)$$

[8] Specifically, an exemption of $25,000 is applied to the first $50,000 of a house's just value and includes all taxes and a second exemption of $25,000 is applied to the value of a house between $50,000 and $75,000 which excludes school district taxes. The most recent expansion of the program was in 2008.

The dependent variable (*y*) is our estimate of the taxable value ratio of the home occupied by homeowner *i*.[9] We measure FMV (the denominator of the ratio) as the sales price of the home in the year preceding the year of the tax roll. We restrict the sample to sales that are qualified as arms-length by the county tax assessor. Each group variable is a binary variable equal to one if the homeowner is part of the racial/ethnic group, zero otherwise. Because observations are drawn from the years 2010 to 2019, we include year fixed effects (τ) to capture possible cyclical changes in housing markets that may be correlated with the race/ethnicity of homebuyers.

Our second set of models relates the taxable value ratio to whether the home buyer is solely a female, solely a male, or a couple who jointly own the home. We estimate an equation similar to equation 1:

$$y_i = \delta_1 female_i + \delta_2 male_i + \tau_t + \epsilon_i \qquad (2),$$

where *female* and *male* are a dummy variables indicating that the homeowner is solely a women or solely a man, respectively. . The reference group are homebuyers sharing ownership, commonly a man and woman married couple. Equations (1) and (2) are estimated at the county level for different subsets of Florida's 67 counties, as described below.

As noted above, there are three values that determine the taxable value ratio: the just value (JV_i) , the amount of SOH (SOH_i) that has been ported to the new home (which is the difference between just and assessed value), and exemptions (HSE_i, LSE_i, and DE_i, representing the homestead , low income senior, and disability exemptions, respectively). The taxable ratio formula for any given property *i* is simply:

$$y_i = JV_i - SOH_i - HSE_i - LSE_i - DE_i, \qquad (3),$$

where all variables are expressed as ratios with respect to FMV. The formula illustrates that group differences in taxable value ratios may result from group differences in any of the right-hand side (RHS) ratios of equation 3.

To determine the relative importance of each RHS ratio in explaining a group gap in the taxable value ratio of a county, we computed the difference in taxable

[9] We choose a linear model over a log-linear model because for varying percentages of homeowners SOH savings and exemptions resulted in a zero taxable value ratio.

value ratio means and the differences in the means of each RHS ratio. To assess the importance of the ratio toward explaining a gap in the taxable value ratio we simply divided the mean difference in the RHS ratio by the mean difference in the taxable value ratio. For example, for the proportion of the black/white gap in the taxable value ratio attributable to the black/white difference in the homestead exemption value ratio, we computed:

$$(HSE_b - HSE_w)/(y_b - y_w) \qquad (4)$$

The RHS ratio gap accounting for the largest percentage of the taxable value ratio gap is identified as the dominant contributor in explaining the latter gap. The computations are made for counties where equations 1 and 2 indicate there is a statistically significant group difference in the taxable value ratio. Below we list the ratios that made the largest and the second largest contributions to explaining the group difference in the taxable value ratio. [10]

We estimate additional informative models. Analogous to equation 1, we regress each of the RHS ratios of equation 3 on the race/ethnicity dummy variables, along with year fixed effects.[11] Analogous to equation 2, we regress the RHS ratios on the female and male buyer dummy variables, again with year fixed effects. The estimates from these models reveal group differences in the RHS ratios, which helps to pinpoint which ratios contribute to differences in the taxable value ratio. For example, where the taxable value ratio is larger for blacks than whites, a positive and statistically significant black coefficient in the *JV* model suggests that assessment error is contributing to the ratio gap in taxable value.

Finally, we estimated conditional value and linear probability models. To illustrate, assume that in county *j* black homeowners are found to have a smaller homestead exemption value ratio than whites. That is, the black homeowner coefficient in the *HSE* model is negative and statistically significant. This could

[10] We also estimated Oaxaca (1973) decompositions to verify our results. The size of the taxable value ratio gap between any two groups is decomposed into the portion attributable to mean differences in the RHS ratios and differences between groups in the effects of the ratios. Differences in the estimated effects are not significant as expected, since regardless of group the effects are additive as shown by equation 3. The advantage of the decompositions is that not only is the size of the mean RHS ratio difference contribution provided but also its statistical significance. All of first and second order of importance ratios we list as contributors to explaining the group gap in the taxable value ratio based on equation 4 are statistically significant in the decompositions. We chose to report the results only from equation 4 due to the relative simplicity of the approach.

[11] We label these models by the ratio's acronym. For example, the "JV" model is the regression of the just value to sales price ratio on the group dummy variables.

result from a lower take-up of the exemption by blacks or from blacks living in less expensive homes that do not qualify for the full exemption.[12] To uncover the relative importance of these two factors, we estimated two additional models. The probability of claiming the exemption was estimated using a linear probability model with the same RHS variables as in (1). Using the same explanatory variables, the amount of the exemption for those taking the exemption was estimated by OLS. Similar comparison models are estimated for SOH and the other exemptions to uncover the relative importance of take-up versus the amount conditional on take-up in judging their importance toward explaining gaps in taxable value ratios.

V. Data and Descriptive Statistics

Our datasets come from the Florida Department of Revenue (FDOR) and the Florida Department of State's Division of Elections (DOE). All counties are required to submit their property tax rolls annually to the FDOR. We use the rolls for the years 2010 to 2019. The DOE collects data on registered voters which includes race, gender, name, and home address. Using the name and address information in the 2019 voter rolls, we merge the race and gender variables to home buyers identified on the FDOR property tax rolls.[15] These tax rolls include extensive information about every house in the state of Florida, including specific property tax exemptions granted; the just, assessed, and taxable value; and most recent sales price.

We define separate county samples based on the number of the black, Hispanic, Asian, or female home purchasers that are matched. For each group the counted counties are those where there are at least 50 homeowners after merging the FDOR and voter registration rolls. Florida has a total of 67 counties. The black

[12] The exempted amount may be less than the maximum amount depending on the assessed value of the home. The first $25,000 exemption applies to all property taxes, including school district taxes. An additional exemption up to $25,000 applies to the assessed value between $50,000 and $75,000 and only to non-school taxes. For example, if the assessed value is $45,000 the first $25,000 of value is exempt from all property tax and the remaining $20,000 of value is taxable. So, the total exemption amount is $25,000. If the assessed value is $85,000 the first $25,000 of value is exempt from all property tax, the next $25,000 of value is taxable, the third $25,000 of value is exempt from non-school taxes, and the remaining $10,000 of value is taxable. So, the total exemption amount is $50,000, the maximum amount.

[15] Averaging across counties, 51 percent of home purchasers are found on the voter registration rolls. Some buyers are not U.S. citizens, which deceased the match rate. Among citizens, many are not registered voters. The U.S. Census Bureau (2019) reports that among Florida's voting age citizens 63 percent are registered to vote.

counted counties equal 49. The corresponding counted counties for Hispanic, Asian, and female homeowners are 46, 37 and 65, respectively.[16]

Error! Reference source not found. presents the summary statistics of the data used in our analysis. Mean values of the ratios with respect to fair market value (FMV) are reported. The means are calculated by first computing the mean values for each county and then taking the mean value of these means across counties within the counted counties of the group. FMV is measured as the sale price in the year preceding the tax roll year. For each minority group, the white homeowner mean (the reference group) of the counted counties is in brackets. The means document large differences between the taxable value and just value ratios, underscoring the importance of exemptions and SOH portability in determining the actual tax burdens of homeowners. Generally, differences between the means of the designated group and the reference group are small, but there are a number of noteworthy comparisons where the means are larger in magnitude. For Asian homeowners, the taxable value ratio mean is larger and the homestead exemption ratio mean is lower in comparison to white homeowners. For sole female owners the mean taxable value ratio is lower, and the homestead value ratio is larger in comparison to both sole male and couple owners. The SOH value ratio means are markedly smaller for all three of the minority groups in comparison to whites. The disability exemption value ratio is larger for black than for white homeowners. Overall, the differences in the mean ratios between comparison groups reported in Table 1 suggest that county gaps in taxable value ratios may be sourced by race/ethnic and gender differences in the other ratios. Uncovering their relative importance within each county motivates the regressions models we estimate for each county.

VI. Results from Estimating the County Regressions

Panel A of Table 2 shows that racial/ethnic differences in taxable value ratios vary in sign and significance across counties, underscoring the importance of not aggregating the data but keeping the analysis at the county level. [17] Within 11 (11) of the 49 counted counties the taxable value ratio is significantly lower (higher)

[16] Upping the minimum number of observations to 100 reduced the number of counted counties by an average of 5, with no discernable impact on our results. We make these results available upon request.

[17] The results from estimating equation 1 for each county are reported in Appendix Table A. Reported are the estimates from the taxable value ratio model and each of the RHS ratio models.

for black homeowners than for white homeowners.[18] In 27 counties there is no significant difference in the taxable value ratio between black and white homeowners. In 6(12) of the 46 counted counties Hispanic homeowners have a significantly lower (higher) taxable value ratio than white homeowners. In contrast to the gaps found for blacks and Hispanics, the sign on the taxable value gap between Asian homeowners and white homeowners is less mixed, in 30 of the 37 counted counties Asian homeowners have a significantly higher taxable value ratio than white homeowners. The taxable value ratio is significantly lower for Asians than whites in only one county.

The final 2 columns of Panel A of Table 2 report significant differences in the taxable value ratio between sole female and couple homeowners and between sole female and sole male homeowners. Significant gaps in the taxable value ratio strongly favor females over both couples and males.[19] In 47 (43) of the 65 counted counties the taxable value ratio is significantly lower for females in comparison to couples (males). For each comparison group, the ratio is significantly higher for women in only a single county.

Panel B of Table 2 reports the gaps found in the just value ratio. In comparison to white homeowners, just value ratios are frequently higher for all three minority groups. For 23 of the 49 black counted counties, 16 of the 46 Hispanic counted counties, and 21 of the 37 Asian counted counties the just value ratio is significantly larger. In comparison, significantly lower just value ratios for each of the minority groups are only found in 5, 6, and 1 of the counties, respectively. These results are somewhat consistent with previous research, suggesting that assessment errors are frequently unfavorable to black and Hispanic homeowners. However, it is important to note that for both black and Hispanic homeowners the just value ratio is not significantly higher within a majority of the counted counties. Assessment errors seem to be more of a problem for Asians, where they are at a disadvantage in a majority of their counted counties. Recent research by Avenancio-León & Howard (2020) find that the homes of black and Hispanic owners are frequently over assessed relative to white homeowners because tax

[18] A reference to a "significant" effect refers to an estimate that is significantly different than zero by a two-tailed test at the 10 percent level. "Counted" counties are those that satisfy the requirement that there are at least 50 homeowners within the designated race/ethnic or female group of home buyers within the county.

[19] The results from estimating equation 2 for each county are reported in Appendix Table B. Reported are the estimates from the taxable value ratio model and each of the RHS ratio models.

assessments are not correctly registering racial differences in neighborhood amenities. Because Asians tend to cluster within the same neighborhoods, there may be differences in amenities between Asian and white neighborhoods that tax assessors also overlook.

In comparison to the race/ethnic just value ratio gaps, significant gender differences in the ratio are infrequent. However, where they exist, they are more frequently smaller than larger for female homeowners in comparison to couples and males.

Turning to Panel C of Table 2, striking differences exist in the assessment value ratio gaps based on race/ethnicity. For a majority of the counties in each of the group samples, assessed value ratios are significantly larger for the minority groups. The ratios are higher in 67, 54, and 73 percent of the counted counties for black, Hispanics, and Asian homeowners, in comparison to white homeowners The gender breakdown shows an even split in the number of counties (11) where the assessed value ratio is significantly higher and significantly lower for females in comparison to couples. But relative to males, the assessed value ratio is significantly lower for females in 24 counties, and only in a single county is the ratio significantly higher for females.

Recall, that assessed value is obtained by subtracting the SOH transfer from just value. Hence, the group differences in the assessed value ratio suggests important differences in the SOH value ratio. Indeed, as shown in Panel D of Table 2, these differences are dramatic. Large percentages of each of the minority groups, ranging from 80 to 94 percent of the counted counties, are porting a smaller amount of SOH savings (relative to FMV) in comparison to white homeowners. The comparison between male and females shows that within many more of the counted counties the SOH value ratio is larger (24) than smaller (5) for females.

Panel E of Table 2 reports on group differences in the homestead exemption value ratio. The ratios are more frequently higher than lower for black and Hispanic homeowners in comparison to white homeowners. They are significantly higher in 19 (22) counties for blacks (Hispanics), and lower in 10 (8) counties. Because the exemption is a flat dollar amount, where blacks and Hispanic homeowners purchase less expensive homes the ratio will be a larger number. In contrast, for a majority of the Asian counted counties the homestead value ratio

is significantly smaller than for whites and is only larger in a single county. Most dramatic are the differences between female and couple buyers and between female and male buyers. For both comparisons, in 44 of the counted counties female owners have larger ratios. More analysis of these large differences will be provided below in Section VII.

The senior exemption value ratios (Panel F of Table 2) are much more frequently significantly smaller than larger in comparison to whites for all three minority groups. For 28, 19, and 21 counties the ratio is smaller for blacks, Hispanics, and Asians, respectively. The ratio is significantly larger in 4 of the counted counted for Hispanics, but it is not larger for any of the counted counties for blacks and Asians. Gender differences again are striking. In 36 (39) counted counties the ratios are higher for females in comparison to couples (males).

The final panel of Table 2 (Panel G) reports the differences between groups in the disability exemption ratio. The results are mixed among the minority groups. The contrast is stark between blacks and Asians. In 26 counties the ratio is larger for blacks than whites, while in 17 counties it is smaller for Asians than whites. Yet again, the gender differences are remarkable. However, for the disability exemption ratio the values are in favor of couples and males. In 36 (40) counties the ratio is smaller for sole female buyers.

VII. Further Analysis of the Minority and Gender Value Ratio Gaps

The group gaps in the SOH, homestead exemption, senior exemption, and disability exemption value ratios reported in Table 2 may arise either because homeowners in the group have different probabilities of receiving a SOH transfer or an exemption and/or receive different value amounts conditional on receipt. In Table 3 we summarize the results obtained from estimating the probabilities and the conditional values.[20]

Panel D of Table 2 shows that for all three minority groups the SOH value ratio is frequently smaller than for whites for a large number of the counted counties. The results reported in Panel A of Table 3 suggest that the SOH value ratios are smaller for minorities because the both the probability of receiving a SOH transfer and its value upon receipt are lower for the minority groups in comparison to

[20] Due to their volume, the linear probability and OLS results for each county are available by request.

whites. The receipt probabilities are particularly negative and significant. This is true for 92 percent of the counted counties for blacks, with the percentages for Hispanics and Asians also high at 83 and 84 percent. These results reflect the fact that minorities are much less likely to have been homesteaded in their previous home and when homesteaded experience less savings from the SOH cap. This suggests there are negative distributional consequences associated with SOH portability, that policy may need to address. To the extent that the lower probability of a transfer results from gaps in prior homeownership between minorities and whites, less porting by minorities may stem from factors accounting for race/ethnicity gaps in prior home ownership. Minorities may port a lower amount to the new home because they live in neighborhoods where the SOH cap is less binding due to less house price appreciation. Discrimination against minorities in mortgage and housing markets is a factor in their lower homeownership rate and their lower neighborhood house price appreciation.[21] Hence, the losses that minorities experience from past discrimination may be exacerbated by Florida's SOH program.

Regarding gender differences, Table 2 shows that the SOH value ratio is frequently larger for female than males. The results in Table 3 suggest that this is more the result of a higher receipt of a transfer rather than a conditionally larger transfer amount. In 24 counties the probability of a SOH transfer is higher for women, but in 17 counties the amount of the transfer is smaller.

The latter may be explained by the previous home of women being less valuable or women residing fewer years under the assessment growth rate cap. The finding that in 37 percent of the counted counties there is a higher frequency of a portable transfer for women than for men merits investigation in future research. One possibility is that women at their prior residence may have more frequently had a homestead exemption, which is required to be eligible for a SOH transfer. Another possibility is that, among those who are eligible, women may be more likely to apply for the transfer. We will return to this issue after discussing the results for the homestead exemption, to which we now turn.

[21] The vast literature documenting discrimination against minorities in housing and mortgage markets has recently been reviewed by Zonta (2019).

The receipt of the homestead exemption requires that homeowners make their new home their primary residence. Our matching algorithm between the registered voter and tax rolls is based on the home address. This suggests that the homeowners in our groups should all be eligible to receive the exemption. Yet, Panel B of Table 3 shows that the homestead value ratios for minorities reported in Table 2 are frequently smaller for minorities because they have a lower take-up rate of the exemption than whites. The take-up rate is significantly smaller for blacks in roughly half of the counted counties and significantly smaller for Hispanics and Asians in a third of the counted counties.[22] Because the exemption provides substantial tax savings to homeowners, these differences in take-up rates are important and merit additional study regarding their sources.[23] The results of Ihlanfeldt (2021) suggest that differences in internet access help explain the gap in homestead take-up between black and white homeowners. In Florida, with the exception of a hand full of rural counties, the homestead exemption can be applied online, which substantially reduces application transactions costs. There may be merit in future research investigating whether differential access to the internet also explains the lower homestead exemption take-up of Hispanic and Asian homeowners. The large positive values of the homestead value ratio for female homeowners in comparison to males reported in Table 2 are shown in Table 3 to reflect frequently higher tale-up rates of the homestead exemption. In 40 counties women have a higher take-up of the homestead exemption than men. These gender differences in the homestead exemption take-up rate also merit additional inquiry. In comparison to male homebuyers, are female homebuyers savvier financially or do gender differences in income make women more motivated to file an application? Again, differences in the ability to apply online may also be a factor. The gender difference in the take-up rate of the homestead exemption provides some indirect evidence that the lower probability of a SOH transfer on the part of male homeowners may result from a lower rate of application among those who are eligible. Like the homestead exemption, a

[22] Note that the Asians in our sample are registered voters; hence, their lower take-up of the homestead exemption is not due to the homestead exemption being available in Florida only to U.S. citizens. Differences in first languages between Asians and whites may be a factor given that applications must be made in English.

[23] Ihlanfeldt (2021) finds that in Florida the homestead exemption saves the average homeowner between $800 and $1200 in annual property taxes.

SOH portability transfer does not come automatically, an application must be submitted to the county tax assessor's office.

Panel C of Table 3 reports that the probability of taking the disability exemption is frequently larger (29 counties) for blacks than whites.This result conforms to data that shows, at the national level, and in most places, blacks have markedly higher disability rates than whites, up to 2.5 times greater (Ross and Bateman, 2018). For Asians, in over half of the counted counties they are less likely to take the disability exemption and when they do it is of lower value in the majority of cases. Again, county gender differences are striking. In over 70 percent of the counted counties women have a lower probability of taking a disability exemption in comparison to either couples or males, and when they do it tends to be of lesser value. A number of Florida's disability exemptions are restricted to veterans, which may help explain the gender gaps.

Table 2 shows that the senior exemption ratio is lower for blacks and Asians relative to whites in a large number of counties. Panel D of Table 3 reports that these groups less frequently take the exemption in a majority of the counted counties and in no county are they more likely to take the exemption. For females, the senior exemption ratio is higher in comparison to both couples and males in a majority of the counted counties. Most important in explaining these differences is the higher probability of females receiving the exemption, which occurs in a majority of the counted counties. This is not surprising in light of women's longer life expectancy.

VIII What Accounts for County Gaps in the Taxable Value Ratio

We now turn to addressing our central question; namely, where there is a significant gap in the taxable value ratio, what accounts for this difference. As outlined in Section IV and show by equation 3, group differences in any of the RHS value ratios may account for differences in the taxable value ratio. In Column 1 of Table 4 we list the number of times that a specific RHS ratio explains the largest proportion of the taxable value ratio. Column 2 identifies RHS ratios that frequently make a significant contribution to explaining the taxable value gap but are of lesser importance than the RHS ratios in Column 1.

The RHS ratio most frequently accounting for the largest proportion of a gap in the taxable value ratio is the homestead exemption value ratio. This is true

whether the taxable value ratio is higher or lower for minorities than for whites. For example, in the 11 counties where the taxable value ratio is higher for blacks, the homestead exemption ratio is dominant in 5 counties, the SOH value ratio in 3 counties, and the just value ratio in 3 counties. In 8 of the 11 counties where the taxable value ratio is lower for blacks, again the homestead exemption ratio is most important. The SOH value ratio also is frequently a significant contributor (either first or second in importance), but only in explaining where the minority group has a higher taxable value ratio than whites. In the many counties where the taxable ratio is lower for females in comparison to couples or males, in almost all cases this is attributable to a higher homestead exemption ratio.

Of key interest is the extent to which taxable value gaps are attributable to differences in the just value ratio. That is, are assessment errors a root cause of the taxable value gaps? Differences in the just value ratio are sometimes important in explaining a higher taxable value ratio for both minorities and males, but only for Asians do they rival the importance of the homestead exemption ratio. In the counties where the taxable ratio is higher for blacks (Hispanics) in only 3(1) counties is assessment error the dominant factor. In 10 of the 30 counties where the taxable value ratio is larger for Asians than whites, assessment error is the dominant factor.

VIII. Conclusion

We have emphasized that the property tax is administered locally, which motivated our study of possible disparities among groups at the jurisdictional level. In Florida the jurisdiction responsible for administering the tax is the county. Hence, we estimated for each county (where samples sizes permitted) racial/ethnic and gender gaps in all of the key value to FMV ratios that effect property tax bills. The most important gaps to consider are those for taxable value ratios, since it is the taxable value that determines homeowners' property tax liabilities. Our results show that these gaps vary across counties, sometimes there is no significant difference, other times the ratio is significantly larger or smaller for a group in comparison to its reference group. The same can be said for the other ratios we estimated. This suggests that policy to improve the fairness of the tax should be tailored to each jurisdiction. For example, where an assessment gap problem exists, it may make sense to supplement comps with professional

appraisals, especially if Avenancio-León & Howard (2020) are correct that the problem with traditional mass appraisal models is that they do not accurately account for neighborhood amenity differences in estimating fair market values. In those jurisdictions where gaps exist in the take-up of the SOH transfer or the homestead exemption more advertising of these opportunities by the county tax assessor may make a difference. One idea would be to insert application forms along with the preliminary tax bill sent to the homeowner. The strong portability advantage enjoyed by white homeowners, presumably due to prior ownership, might be somewhat offset by allowing first-time homeowners an automatic reduction in their assessed value.

Regarding future research, based on our findings we have identified many fertile areas for additional exploration. However, most importantly, we recommend jurisdictional level analyses, perhaps following our methodological approach of merging registered voter and property tax rolls, for other states, where again the emphasis would be on achieving a better understanding of racial/ethnicity and gender gaps across jurisdictions. Ideally, we would want to know the places throughout the nation where gaps appear to be unfavorable to one group over another and why is happening.

We have uncovered large gaps for many of the property tax ratios studied between male and female homeowners and between Asian and white homeowners. To our knowledge, our evidence on these differences is the first that has been provided. Hence, further study of the lower property tax burdens of female homeowners and the higher tax burdens of Asian homeowners should be a priority of future research.

References

Amornsiripanitch, Natee. (2021). Why Are Residential Property Tax Rates Regressive? Working Paper. Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia

Avenancio-León, Carlos, and Troup Howard. (2021a). The Assessment Gap: Racial Inequalities in Property Taxation. Working paper.

Avenancio-León, Carlos, and Troup Howard. (2021b). Assessment Caps and the Racial Assessment Gap. Working Paper.

Atuahene, B. (2017). Our taxes are too damn high: Institutional racism, property tax assessments, and the Fair Housing Act. Nw. UL Rev., 112:1501.

Atuahene, B. and Berry, C. (2019). Taxed out: Illegal property tax assessments and the epidemic of tax foreclosures in Detroit. UC Irvine Law Review, 9(4):847.

Berry, C. (2021). Reassessing the Property Tax. The University of Chicago Harris School of Public Policy and the College, working paper.

Hendon, William S. (1968). "Discrimination against Negro Homeowners in Property Tax Assessment." *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 27 (2): 125:132.

Hodge, Timothy R. and Daniel P. McMillen, Gary Sands, Mark Skidmore. (2017). "Assessment Inequity in a Declining Housing Market: The Case of Detroit." *Real Estate Economics*, 45 (2): 237–258.

Ihlanfeldt, Keith. (2021). "Property Tax Homestead Exemptions: An Analysis of the Variance in Take-up Rates Across Neighborhoods." *National Tax Journal*, 74 (2): 405-430.

Ihlanfeldt, Keith, and Luke P. Rodgers. (2022). "Homestead Exemptions, Heterogeneous Assessment, and Property Tax Progressivity." *National Tax Journal*, Volume, 75 (1): 7-31.

McMillen, Daniel P., and Rachel N. Weber. (2010). "Ask and Ye Shall Receive? Predicting the Successful Appeal of Property Tax Assessments." *Public Finance Review*, 38(1), 74-101.

McMillen, Daniel, and Ruchi Singh. (2020a). Assessment Regressivity and Property Taxation. *Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*, 60, 155-169.

McMillen, Daniel, and Ruchi Singh. 2020b. "Measures of Vertical Inequality in Assessments." Working paper.

Oaxaca, R. (1973). Male-Female Wage Differentials in Urban Labor Markets. *International Economic Review*, 14 (3): 693–709.

Rothstein, Richard. (2017). The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America. Liveright Publishing.

Kahrl, Andrew W. (2016). The power to destroy: Discriminatory property assessments and the struggle for tax justice in Mississippi." *Journal of Southern History* 82 (3): 579{616.

Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 2017. “Significant Features of the Property Tax.” Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Cambridge, MA, https://www.lincolninst.edu/research-data/data-toolkits/significant-features-property-tax.

Margo, Robert A. (1984). “Accumulation of property by southern blacks before World War I: Comment and further evidence." *The American Economic Review,* 74 (4): 768:776.

Zonta, Michela, 2019. “Racial Disparities in Home Appreciation Implications of the Racially Segmented Housing Market for African Americans’ Equity Building and the Enforcement of Fair Housing Policies,” Center for American Progress, July. https://www.americanprogress.org/article/racial-disparities-home-appreciation/.

Ross, Martha and Nicole Bateman. (2018). Disability rates among working-age adults are shaped by race, place, and education. Brookings. https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2018/05/15/disability-rates-among-working-age-adults-are-shaped-by-race-place-and-education/#:~:text=At%20the%20national%20level%2C%20Native,and%20Asians%20(4%20percent).

United States Census Bureau. (2019). Voting and Registration in the Election of November 2018, Table 4a. https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/voting-and-registration/p20-583.html.

.

Table 1
Mean Values

	Black (n=49)	Hispanic (n=46)	Asian (n=37)	Female (n=65)	Male (n=65)	Couple (n=65)
Taxable	.641	.630	.672	.575	.601	.631
	(.066)	(.055)	(.043)	(.072)	(.074)	(.074)
	[.634]	[.628]	[.630]			
	(.052)	(.055)	(.048)			
Just	.904	.874	.860	.923	.910	.947
	(.146)	(.082)	(.042)	(.149)	(.112)	(.178)
	[.895]	[.875]	[.854]			
	(.113)	(.086)	(.058)			
Assessed	.893	.856	.846	.897	.890	.919
	(.146)	(.080)	(.037)	(.131)	(.107)	(.166)
	[.870]	[.851]	[.829]			
	(.106)	(.080)	(.050)			
SOH	.011	.018	.014	.027	.019	.028
	(.007)	(.008)	(.009)	(.030)	(.014)	(.018)
	[.025]	[.025]	[.024]			
	(.012)	(.012)	(.012)			
Homestead	.180	.164	.126	.232	.204	.200
	(.081)	(.056)	(.030)	(.094)	(.095)	(.101)
	[.167]	[.158]	[.142]			
	(.074)	(.059)	(.039)			
Senior	.003	.004	.002	.009	.005	.005
	(.005)	(.007)	(.002)	(.008)	(.007)	(.008)
	[.005]	[.005]	[.004]			
	(.004)	(.005)	(.004)			
Disability	.015	.008	.005	.004	.011	.012
	(.009)	(.006)	(.005)	(.006)	(.009)	(.011)
	[.009]	[.008]	[.008]			
	(.005)	(.004)	(.004)			

Notes: Reported are the mean values of the ratios for homeowners in the designated group with respect to the fair market value (sales price). Means for white homeowners for the same counted counties in each minority group are in brackets. Standard deviations are in parentheses.

Table 2
Results from the Estimation of Equations 1 and 2

	Black (n=49)	Hispanic (n=46)	Asian (n=37)	Female/Couple (n=65)	Female/Male (n=65)
A. Taxable Value					
positive	11	6	30	1	1
	(22)	(13)	(81)	(1)	(1)
negative	11	12	1	47	43
	(22)	(26)	(3)	(72)	(66)
B. Just Value					
positive	23	16	21	4	3
	(47)	(35)	(57)	(6)	(5)
negative	5	6	1	15	16
	(10)	(13)	(3)	(23)	(25)
C. Assessed Value					
positive	33	25	27	11	1
	(67)	(54)	(73)	(17)	(1)
negative	3	3	1	11	24
	(6)	(6)	(3)	(17)	(37)
D. SOH					
positive	0	1	0	11	27
	(0)	(2)	(0)	(17)	(41)
negative	46	37	32	10	5
	(94)	(80)	(86)	(15)	(8)
E. Homestead Exemption					
positive	19	22	1	44	44
	(39)	(48)	(3)	(68)	(68)
negative	10	8	21	2	0
	(20)	(17)	(57)	(3)	(0)
F. Senior Exemption					
positive	0	4	0	36	39
	(0)	(9)	(0)	(55)	(60)
negative	28	19	21	1	1
	(57)	(41)	(57)	(1)	(1)
G. Disability Exemption					

positive	26	6	0	0	0
	(53)	(13)	(0)	(0)	(0)
negative	4	10	17	36	40
	(8)	(22)	(46)	(55)	(61)

Notes: Reported are the number of counties where the minority/gender group gap is statistically significant at the 10 percent level by a two-tailed test. Percentages are in parentheses. Cases are broken down into those that are positive and negative in sign.

Table 3
Results from Estimating the Probability of Receiving a
SOH Transfer or an Exemption and their Values Conditional on Receipt

	Black (n=49)	Hispanic (n=46)	Asian (n=37)	Female/Couple (n=65)	Female/Male (n=65)
A. SOH Transfer (yes=1)					
positive	0	1	0	0	24
	(0)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(37)
negative	45	38	31	24	15
	(82)	(83)	(84)	(37)	(23)
Value of Transfer					
positive	2	4	1	2	3
	(4)	(9)	(3)	(3)	(5)
negative	28	19	15	22	17
	(57)	(41)	(40)	(34)	(26)
B. Homestead Exemption Taken					
positive	1	3	1	26	40
	(2)	(6)	(3)	(40)	(61)
negative	24	15	14	2	0
	(49)	(33)	(38)	(3)	(0)
Value of Homestead Exemption					
positive	7	7	19	0	12
	(14)	(15)	(51)	(0)	(18)
negative	20	22	0	43	27
	(41)	(48)	(0)	(66)	(41)
C. Disability Exemption Taken					

positive	29	9	0	1	0
	(59)	(20)	(0)	(1)	(0)
negative	3	10	19	44	47
	(6)	(22)	(51)	(68)	(72)
Value of Disability Exemption					
positive	14	4	0	0	0
	(29)	(9)	(0)	(0)	(0)
negative	4	8	11	17	20
	(8)	(17)	(30)	(26)	(31)
D. Senior Exemption Taken					
positive	0	3	0	33	38
	(0)	(6)	(0)	(51)	(58)
negative	30	19	19	3	1
	(61)	(41)	(51)	(5)	(1)
Value of Senior Exemption					
positive	7	4	5	0	5
	(14)	(9)	(13)	(0)	(8)
negative	8	6	1	8	7
	(16)	(13)	(3)	(12)	(11)

Notes: Reported are the results from estimating the probability of receiving a SOH transfer and each of the exemptions and their amounts conditional on receipt. The first number for each panel is the number of counties where the probability is statistically significant for the designated group, broken down by whether the effect is positive or negative. The second number is the number of cases, again broken down by the sign of the effect, where the value of the transfer or exemption is statistically significant, conditional on receipt. The number in parentheses is the percentage of total cases. Total cases for each group are reported at the top of the table in brackets.

Table 4
Which Ratios of Equation 3 are Dominant in
Explaining Gaps in the Taxable Value Ratio

	First Contributor	Second Contributor
Black Homeowners		
positive [n=11]	Homestead	SOH 8
	Exemption 5	Senior Exemption 3
	SOH 3	
	Just Value 3	
negative [n=11]	Homestead	Disability Exemption 7
	Exemption 8	Homestead
	Disability Exemption 1	Exemption 2
	Senior Exemption 1	
	Just Value 1	
Hispanic Homeowners		
positive [n=6]	Homestead	SOH 6
	Exemption 5	
	Just Value 1	
negative [n=12]	Homestead	Disability Exemption 6
	Exemption 11	Senior Exemption 5
	Just Value 1	
Asian Homeowners		
positive [n=30]	Homestead	SOH 10
	Exemption 13	Homestead
	Just Value 10	Exemption 8
	SOH 5	Just Value 8
negative [n=1]	Homestead	
	Exemption 1	
Female Homeowners vs. Couples		
positive [n=0]		
negative [n=45]	Homestead	Senior Exemption 20
	Exemption 38	SOH 9
	Just Value 7	
Female Homeowners vs. Males		

positive [n=2]	Homestead Exemption 1 Disability Exemption 1	
negative [n=40]	Homestead Exemption 37 Just Value 3	SOH 17 Senior Exemption 13

Notes: Listed in the table is the number of times that the designated ratio made the largest or second largest contribution towards explaining the gap in the taxable value ratio. The number of counties where the gap is statistically significant is given in brackets.

Appendix A: Reported are the results from estimating the Race/Ethnic Value Ratios (Equation 1) for all Florida Counties.

Table A1 Taxable Value Ratio

Table A2 Just Value Ratio

Table A3 Assessed Value Ratio

Table A4 SOH Value Ratio

Table A5 Homestead Exemption Value Ratio

Table A6 Senior Exemption Value Ratio

Table A7 Disability Exemption Value Ratio

			Table A1	**Taxable Value Ratio**			
County	**black**	**t-stat**	**Hispanic**	**t-stat**	**Asian**	**t-stat**	**Obs**
Alachua	-0.022	-2.720	-0.014	-1.770	0.062	8.407	14304
Baker	0.052	1.625	-0.083	-1.547	0.072	0.982	919
Bay	-0.003	-0.205	-0.003	-0.172	0.004	0.242	12727
Bradford	-0.046	-0.631	-0.078	-0.989	-0.172	-1.653	861
Brevard	0.000	-0.006	-0.004	-0.818	0.055	8.352	49821
Broward	0.011	2.859	-0.005	-1.274	0.040	5.342	18806
Calhoun	-0.164	-1.680	-0.337	-1.789	-0.296	-2.788	233

Charlotte	-0.051	-1.083	-0.112	-2.736	0.022	0.381	22701
Citrus	-0.022	-0.845	0.038	0.912	0.060	1.721	9165
Clay	0.023	4.276	0.007	0.988	0.046	4.563	16688
Collier	-0.038	-5.075	-0.062	-14.886	0.023	2.901	32341
Columbia	0.021	0.593	0.021	0.457	0.002	0.041	2743
Dade	-0.037	-15.221	-0.019	-14.533	-0.018	-3.237	105955
Desoto	-0.081	-1.830	-0.018	-0.519	0.132	1.699	903
Dixie	0.084	1.260	0.023	0.159	0.000		501
Duval	-0.018	-8.005	-0.012	-3.171	0.017	4.449	53795
Escambia	-0.001	-0.130	0.019	1.712	0.044	4.652	18461
Flagler	0.007	0.371	-0.013	-0.612	0.073	2.489	2749
Franklin	-0.103	-1.204	-0.001	-0.015	-0.761	-13.344	497
Gadsden	0.179	3.316	-0.012	-0.172	0.002	0.027	1091
Gilchrist	0.131	0.697	0.171	1.509	0.331	7.486	714
Glades	0.088	0.361	-0.018	-0.146	0.000		417
Gulf	0.356	1.238	-0.129	-0.968	0.017	0.196	978
Hamilton	-0.006	-0.051	0.031	0.135	0.000		231
Hardee	0.060	0.725	0.005	0.122	-0.047	-0.637	529
Hendry	-0.006	-0.096	0.006	0.178	-0.014	-0.250	1188
Hernando	0.052	4.570	0.030	3.998	0.073	3.359	17249
Highlands	-0.034	-0.952	-0.014	-0.668	-0.028	-0.833	6666
Hillsborough	-0.009	-4.421	-0.010	-5.351	0.051	18.954	104045
Homes	0.412	0.893	-0.067	-0.403	0.970	6.640	322
Indian River	-0.043	-2.989	-0.033	-2.839	0.001	0.030	18070
Jackson	-0.094	-2.128	-0.062	-0.947	0.332	0.749	1212
Jefferson	-0.022	-0.326	0.097	1.076	-0.278	-3.833	401
Lafayette	0.833	0.581	-0.203	-0.652	0.000		111
Lake	0.041	8.631	0.025	5.780	0.074	9.494	31166
Lee	-0.017	-3.762	-0.037	-12.138	0.032	5.031	78781
Leon	-0.026	-4.351	-0.006	-0.540	0.074	7.547	14165
Levy	0.091	0.645	0.104	0.636	0.370	1.169	2133
Liberty	-0.562	-2.211	-0.569	-1.605	0.989	6.090	143
Madison	0.161	1.390	-0.164	-1.310	0.028	0.186	378
Manatee	0.010	1.522	0.005	0.950	0.054	8.244	38387
Marion	0.034	3.862	0.008	1.075	0.063	5.164	27502
Martin	0.029	1.746	0.014	1.517	0.080	5.322	16268
Monroe	0.016	1.270	-0.009	-1.127	0.017	0.948	4162
Nassau	-0.004	-0.264	-0.018	-1.295	0.020	0.451	8481
Okaloosa	-0.011	-1.487	0.005	0.712	0.009	0.916	15563
Okeechobee	-0.004	-0.044	0.051	1.078	0.325	0.824	1720
Orange	-0.019	-8.648	-0.014	-7.833	0.043	17.267	72968
Osceola	0.020	4.071	-0.004	-1.479	0.062	8.357	23191
Palm Beach	-0.002	-0.789	-0.025	-11.830	0.035	9.660	114591

Pasco	0.043	9.094	0.027	7.384	0.080	13.500	49944
Pinellas	-0.003	-0.649	-0.005	-1.353	0.027	6.076	76012
Polk	0.026	4.228	0.027	5.443	0.086	5.855	67196
Putnam	0.106	1.553	0.079	1.344	-0.071	-0.996	4352
Saint Johns	-0.002	-0.283	0.001	0.103	0.046	10.579	29270
Saint Lucie	0.036	8.249	0.006	1.348	0.058	5.066	27787
Santa Rosa	0.017	1.520	0.030	2.319	0.047	2.791	18782
Sarasota	-0.004	-0.421	-0.013	-2.332	0.049	7.107	40384
Seminole	-0.002	-0.527	0.001	0.362	0.053	11.801	28163
Sumter	0.013	0.749	-0.012	-1.044	0.024	1.815	24597
Suwannee	-0.009	-0.093	0.002	0.019	-0.118	-0.935	1337
Taylor	-0.164	-2.522	-0.352	-4.320	-0.302	-1.334	719
Union	0.327	1.381	-0.145	-1.157	0.351	5.892	192
Volusia	0.007	1.200	-0.014	-3.285	0.065	7.409	41944
Wakulla	0.032	0.480	-0.225	-2.996	-0.102	-2.113	997
Walton	-0.039	-1.492	0.031	1.219	0.067	2.427	5416
Washington	0.006	0.104	-0.022	-0.314	0.015	0.226	805

			Table A2	**Just Value Ratio**			
County	**black**	**t-stat**	**Hispanic**	**t-stat**	**Asian**	**t-stat**	**Obs**
Alachua	0.016	3.110	0.001	0.155	0.003	0.833	14304
Baker	-0.080	-3.507	-0.157	-3.564	-0.065	-1.330	919
Bay	0.009	0.627	-0.006	-0.351	-0.013	-0.870	12727
Bradford	0.013	0.179	-0.128	-2.618	-0.203	-3.108	861
Brevard	0.010	5.824	0.006	3.374	0.013	4.934	49821
Broward	0.002	1.678	0.000	0.486	0.007	3.606	18806
Calhoun	-0.583	-2.177	-0.198	-0.857	-0.566	-1.984	233
Charlotte	-0.123	-1.669	-0.150	-2.888	-0.070	-0.760	22701
Citrus	-0.056	-3.756	0.015	0.353	0.007	0.179	9165
Clay	-0.003	-1.117	-0.008	-1.855	0.001	0.168	16688
Collier	0.004	1.184	0.001	0.578	0.012	2.605	32341
Columbia	0.047	0.847	0.031	0.331	-0.141	-5.358	2743
Dade	0.000	-0.008	0.004	6.179	0.005	1.725	105955
Desoto	-0.027	-1.031	0.015	0.487	0.054	1.275	903
Dixie	-0.059	-1.387	-0.072	-0.988	0.000		501
Duval	0.007	7.712	0.001	0.514	0.004	2.674	53795
Escambia	0.019	5.483	0.012	1.799	0.028	5.211	18461
Flagler	0.015	1.695	0.025	1.713	0.014	1.134	2749
Franklin	-0.016	-0.304	-0.115	-2.784	-0.125	-2.680	497
Gadsden	0.267	3.917	0.079	0.551	0.174	3.093	1091

Gilchrist	0.376	0.837	-0.029	-0.481	0.012	0.333	714
Glades	0.003	0.016	0.122	0.644	0.000		417
Gulf	0.277	1.010	-0.080	-1.947	-0.149	-2.033	978
Hamilton	-0.200	-0.785	-0.631	-0.936	0.000		231
Hardee	-0.051	-0.802	-0.063	-1.239	-0.013	-0.230	529
Hendry	0.072	0.708	0.039	0.851	-0.146	-2.952	1188
Hernando	-0.001	-0.187	0.007	1.733	0.036	3.605	17249
Highlands	-0.073	-1.654	-0.051	-1.752	-0.090	-1.781	6666
Hillsborough	0.002	2.057	0.007	6.690	0.013	8.190	104045
Homes	1.142	1.044	-0.232	-2.230	0.605	5.388	322
Indian River	0.029	2.021	0.009	1.068	0.006	0.375	18070
Jackson	-0.079	-1.037	-0.173	-3.439	0.460	0.766	1212
Jefferson	0.081	0.799	-0.055	-0.998	-0.184	-1.877	401
Lafayette	0.398	0.303	-0.420	-1.137	0.000		111
Lake	0.003	1.575	-0.001	-0.516	0.004	1.142	31166
Lee	0.008	3.284	0.017	10.222	0.011	3.262	78781
Leon	0.015	3.293	0.005	0.737	0.013	1.503	14165
Levy	0.065	0.436	0.096	0.476	0.564	1.041	2133
Liberty	-1.255	-2.303	-0.663	-1.801	0.326	1.252	143
Madison	0.250	1.055	-0.699	-2.687	1.256	4.452	378
Manatee	0.021	5.841	0.025	7.693	0.020	5.503	38387
Marion	0.014	2.247	0.004	0.699	0.007	0.869	27502
Martin	0.001	0.096	0.008	1.869	0.017	2.323	16268
Monroe	-0.001	-0.146	0.005	1.034	0.002	0.142	4162
Nassau	0.004	0.403	-0.014	-2.728	0.015	0.394	8481
Okaloosa	0.010	2.328	0.002	0.270	0.001	0.141	15563
Okeechobee	0.258	0.762	-0.090	-1.865	0.619	0.920	1720
Orange	0.009	9.800	0.004	6.090	0.015	13.543	72968
Osceola	0.005	2.390	0.007	5.021	0.021	6.149	23191
Palm Beach	0.007	6.676	0.007	6.940	0.016	9.632	114591
Pasco	0.008	3.110	0.002	1.091	0.013	3.734	49944
Pinellas	0.000	-0.009	0.003	1.514	0.006	3.102	76012
Polk	0.003	0.446	-0.020	-3.322	-0.008	-0.495	67196
Putnam	0.050	0.613	-0.033	-0.498	-0.168	-2.156	4352
Saint Johns	0.008	4.097	0.003	2.125	0.006	3.586	29270
Saint Lucie	0.020	9.037	0.017	7.054	0.016	2.649	27787
Santa Rosa	0.001	0.144	-0.002	-0.182	0.023	1.238	18782
Sarasota	0.008	2.385	0.006	2.817	0.006	1.822	40384
Seminole	0.007	3.972	0.005	4.123	0.016	8.072	28163
Sumter	0.023	2.624	-0.006	-0.943	0.008	0.997	24597
Suwannee	0.185	0.625	-0.149	-2.009	-0.313	-3.706	1337
Taylor	-0.290	-3.120	1.238	1.072	-0.467	-3.175	719
Union	0.411	0.955	-0.233	-1.689	-0.136	-1.077	192

Volusia	0.004	1.118	0.001	0.333	0.008	1.355	41944
Wakulla	0.067	0.622	-0.189	-4.752	-0.236	-2.035	997
Walton	-0.019	-1.336	-0.003	-0.137	0.053	2.537	5416
Washington	-0.046	-0.782	-0.018	-0.275	-0.091	-1.589	805

			Table A3	**Assessed Value Ratio**			
County	**black**	**t-stat**	**Hispanic**	**t-stat**	**Asian**	**t-stat**	**Obs**
Alachua	0.030	5.584	0.006	1.211	0.016	3.671	14304
Baker	-0.057	-2.519	-0.151	-3.333	-0.065	-1.175	919
Bay	0.015	1.075	-0.004	-0.220	-0.010	-0.677	12727
Bradford	0.037	0.492	-0.133	-2.447	-0.186	-2.771	861
Brevard	0.023	11.467	0.012	5.901	0.021	6.526	49821
Broward	0.030	14.538	0.016	8.125	0.022	5.285	18806
Calhoun	-0.565	-2.103	-0.180	-0.816	-0.546	-1.908	233
Charlotte	-0.082	-1.169	-0.123	-2.514	-0.051	-0.632	22701
Citrus	-0.043	-2.809	0.024	0.568	0.026	0.692	9165
Clay	0.008	2.706	-0.003	-0.718	0.010	1.453	16688
Collier	0.016	3.846	0.005	1.930	0.020	4.038	32341
Columbia	0.056	1.004	0.027	0.290	-0.130	-4.952	2743
Dade	0.008	5.630	0.009	10.868	0.009	2.937	105955
Desoto	-0.008	-0.287	0.022	0.689	0.032	1.050	903
Dixie	-0.049	-1.161	-0.063	-0.854	0.000		501
Duval	0.019	17.996	0.009	5.002	0.013	7.334	53795
Escambia	0.025	7.430	0.019	2.778	0.033	6.044	18461
Flagler	0.027	2.811	0.033	2.109	0.030	2.482	2749
Franklin	0.006	0.090	-0.103	-3.209	-0.104	-2.160	497
Gadsden	0.279	4.115	0.086	0.594	0.194	3.435	1091
Gilchrist	0.413	0.918	-0.009	-0.155	0.019	0.502	714
Glades	-0.007	-0.033	0.136	0.716	0.000		417
Gulf	0.295	1.082	-0.076	-1.918	-0.135	-1.850	978
Hamilton	-0.178	-0.722	-0.608	-0.926	0.000		231
Hardee	-0.030	-0.477	-0.053	-1.039	0.009	0.161	529
Hendry	0.087	0.858	0.048	1.068	-0.129	-2.628	1188
Hernando	0.013	2.345	0.015	3.908	0.040	3.718	17249
Highlands	-0.052	-1.197	-0.043	-1.505	-0.078	-1.852	6666
Hillsborough	0.014	13.569	0.017	15.481	0.021	13.050	104045
Homes	1.114	1.014	-0.223	-2.154	0.611	5.410	322
Indian River	0.042	2.911	0.016	1.849	0.018	1.079	18070
Jackson	-0.079	-1.212	-0.159	-3.243	0.450	0.739	1212
Jefferson	0.053	0.622	-0.039	-0.677	-0.239	-3.186	401
Lafayette	0.538	0.411	-0.352	-1.023	0.000		111

Lake	0.014	6.047	0.006	2.893	0.015	3.742	31166
Lee	0.018	7.145	0.022	12.056	0.018	4.787	78781
Leon	0.032	6.796	0.010	1.344	0.026	2.980	14165
Levy	0.097	0.646	0.109	0.555	0.571	1.096	2133
Liberty	-1.061	-2.867	-0.628	-1.746	0.339	1.320	143
Madison	0.302	1.315	-0.637	-2.759	0.442	1.621	378
Manatee	0.032	8.164	0.034	9.656	0.029	6.980	38387
Marion	0.027	4.306	0.010	1.848	0.016	2.056	27502
Martin	0.019	2.582	0.014	2.728	0.029	3.453	16268
Monroe	0.006	0.816	0.001	0.141	0.009	0.678	4162
Nassau	0.016	1.688	-0.016	-2.055	0.028	0.766	8481
Okaloosa	0.015	3.540	0.006	1.065	0.005	0.960	15563
Okeechobee	0.036	0.234	-0.056	-1.200	0.631	0.938	1720
Orange	0.019	18.329	0.012	14.390	0.022	17.154	72968
Osceola	0.013	5.887	0.011	7.730	0.028	7.659	23191
Palm Beach	0.025	20.360	0.015	13.228	0.029	14.816	114591
Pasco	0.021	7.406	0.008	3.234	0.020	5.476	49944
Pinellas	0.017	8.339	0.012	5.873	0.022	9.483	76012
Polk	0.013	1.790	-0.005	-0.942	0.004	0.243	67196
Putnam	0.075	0.928	-0.010	-0.154	-0.133	-1.743	4352
Saint Johns	0.017	7.503	0.009	3.733	0.017	7.864	29270
Saint Lucie	0.036	14.633	0.025	8.842	0.026	3.719	27787
Santa Rosa	0.007	0.760	0.002	0.162	0.027	1.452	18782
Sarasota	0.021	5.494	0.013	4.642	0.016	4.368	40384
Seminole	0.018	8.839	0.014	9.032	0.024	11.039	28163
Sumter	0.031	3.420	-0.016	-2.045	0.017	1.991	24597
Suwannee	0.160	0.644	-0.130	-1.760	-0.314	-3.581	1337
Taylor	-0.256	-2.801	1.269	1.100	-0.427	-3.036	719
Union	0.429	0.992	-0.174	-1.576	-0.104	-0.814	192
Volusia	0.020	5.591	0.012	5.390	0.021	3.315	41944
Wakulla	0.069	0.659	-0.192	-4.536	-0.251	-2.270	997
Walton	-0.015	-1.114	0.000	-0.012	0.054	2.514	5416
Washington	-0.029	-0.517	-0.011	-0.166	-0.066	-1.266	805

			Table A4	**SOH Value Ratio**			
County	**black**	**t-stat**	**Hispanic**	**t-stat**	**Asian**	**t-stat**	**Obs**
Alachua	-0.014	-10.635	-0.006	-2.837	-0.013	-9.466	14304
Baker	-0.023	-7.498	-0.006	-0.508	0.000	-0.023	919
Bay	-0.006	-6.733	-0.002	-0.867	-0.003	-1.220	12727

Bradford	-0.023	-7.123	0.005	0.182	-0.018	-3.837	861
Brevard	-0.013	-12.600	-0.006	-5.292	-0.008	-4.489	49821
Broward	-0.029	-15.786	-0.016	-8.875	-0.015	-3.995	18806
Calhoun	-0.018	-2.178	-0.018	-1.502	-0.019	-1.377	233
Charlotte	-0.041	-6.754	-0.026	-3.438	-0.020	-0.775	22701
Citrus	-0.013	-2.578	-0.009	-1.755	-0.020	-5.269	9165
Clay	-0.011	-12.273	-0.005	-2.674	-0.009	-6.181	16688
Collier	-0.012	-5.994	-0.003	-2.681	-0.009	-3.782	32341
Columbia	-0.009	-2.057	0.004	0.234	-0.011	-1.510	2743
Dade	-0.008	-11.896	-0.005	-10.456	-0.005	-2.796	105955
Desoto	-0.019	-5.166	-0.007	-0.990	0.022	0.651	903
Dixie	-0.009	-2.387	-0.010	-2.833	0.000		501
Duval	-0.011	-23.980	-0.008	-9.151	-0.009	-11.405	53795
Escambia	-0.007	-10.325	-0.007	-5.365	-0.005	-4.343	18461
Flagler	-0.012	-3.594	-0.008	-1.247	-0.016	-2.715	2749
Franklin	-0.022	-0.973	-0.012	-0.426	-0.021	-1.919	497
Gadsden	-0.012	-2.356	-0.007	-0.799	-0.020	-2.671	1091
Gilchrist	-0.037	-3.728	-0.020	-2.776	-0.006	-1.604	714
Glades	0.010	0.221	-0.014	-2.677	0.000		417
Gulf	-0.018	-2.820	-0.004	-0.971	-0.014	-2.080	978
Hamilton	-0.022	-1.303	-0.024	-1.246	0.000		231
Hardee	-0.021	-4.531	-0.010	-1.946	-0.021	-3.585	529
Hendry	-0.015	-2.928	-0.009	-1.817	-0.017	-3.551	1188
Hernando	-0.014	-8.734	-0.009	-6.685	-0.003	-0.948	17249
Highlands	-0.020	-4.126	-0.007	-1.772	-0.012	-0.992	6666
Hillsborough	-0.012	-29.962	-0.010	-23.583	-0.009	-14.391	104045
Homes	0.028	0.803	-0.009	-0.886	-0.006	-1.448	322
Indian River	-0.012	-4.290	-0.007	-2.707	-0.012	-2.355	18070
Jackson	-0.001	-0.029	-0.015	-2.613	0.011	0.389	1212
Jefferson	0.028	0.765	-0.016	-1.574	0.055	1.372	401
Lafayette	-0.140	-1.389	-0.068	-1.477	0.000		111
Lake	-0.011	-9.765	-0.007	-6.494	-0.011	-7.235	31166
Lee	-0.010	-10.998	-0.005	-6.252	-0.007	-4.162	78781
Leon	-0.016	-15.127	-0.005	-1.769	-0.013	-8.415	14165
Levy	-0.031	-6.642	-0.013	-0.970	-0.008	-0.377	2133
Liberty	-0.194	-0.885	-0.035	-1.383	-0.013	-0.698	143
Madison	-0.052	-1.651	-0.062	-1.266	0.814	45.703	378
Manatee	-0.010	-7.442	-0.008	-6.545	-0.008	-4.588	38387
Marion	-0.013	-8.561	-0.006	-3.898	-0.010	-3.251	27502
Martin	-0.019	-4.194	-0.007	-1.873	-0.012	-2.183	16268
Monroe	-0.007	-2.786	0.004	1.135	-0.007	-1.717	4162
Nassau	-0.012	-5.216	0.002	0.385	-0.014	-5.572	8481
Okaloosa	-0.005	-6.272	-0.004	-4.820	-0.004	-4.301	15563

Okeechobee	0.221	1.170	-0.034	-4.143	-0.012	-1.198	1720
Orange	-0.010	-19.706	-0.008	-16.954	-0.007	-10.415	72968
Osceola	-0.008	-8.243	-0.005	-6.745	-0.007	-4.736	23191
Palm Beach	-0.018	-28.850	-0.009	-12.991	-0.013	-12.287	114591
Pasco	-0.012	-14.561	-0.005	-6.041	-0.007	-5.056	49944
Pinellas	-0.017	-16.252	-0.010	-7.596	-0.015	-13.166	76012
Polk	-0.009	-6.457	-0.014	-11.868	-0.012	-3.600	67196
Putnam	-0.025	-3.888	-0.023	-3.151	-0.035	-4.923	4352
Saint Johns	-0.010	-7.015	-0.005	-3.073	-0.010	-8.470	29270
Saint Lucie	-0.017	-13.855	-0.008	-5.315	-0.010	-2.899	27787
Santa Rosa	-0.006	-9.766	-0.004	-4.036	-0.004	-4.008	18782
Sarasota	-0.013	-6.347	-0.006	-3.783	-0.010	-5.228	40384
Seminole	-0.011	-10.172	-0.008	-9.386	-0.008	-7.772	28163
Sumter	-0.009	-3.042	0.010	2.283	-0.008	-3.361	24597
Suwannee	0.025	0.453	-0.019	-0.998	0.001	0.030	1337
Taylor	-0.034	-3.464	-0.030	-0.955	-0.041	-2.681	719
Union	-0.018	-1.249	-0.059	-1.533	-0.032	-2.480	192
Volusia	-0.016	-15.381	-0.012	-10.914	-0.012	-6.921	41944
Wakulla	-0.002	-0.262	0.003	0.153	0.015	0.512	997
Walton	-0.003	-0.916	-0.003	-0.747	-0.001	-0.325	5416
Washington	-0.016	-2.613	-0.007	-3.109	-0.025	-1.663	805

			Table A5	**Homestead E Value Ratio**			
County	**black**	**t-stat**	**Hispanic**	**t-stat**	**Asian**	**t-stat**	**Obs**
Alachua	0.036	7.146	0.013	2.614	-0.027	-5.234	14304
Baker	-0.074	-3.184	-0.019	-0.602	-0.089	-2.568	919
Bay	0.007	0.967	0.000	-0.007	-0.006	-0.624	12727
Bradford	0.046	0.740	-0.046	-0.762	0.054	1.051	861
Brevard	0.008	2.569	0.008	3.056	-0.025	-6.019	49821
Broward	0.018	6.940	0.020	8.652	-0.013	-2.502	18806
Calhoun	-0.294	-1.408	0.166	2.593	-0.242	-1.163	233
Charlotte	0.003	0.095	-0.022	-2.054	-0.022	-0.718	22701
Citrus	-0.008	-0.560	-0.010	-0.671	0.005	0.173	9165
Clay	-0.021	-7.220	-0.011	-2.563	-0.021	-3.814	16688
Collier	0.047	8.970	0.056	19.662	0.001	0.177	32341
Columbia	0.041	1.152	0.024	0.396	-0.091	-2.948	2743
Dade	0.035	21.291	0.022	26.466	0.020	5.649	105955
Desoto	0.075	2.270	0.051	1.510	-0.014	-0.214	903
Dixie	-0.089	-1.663	-0.077	-0.941	0.000		501
Duval	0.022	13.829	0.013	4.831	-0.001	-0.450	53795

Escambia	0.019	4.866	-0.003	-0.328	-0.006	-0.879	18461
Flagler	-0.018	-2.021	0.031	2.241	-0.011	-0.563	2749
Franklin	0.048	0.803	-0.021	-0.921	0.072	2.197	497
Gadsden	0.075	2.371	0.080	0.809	0.181	5.986	1091
Gilchrist	0.272	0.933	-0.159	-2.608	-0.005	-1.426	714
Glades	-0.071	-0.767	0.183	1.568	0.000		417
Gulf	-0.045	-1.159	-0.037	-0.710	-0.091	-1.785	978
Hamilton	-0.103	-0.791	-0.543	-1.087	0.000		231
Hardee	-0.086	-1.594	-0.007	-0.181	0.115	2.589	529
Hendry	0.100	1.288	0.064	2.842	-0.054	-0.977	1188
Hernando	-0.040	-5.948	-0.005	-1.114	-0.028	-2.174	17249
Highlands	-0.002	-0.083	-0.004	-0.243	-0.045	-2.117	6666
Hillsborough	0.008	6.389	0.018	14.626	-0.021	-11.662	104045
Homes	0.631	1.088	-0.105	-0.710	-0.348	-5.903	322
Indian River	0.070	7.047	0.039	5.105	0.013	0.913	18070
Jackson	0.026	0.501	-0.110	-2.361	0.165	0.977	1212
Jefferson	0.059	1.254	-0.167	-2.599	0.003	0.064	401
Lafayette	-0.326	-0.993	-0.151	-1.256	0.000		111
Lake	-0.024	-8.612	-0.014	-5.647	-0.035	-7.216	31166
Lee	0.028	8.752	0.047	22.569	-0.005	-1.204	78781
Leon	0.043	10.013	0.018	2.621	-0.033	-5.625	14165
Levy	0.019	0.314	-0.058	-0.630	0.103	0.442	2133
Liberty	-0.528	-1.942	0.022	0.612	-0.644	-4.822	143
Madison	-0.059	-0.516	-0.364	-1.962	0.404	2.782	378
Manatee	0.013	3.207	0.023	6.382	-0.016	-3.978	38387
Marion	-0.008	-1.510	0.001	0.260	-0.026	-3.083	27502
Martin	-0.008	-0.644	0.007	1.087	-0.040	-5.085	16268
Monroe	-0.012	-2.070	0.009	2.000	-0.007	-0.686	4162
Nassau	-0.010	-1.344	-0.002	-0.266	0.001	0.052	8481
Okaloosa	0.012	2.818	-0.001	-0.173	-0.008	-1.463	15563
Okeechobee	0.092	0.878	-0.056	-2.788	0.282	0.994	1720
Orange	0.021	13.751	0.011	9.456	-0.015	-8.659	72968
Osceola	-0.014	-4.664	0.005	2.414	-0.019	-3.706	23191
Palm Beach	0.022	13.554	0.032	21.654	0.000	-0.075	114591
Pasco	-0.030	-11.212	-0.014	-5.833	-0.045	-10.877	49944
Pinellas	0.007	2.374	0.016	5.751	-0.001	-0.172	76012
Polk	-0.008	-2.075	-0.026	-8.401	-0.066	-11.791	67196
Putnam	-0.020	-0.615	-0.022	-0.548	0.016	0.237	4352
Saint Johns	0.005	1.386	0.002	0.744	-0.016	-5.789	29270
Saint Lucie	0.000	0.145	0.019	6.853	-0.017	-2.219	27787
Santa Rosa	-0.015	-3.278	-0.021	-3.882	-0.006	-0.625	18782
Sarasota	0.015	2.264	0.025	6.100	-0.025	-5.158	40384
Seminole	0.012	3.726	0.006	2.616	-0.020	-6.217	28163

Sumter	0.009	0.803	-0.002	-0.324	-0.002	-0.309	24597
Suwannee	-0.060	-0.948	-0.058	-1.451	-0.187	-3.114	1337
Taylor	-0.044	-0.742	1.370	1.143	-0.132	-1.401	719
Union	0.118	0.477	-0.112	-2.051	-0.433	-4.493	192
Volusia	0.005	1.453	0.018	6.397	-0.026	-4.260	41944
Wakulla	0.018	0.424	-0.015	-0.477	-0.126	-1.721	997
Walton	-0.002	-0.127	-0.024	-2.571	-0.014	-0.955	5416
Washington	0.001	0.035	0.062	0.879	0.073	2.317	805

			Table A6	**Senior Ex Value Ratio**			
County	**black**	**t-stat**	**Hispanic**	**t-stat**	**Asian**	**t-stat**	**Obs**
Alachua	-0.001	-1.538	0.000	-0.198	-0.001	-1.745	14304
Baker	0.001	0.132	-0.007	-2.711	-0.010	-2.506	919
Bay	0.000	-0.277	0.000	-0.063	-0.002	-0.949	12727
Bradford	0.002	0.272	-0.006	-2.799	-0.005	-1.030	861
Brevard	-0.001	-0.800	0.000	-0.452	-0.004	-5.535	49821
Broward	-0.006	-4.584	0.001	0.583	-0.006	-2.713	18806
Calhoun	0.000	-1.675	-0.009	-0.824	0.000	-2.224	233
Charlotte	-0.002	-1.051	-0.001	-0.599	0.001	0.433	22701
Citrus	0.000	-1.575	0.000	0.307	0.000	-1.614	9165
Clay	-0.003	-4.371	-0.004	-7.959	-0.002	-1.572	16688
Collier	-0.001	-9.948	0.000	0.994	-0.001	-9.866	32341
Columbia	-0.011	-5.112	-0.015	-6.740	0.000	0.038	2743
Dade	0.000	-0.132	0.001	4.817	0.000	0.084	105955
Desoto	-0.017	-4.345	-0.013	-5.018	-0.014	-2.422	903
Dixie	0.000	0.878	0.000	0.145	0.000		501
Duval	0.000	-1.695	0.000	1.330	0.000	-0.797	53795
Escambia	-0.002	-5.577	-0.001	-1.291	0.000	-0.361	18461
Flagler	-0.012	-5.231	0.009	0.799	-0.011	-4.815	2749
Franklin	-0.004	-1.233	-0.001	-0.811	0.000	-0.894	497
Gadsden	0.008	1.067	-0.002	-1.261	0.003	1.034	1091
Gilchrist	-0.003	-1.385	-0.003	-1.718	0.000	-1.246	714
Glades	0.002	0.356	0.002	0.289	0.000		417
Gulf	-0.005	-1.978	0.053	0.946	-0.008	-1.968	978
Hamilton	-0.015	-1.935	-0.043	-2.167	0.000		231
Hardee	-0.025	-3.148	-0.024	-3.571	-0.024	-2.178	529
Hendry	0.003	0.336	-0.004	-1.334	-0.009	-2.782	1188
Hernando	-0.008	-5.133	-0.003	-1.840	-0.002	-0.470	17249
Highlands	-0.003	-2.166	-0.004	-4.419	0.001	0.271	6666
Hillsborough	-0.001	-3.825	0.000	1.470	-0.001	-3.393	104045
Homes	-0.010	-0.747	-0.012	-1.557	-0.010	-1.004	322

Indian River	-0.002	-1.638	-0.001	-2.078	-0.001	-1.160	18070
Jackson	0.001	0.223	-0.007	-3.464	-0.004	-2.078	1212
Jefferson	0.001	0.411	-0.004	-1.128	-0.001	-0.799	401
Lafayette	0.000	-0.722	-0.001	-0.873	0.000		111
Lake	-0.005	-9.051	-0.003	-3.885	-0.003	-2.127	31166
Lee	-0.002	-2.295	0.001	0.887	-0.003	-3.213	78781
Leon	0.001	1.622	-0.001	-5.312	-0.001	-5.163	14165
Levy	-0.006	-0.853	0.029	0.860	-0.009	-2.476	2133
Liberty	0.000	-2.171	0.000	-2.745	0.000	1.942	143
Madison	-0.009	-2.072	-0.008	-1.355	-0.008	-1.123	378
Manatee	-0.001	-1.096	-0.001	-2.132	-0.001	-3.287	38387
Marion	0.000	0.878	0.000	-1.036	0.000	-1.207	27502
Martin	-0.002	-1.541	-0.002	-1.388	-0.004	-11.763	16268
Monroe	0.002	0.683	0.000	0.398	-0.001	-2.393	4162
Nassau	0.002	0.515	0.001	0.291	-0.002	-6.283	8481
Okaloosa	-0.002	-2.900	-0.002	-3.721	-0.001	-1.150	15563
Okeechobee	0.015	0.785	-0.014	-4.175	-0.011	-2.240	1720
Orange	-0.001	-3.703	0.001	3.696	-0.001	-3.023	72968
Osceola	-0.001	-2.353	0.003	5.308	-0.001	-1.091	23191
Palm Beach	-0.001	-4.913	0.000	1.273	-0.001	-4.181	114591
Pasco	0.000	-22.146	0.000	-8.719	0.000	-19.650	49944
Pinellas	-0.002	-4.340	-0.001	-1.167	-0.002	-5.761	76012
Polk	-0.008	-9.156	-0.004	-3.412	-0.008	-5.225	67196
Putnam	-0.009	-3.394	-0.012	-4.879	-0.012	-5.098	4352
Saint Johns	-0.001	-2.343	0.000	0.297	-0.002	-4.063	29270
Saint Lucie	-0.003	-5.171	-0.001	-1.777	-0.002	-0.995	27787
Santa Rosa	-0.002	-3.263	-0.002	-3.609	0.000	-0.170	18782
Sarasota	0.000	-2.338	0.000	0.907	0.000	-2.116	40384
Seminole	-0.001	-3.185	-0.001	-1.140	-0.001	-2.100	28163
Sumter	-0.001	-10.980	-0.001	-1.922	0.001	0.764	24597
Suwannee	0.002	0.313	-0.008	-2.991	0.008	0.504	1337
Taylor	0.000	1.557	0.000	1.013	0.000	0.179	719
Union	-0.008	-1.471	-0.009	-1.229	-0.008	-1.038	192
Volusia	-0.003	-1.446	0.003	1.646	-0.006	-2.280	41944
Wakulla	0.025	0.847	0.012	0.653	-0.005	-1.031	997
Walton	-0.004	-5.698	-0.003	-5.671	-0.003	-5.220	5416
Washington	-0.009	-2.892	-0.003	-1.886	-0.012	-1.732	805

			Table A7	**Disability Ex Value Ratio**			
County	**black**	**t-stat**	**Hispanic**	**t-stat**	**Asian**	**t-stat**	**Obs**
Alachua	0.003	1.746	0.002	0.839	-0.003	-8.035	14304

Baker	-0.005	-0.406	0.022	0.559	-0.015	-1.984	919
Bay	0.006	1.504	0.006	1.145	-0.005	-1.631	12727
Bradford	0.020	1.109	-0.004	-1.433	-0.002	-0.537	861
Brevard	0.011	4.418	0.003	1.736	0.001	0.437	49821
Broward	0.005	3.120	-0.001	-1.595	-0.003	-1.699	18806
Calhoun	-0.069	-0.906	-0.001	-0.974	-0.005	-0.829	233
Charlotte	-0.016	-4.496	0.011	0.744	-0.014	-2.965	22701
Citrus	0.002	0.163	0.009	1.082	-0.008	-1.659	9165
Clay	0.012	4.482	0.002	0.603	-0.007	-5.058	16688
Collier	0.000	-0.024	-0.001	-0.682	0.001	0.343	32341
Columbia	0.009	1.167	0.001	0.104	-0.010	-4.729	2743
Dade	0.001	2.462	0.000	-1.085	0.000	0.294	105955
Desoto	-0.006	-2.222	-0.006	-3.091	-0.006	-1.468	903
Dixie	0.004	0.476	-0.010	-1.670	0.000		501
Duval	0.006	8.062	0.002	2.323	0.001	0.749	53795
Escambia	0.003	2.154	0.000	-0.033	-0.002	-2.337	18461
Flagler	0.035	2.946	-0.005	-1.119	-0.008	-3.141	2749
Franklin	0.051	1.101	-0.004	-0.780	0.585	247.260	497
Gadsden	0.019	1.545	0.024	1.082	0.009	1.697	1091
Gilchrist	-0.007	-1.318	-0.018	-1.403	-0.001	-1.083	714
Glades	0.012	0.416	-0.035	-1.605	0.000		417
Gulf	0.042	0.956	0.104	0.998	-0.010	-1.375	978
Hamilton	0.021	0.502	-0.036	-1.210	0.000		231
Hardee	-0.011	-1.863	-0.006	-1.438	-0.008	-1.311	529
Hendry	0.006	0.500	-0.007	-2.560	-0.009	-2.208	1188
Hernando	0.019	2.887	-0.001	-0.432	0.013	1.257	17249
Highlands	0.006	0.786	-0.005	-1.445	-0.001	-0.092	6666
Hillsborough	0.011	10.809	0.002	3.551	-0.003	-4.321	104045
Homes	0.049	0.754	-0.039	-2.367	0.000	0.518	322
Indian River	0.004	1.070	0.006	1.568	0.009	1.120	18070
Jackson	0.015	1.271	-0.017	-4.205	-0.011	-2.408	1212
Jefferson	-0.001	-0.901	-0.009	-1.224	0.036	0.956	401
Lafayette	0.000	-1.324	-0.002	-0.951	0.000		111
Lake	0.006	2.469	0.002	1.079	-0.006	-3.229	31166
Lee	0.001	0.826	-0.002	-2.004	-0.002	-1.086	78781
Leon	0.003	1.772	0.001	0.267	-0.003	-6.031	14165
Levy	0.010	0.574	-0.014	-5.018	0.124	1.530	2133
Liberty	0.070	0.849	-0.034	-0.942	-0.003	-0.265	143
Madison	-0.009	-0.736	-0.012	-1.318	-0.001	-1.047	378
Manatee	0.008	2.723	0.001	0.644	-0.002	-1.156	38387
Marion	0.003	1.084	0.001	0.493	-0.005	-1.498	27502
Martin	0.001	0.152	-0.002	-1.782	0.001	0.277	16268
Monroe	0.004	0.534	0.002	0.535	-0.003	-2.500	4162

Nassau	0.019	2.441	0.001	0.106	0.008	0.693	8481
Okaloosa	0.008	2.210	0.001	0.388	0.000	0.046	15563
Okeechobee	-0.021	-2.504	-0.014	-1.838	-0.014	-1.626	1720
Orange	0.007	7.031	0.007	9.061	-0.001	-1.276	72968
Osceola	0.009	4.010	0.006	5.418	-0.002	-0.915	23191
Palm Beach	0.001	2.168	-0.001	-2.300	-0.002	-2.563	114591
Pasco	0.013	5.265	0.000	-0.280	-0.002	-1.239	49944
Pinellas	0.008	4.104	-0.001	-0.656	-0.003	-2.466	76012
Polk	0.004	3.302	0.001	0.566	-0.005	-3.707	67196
Putnam	-0.008	-1.867	-0.011	-2.227	-0.004	-0.596	4352
Saint Johns	0.014	3.533	0.005	1.734	-0.004	-4.651	29270
Saint Lucie	0.004	2.465	0.000	-0.270	-0.006	-3.101	27787
Santa Rosa	0.010	2.608	0.003	0.705	0.000	-0.119	18782
Sarasota	0.006	1.556	-0.001	-0.634	-0.002	-1.192	40384
Seminole	0.005	2.791	0.001	0.974	-0.002	-2.179	28163
Sumter	0.012	1.330	-0.006	-3.428	-0.007	-10.518	24597
Suwannee	0.004	0.201	-0.001	-0.061	-0.021	-3.464	1337
Taylor	-0.028	-1.740	-0.013	-2.095	0.175	1.100	719
Union	-0.009	-1.067	0.010	0.771	-0.014	-0.995	192
Volusia	0.007	2.884	0.001	0.830	-0.003	-0.861	41944
Wakulla	-0.011	-3.444	0.035	0.788	-0.018	-2.717	997
Walton	0.027	1.607	-0.004	-4.643	-0.004	-4.537	5416
Washington	0.012	0.610	-0.009	-2.161	-0.008	-1.188	805

Appendix B: Reported are the results from estimating the Gender Value Ratios (Equation 2) for all Florida Counties.

Table B1 Taxable Value Ratio

Table B2 Just Value Ratio

Table B3 Assessed Value Ratio

Table B4 SOH Value Ratio

Table B5 Homestead Exemption Value Ratio

Table B6 Senior Exemption Value Ratio

Table B7 Disability Exemption Value Ratio

		Table B1 Taxable Value Ratio			
County	**female**	**t-stat**	**male**	**t-stat**	**Obs**
Alachua	-0.083	-16.159	-0.038	-6.780	10565

Baker	-0.109	-2.999	-0.037	-1.266	930
Bay	-0.066	-7.053	-0.003	-0.381	10626
Bradford	-0.097	-2.317	-0.036	-0.943	771
Brevard	-0.034	-6.008	0.014	2.674	43188
Broward	-0.060	-1.674	0.031	1.099	338
Calhoun	-0.227	-2.079	-0.142	-0.851	185
Charlotte	-0.171	-7.958	-0.133	-6.687	20070
Citrus	-0.073	-3.267	-0.018	-0.832	7844
Clay	-0.063	-10.964	-0.014	-2.343	14877
Collier	-0.057	-19.154	-0.014	-5.940	26136
Columbia	-0.006	-0.196	-0.024	-0.951	2361
Dade	0.035	0.351	-0.004	-0.048	51
Desoto	-0.060	-2.125	-0.026	-0.837	766
Dixie	-0.047	-0.510	-0.064	-0.774	375
Duval	-0.030	-7.457	0.017	4.405	46743
Escambia	-0.078	-16.640	-0.013	-3.192	16169
Flagler	-0.063	-4.130	-0.015	-0.870	2079
Franklin	-0.044	-0.646	-0.063	-1.713	406
Gadsden	0.088	1.270	0.010	0.168	896
Gilchrist	-0.106	-2.742	-0.060	-1.462	616
Glades	0.074	1.027	0.089	1.439	377
Gulf	0.077	1.063	-0.052	-0.956	803
Hamilton	0.066	0.595	-0.178	-2.484	209
Hardee	-0.064	-0.861	-0.067	-1.698	429
Hendry	-0.043	-0.935	-0.044	-1.055	1019
Hernando	-0.048	-4.213	-0.007	-0.653	12916
Highlands	-0.102	-2.116	0.010	0.217	5602
Hillsborough	-0.028	-8.932	0.015	4.831	84884
Homes	-0.029	-0.389	-0.117	-1.712	260
Indian River	-0.069	-12.719	-0.025	-4.509	15752
Jackson	-0.121	-2.513	0.015	0.230	1019
Jefferson	-0.097	-1.695	-0.207	-3.866	347
Lafayette	0.119	0.395	-0.166	-1.226	88
Lake	-0.058	-15.779	-0.016	-4.098	27782
Lee	-0.056	-21.898	0.001	0.482	67051
Leon	-0.042	-4.606	0.013	1.456	12533
Levy	-0.220	-1.900	-0.157	-1.397	1799
Liberty	-0.250	-1.288	-0.324	-1.733	110
Madison	-0.148	-1.439	-0.067	-0.768	314
Manatee	-0.027	-4.935	0.019	3.737	33560
Marion	-0.043	-4.735	-0.006	-0.656	23893
Martin	-0.091	-15.988	-0.011	-2.108	14523
Monroe	-0.035	-4.359	-0.016	-2.434	3270

Nassau	-0.053	-6.363	-0.009	-1.265	7613
Okaloosa	-0.063	-10.198	-0.008	-1.508	13283
Okeechobee	-0.036	-0.610	-0.013	-0.401	1476
Orange	-0.031	-10.381	0.006	2.288	61609
Osceola	-0.018	-2.599	0.003	0.509	18079
Palm Beach	-0.081	-46.151	-0.026	-14.567	99645
Pasco	-0.068	-21.278	-0.036	-10.327	40322
Pinellas	-0.040	-10.160	0.013	3.409	65454
Polk	-0.048	-5.324	0.009	1.073	53376
Putnam	-0.082	-1.285	-0.080	-1.385	3339
Saint Johns	-0.033	-6.962	0.013	2.936	21566
Saint Lucie	-0.029	-3.256	0.006	0.695	22147
Santa Rosa	-0.067	-9.738	-0.020	-2.941	16699
Sarasota	-0.031	-6.081	0.010	2.064	34560
Seminole	-0.077	-25.205	-0.025	-7.625	25255
Sumter	-0.046	-13.683	-0.035	-7.766	22355
Suwannee	-0.012	-0.250	-0.018	-0.370	1136
Taylor	-0.037	-0.435	-0.018	-0.189	614
Union	0.018	0.219	0.039	0.611	159
Volusia	-0.045	-14.987	-0.018	-5.989	35386
Wakulla	-0.063	-0.854	-0.031	-0.511	680
Walton	-0.064	-6.218	-0.026	-2.321	4354
Washington	-0.066	-1.570	0.013	0.369	685

	Table B2 Just Value Ratio				
County	**female**	**t-stat**	**male**	**t-stat**	**Obs**
Alachua	0.003	0.860	0.007	1.813	10565
Baker	-0.098	-2.489	-0.090	-2.617	930
Bay	-0.016	-1.755	-0.007	-0.782	10626
Bradford	-0.096	-1.753	-0.064	-1.239	771
Brevard	0.001	0.240	0.002	1.200	43188
Broward	0.008	1.022	0.005	0.686	338
Calhoun	-0.497	-2.422	-0.092	-0.264	185
Charlotte	-0.164	-4.775	-0.132	-3.935	20070
Citrus	-0.002	-0.092	0.027	1.196	7844
Clay	0.005	1.339	0.015	3.794	14877
Collier	-0.002	-1.749	0.000	-0.214	26136
Columbia	0.012	0.288	-0.016	-0.415	2361
Dade	0.020	0.414	-0.017	-0.433	51
Desoto	0.006	0.167	0.020	0.475	766
Dixie	0.032	0.748	-0.031	-1.062	375
Duval	0.004	2.371	0.002	1.484	46743

Escambia	-0.003	-0.978	0.000	-0.146	16169
Flagler	0.004	0.364	0.020	1.446	2079
Franklin	0.117	1.363	-0.008	-0.203	406
Gadsden	0.129	1.523	0.045	0.520	896
Gilchrist	-0.083	-1.408	-0.042	-0.707	616
Glades	0.171	1.860	0.165	2.550	377
Gulf	0.074	0.794	-0.013	-0.150	803
Hamilton	-0.112	-0.504	-0.330	-1.823	209
Hardee	0.059	0.559	-0.046	-0.888	429
Hendry	0.078	1.021	-0.030	-0.498	1019
Hernando	-0.005	-0.964	-0.002	-0.428	12916
Highlands	-0.135	-1.950	-0.040	-0.585	5602
Hillsborough	0.000	0.182	0.003	1.865	84884
Homes	0.004	0.035	-0.036	-0.204	260
Indian River	-0.019	-4.312	-0.006	-1.429	15752
Jackson	0.012	0.146	0.001	0.014	1019
Jefferson	-0.087	-1.204	-0.124	-2.111	347
Lafayette	0.441	0.534	-0.338	-0.973	88
Lake	0.001	0.844	0.009	4.578	27782
Lee	-0.004	-2.889	-0.001	-0.433	67051
Leon	-0.002	-0.357	-0.005	-0.874	12533
Levy	-0.440	-2.436	-0.337	-1.891	1799
Liberty	-0.506	-1.832	-0.555	-1.916	110
Madison	-0.066	-0.275	-0.327	-1.733	314
Manatee	0.002	0.880	0.003	1.252	33560
Marion	-0.006	-0.883	-0.005	-0.776	23893
Martin	0.004	1.777	0.007	3.003	14523
Monroe	-0.001	-0.203	0.003	0.665	3270
Nassau	0.002	0.290	0.005	0.930	7613
Okaloosa	0.000	0.031	0.001	0.421	13283
Okeechobee	0.095	1.019	-0.061	-0.946	1476
Orange	-0.003	-2.568	0.000	0.054	61609
Osceola	-0.001	-0.491	0.000	0.138	18079
Palm Beach	-0.005	-6.478	0.000	0.258	99645
Pasco	-0.001	-0.524	0.003	1.518	40322
Pinellas	0.000	0.012	0.002	1.217	65454
Polk	-0.009	-0.791	0.014	1.320	53376
Putnam	-0.188	-1.467	-0.231	-1.856	3339
Saint Johns	-0.001	-0.399	0.001	1.051	21566
Saint Lucie	-0.001	-0.215	-0.005	-1.039	22147
Santa Rosa	0.014	2.104	0.006	1.039	16699
Sarasota	0.000	-0.196	0.000	-0.143	34560
Seminole	-0.005	-4.075	0.000	-0.256	25255

Sumter	-0.008	-4.596	-0.003	-1.282	22355
Suwannee	0.009	0.118	0.063	0.659	1136
Taylor	-0.005	-0.034	-0.154	-1.057	614
Union	-0.169	-1.646	-0.097	-1.204	159
Volusia	0.003	2.031	0.004	3.076	35386
Wakulla	-0.037	-0.384	-0.015	-0.219	680
Walton	-0.010	-1.127	-0.009	-0.858	4354
Washington	0.083	1.244	0.012	0.328	685

		Table B3 Assessed Value Ratio			
County	**female**	**t-stat**	**male**	**t-stat**	**Obs**
Alachua	0.006	1.526	0.017	4.180	10565
Baker	-0.084	-2.231	-0.075	-2.224	930
Bay	-0.017	-1.822	-0.003	-0.350	10626
Bradford	-0.082	-1.500	-0.043	-0.835	771
Brevard	-0.001	-0.369	0.002	0.806	43188
Broward	0.023	1.268	0.040	3.044	338
Calhoun	-0.472	-2.318	-0.061	-0.176	185
Charlotte	-0.147	-4.968	-0.102	-3.466	20070
Citrus	-0.006	-0.251	0.024	1.085	7844
Clay	0.005	1.415	0.026	6.185	14877
Collier	-0.004	-2.050	0.005	3.508	26136
Columbia	0.016	0.386	-0.004	-0.116	2361
Dade	0.021	0.429	-0.028	-0.667	51
Desoto	0.013	0.367	0.040	1.040	766
Dixie	0.026	0.594	-0.036	-1.214	375
Duval	0.001	0.330	-0.001	-0.778	46743
Escambia	-0.002	-0.629	0.004	1.459	16169
Flagler	0.009	0.775	0.031	2.245	2079
Franklin	0.100	1.183	0.009	0.211	406
Gadsden	0.152	1.801	0.068	0.795	896
Gilchrist	-0.061	-1.059	-0.019	-0.326	616
Glades	0.165	1.801	0.146	2.279	377
Gulf	0.078	0.873	0.004	0.045	803
Hamilton	-0.078	-0.365	-0.317	-1.806	209
Hardee	0.055	0.521	-0.025	-0.494	429
Hendry	0.080	1.071	-0.022	-0.358	1019
Hernando	-0.008	-1.260	-0.005	-0.786	12916
Highlands	-0.121	-1.781	-0.037	-0.545	5602
Hillsborough	-0.002	-0.883	-0.001	-0.317	84884
Homes	0.015	0.146	-0.004	-0.021	260
Indian River	-0.021	-4.743	0.004	0.840	15752

Jackson	0.033	0.421	0.017	0.225	1019
Jefferson	-0.105	-1.443	-0.115	-1.990	347
Lafayette	0.245	0.376	-0.262	-0.879	88
Lake	0.001	0.497	0.018	8.706	27782
Lee	-0.004	-2.549	0.004	2.664	67051
Leon	-0.008	-1.202	-0.012	-1.829	12533
Levy	-0.412	-2.438	-0.321	-1.933	1799
Liberty	-0.428	-1.603	-0.508	-2.029	110
Madison	-0.065	-0.276	-0.325	-1.775	314
Manatee	0.001	0.164	0.002	0.574	33560
Marion	-0.009	-1.257	-0.007	-0.929	23893
Martin	0.004	1.276	0.011	4.020	14523
Monroe	-0.001	-0.271	0.006	1.373	3270
Nassau	-0.003	-0.394	0.013	2.108	7613
Okaloosa	-0.003	-0.719	0.007	1.890	13283
Okeechobee	0.056	0.721	-0.065	-1.290	1476
Orange	-0.005	-3.160	-0.004	-3.003	61609
Osceola	-0.003	-0.826	-0.002	-0.576	18079
Palm Beach	-0.010	-10.143	0.011	11.113	99645
Pasco	0.000	0.068	0.015	6.748	40322
Pinellas	0.000	-0.217	0.004	2.005	65454
Polk	-0.014	-1.295	0.008	0.776	53376
Putnam	-0.110	-1.001	-0.167	-1.594	3339
Saint Johns	-0.005	-2.073	0.001	0.626	21566
Saint Lucie	-0.006	-1.210	-0.009	-1.743	22147
Santa Rosa	0.013	2.029	0.011	1.753	16699
Sarasota	-0.003	-1.113	-0.001	-0.315	34560
Seminole	-0.002	-1.663	0.012	7.795	25255
Sumter	-0.012	-5.825	-0.001	-0.421	22355
Suwannee	0.022	0.291	0.067	0.757	1136
Taylor	0.000	-0.001	-0.175	-1.305	614
Union	-0.126	-1.284	-0.038	-0.576	159
Volusia	0.006	3.591	0.015	10.139	35386
Wakulla	-0.039	-0.404	0.003	0.038	680
Walton	-0.012	-1.392	-0.003	-0.337	4354
Washington	0.083	1.250	0.021	0.578	685

		Table B4 SOH Value Ratio			
County	**female**	**t-stat**	**male**	**t-stat**	**Obs**
Alachua	-0.003	-1.795	-0.010	-6.750	10565
Baker	-0.013	-2.117	-0.015	-3.288	930
Bay	0.001	0.393	-0.004	-2.815	10626

Bradford	-0.014	-2.245	-0.021	-4.260	771
Brevard	0.002	0.860	0.000	0.161	43188
Broward	-0.015	-0.961	-0.035	-3.153	338
Calhoun	-0.025	-1.496	-0.031	-1.735	185
Charlotte	-0.017	-2.025	-0.030	-4.239	20070
Citrus	0.004	0.927	0.003	0.889	7844
Clay	-0.001	-0.446	-0.010	-10.641	14877
Collier	0.001	1.058	-0.006	-6.351	26136
Columbia	-0.004	-0.888	-0.012	-2.109	2361
Dade	-0.001	-0.164	0.010	1.237	51
Desoto	-0.007	-1.036	-0.021	-2.981	766
Dixie	0.006	0.687	0.005	0.754	375
Duval	0.003	3.159	0.004	3.860	46743
Escambia	-0.001	-0.838	-0.004	-5.319	16169
Flagler	-0.005	-1.279	-0.012	-3.547	2079
Franklin	0.017	1.020	-0.017	-1.718	406
Gadsden	-0.023	-4.582	-0.023	-4.121	896
Gilchrist	-0.022	-2.227	-0.023	-2.222	616
Glades	0.006	0.801	0.019	3.044	377
Gulf	-0.005	-0.532	-0.016	-2.652	803
Hamilton	-0.034	-1.639	-0.013	-0.970	209
Hardee	0.004	0.432	-0.020	-4.342	429
Hendry	-0.002	-0.210	-0.009	-1.670	1019
Hernando	0.002	0.972	0.002	1.061	12916
Highlands	-0.015	-2.046	-0.004	-0.512	5602
Hillsborough	0.002	2.088	0.003	3.962	84884
Homes	-0.011	-0.501	-0.033	-1.564	260
Indian River	0.003	1.559	-0.010	-6.536	15752
Jackson	-0.021	-1.498	-0.016	-1.247	1019
Jefferson	0.019	1.160	-0.009	-0.994	347
Lafayette	0.196	1.066	-0.076	-1.398	88
Lake	0.000	0.364	-0.009	-10.550	27782
Lee	0.000	0.269	-0.004	-5.641	67051
Leon	0.006	2.714	0.006	3.143	12533
Levy	-0.028	-1.050	-0.016	-0.603	1799
Liberty	-0.078	-1.638	-0.047	-0.732	110
Madison	-0.001	-0.038	-0.002	-0.057	314
Manatee	0.002	1.136	0.002	0.969	33560
Marion	0.003	1.300	0.001	0.566	23893
Martin	0.000	0.225	-0.004	-2.608	14523
Monroe	0.001	0.176	-0.004	-1.425	3270
Nassau	0.005	2.067	-0.007	-4.353	7613
Okaloosa	0.003	2.398	-0.005	-8.628	13283

Okeechobee	0.038	1.372	0.004	0.193	1476
Orange	0.002	1.803	0.004	5.270	61609
Osceola	0.001	0.818	0.002	1.439	18079
Palm Beach	0.005	7.908	-0.011	-18.874	99645
Pasco	-0.001	-1.364	-0.012	-17.334	40322
Pinellas	0.001	0.331	-0.002	-1.599	65454
Polk	0.005	2.347	0.006	2.996	53376
Putnam	-0.078	-1.642	-0.064	-1.328	3339
Saint Johns	0.004	2.407	0.000	0.140	21566
Saint Lucie	0.005	2.053	0.004	1.728	22147
Santa Rosa	0.001	0.707	-0.004	-7.621	16699
Sarasota	0.003	1.477	0.001	0.316	34560
Seminole	-0.002	-2.144	-0.012	-15.165	25255
Sumter	0.004	3.467	-0.002	-1.549	22355
Suwannee	-0.013	-1.361	-0.003	-0.235	1136
Taylor	-0.005	-0.348	0.021	0.607	614
Union	-0.043	-2.218	-0.059	-2.023	159
Volusia	-0.003	-3.165	-0.011	-13.153	35386
Wakulla	0.002	0.192	-0.017	-2.599	680
Walton	0.003	1.148	-0.005	-3.446	4354
Washington	0.001	0.077	-0.009	-2.089	685

	Table B5 Homestead Exemption Value Ratio				
County	**female**	**t-stat**	**male**	**t-stat**	**Obs**
Alachua	0.067	19.239	0.036	9.513	10565
Baker	0.008	0.371	-0.014	-0.751	930
Bay	0.040	7.909	0.007	1.414	10626
Bradford	0.014	0.439	-0.019	-0.635	771
Brevard	0.024	6.331	-0.013	-3.696	43188
Broward	0.062	2.606	0.001	0.048	338
Calhoun	-0.109	-1.060	0.172	0.897	185
Charlotte	0.023	2.145	0.007	0.634	20070
Citrus	0.023	2.287	-0.003	-0.291	7844
Clay	0.047	13.233	0.026	6.946	14877
Collier	0.042	23.063	0.015	11.154	26136
Columbia	0.028	1.261	0.028	1.349	2361
Dade	0.055	0.746	0.045	0.585	51
Desoto	0.047	2.026	0.067	2.543	766
Dixie	0.032	0.478	-0.008	-0.128	375
Duval	0.023	7.990	-0.015	-5.303	46743
Escambia	0.062	17.946	0.017	6.102	16169
Flagler	0.046	5.377	0.026	2.149	2079

Franklin	0.117	2.933	0.022	0.786	406
Gadsden	0.088	2.261	0.073	1.558	896
Gilchrist	0.054	1.477	0.055	1.601	616
Glades	0.009	0.153	-0.006	-0.134	377
Gulf	-0.006	-0.183	0.034	0.648	803
Hamilton	0.006	0.080	0.019	0.235	209
Hardee	0.074	1.532	0.002	0.047	429
Hendry	0.095	2.256	0.026	0.783	1019
Hernando	0.015	2.062	-0.015	-2.109	12916
Highlands	0.001	0.040	-0.031	-1.201	5602
Hillsborough	0.024	12.192	-0.011	-5.631	84884
Homes	0.086	1.174	0.074	0.629	260
Indian River	0.039	11.424	0.020	5.773	15752
Jackson	0.131	2.469	0.001	0.031	1019
Jefferson	0.010	0.212	0.012	0.396	347
Lafayette	0.188	0.525	-0.049	-0.254	88
Lake	0.042	17.331	0.016	5.818	27782
Lee	0.039	25.024	0.000	0.037	67051
Leon	0.025	4.500	-0.020	-3.870	12533
Levy	-0.152	-1.893	-0.120	-1.526	1799
Liberty	-0.067	-0.363	-0.169	-1.414	110
Madison	0.031	0.220	-0.161	-2.074	314
Manatee	0.023	6.301	-0.014	-4.208	33560
Marion	0.026	4.410	-0.005	-0.899	23893
Martin	0.067	17.468	0.019	5.516	14523
Monroe	0.026	5.836	0.009	2.414	3270
Nassau	0.035	6.997	0.017	3.421	7613
Okaloosa	0.045	10.769	0.012	3.638	13283
Okeechobee	0.066	2.061	-0.006	-0.168	1476
Orange	0.018	8.446	-0.013	-6.510	61609
Osceola	0.011	2.536	-0.010	-2.364	18079
Palm Beach	0.052	44.329	0.026	20.758	99645
Pasco	0.062	27.062	0.039	15.269	40322
Pinellas	0.033	12.643	-0.007	-2.873	65454
Polk	0.018	3.361	-0.008	-1.555	53376
Putnam	0.017	0.350	-0.041	-0.876	3339
Saint Johns	0.020	6.821	-0.010	-3.803	21566
Saint Lucie	0.020	3.632	-0.011	-2.141	22147
Santa Rosa	0.062	14.666	0.023	6.698	16699
Sarasota	0.024	6.778	-0.009	-2.727	34560
Seminole	0.055	26.340	0.031	13.215	25255
Sumter	0.034	15.377	0.025	8.454	22355
Suwannee	0.012	0.365	-0.017	-0.434	1136

Taylor	0.000	0.004	-0.093	-1.473	614
Union	-0.142	-2.202	-0.045	-0.734	159
Volusia	0.044	22.142	0.022	10.955	35386
Wakulla	0.032	0.878	0.002	0.079	680
Walton	0.034	4.549	0.018	2.402	4354
Washington	0.112	3.493	0.013	0.699	685

	Table B6 Senior Exemption Value Ratio				
County	**female**	**t-stat**	**male**	**t-stat**	**Obs**
Alachua	0.005	5.417	0.001	1.695	10565
Baker	0.011	1.281	0.001	0.114	930
Bay	0.005	2.203	-0.002	-0.987	10626
Bradford	0.012	2.506	0.000	-0.001	771
Brevard	0.003	2.520	-0.002	-1.500	43188
Broward	0.016	1.059	-0.003	-0.377	338
Calhoun	-0.005	-1.126	-0.009	-1.343	185
Charlotte	0.008	3.526	0.002	1.107	20070
Citrus	0.000	4.922	0.000	0.850	7844
Clay	0.007	5.249	0.001	1.155	14877
Collier	0.002	5.196	0.000	1.732	26136
Columbia	0.002	0.618	-0.005	-1.547	2361
Dade	0.033	0.967	0.003	0.335	51
Desoto	-0.002	-0.302	-0.007	-1.448	766
Dixie	0.000	0.578	0.000	-0.307	375
Duval	0.001	5.427	0.000	0.892	46743
Escambia	0.003	3.625	0.000	0.596	16169
Flagler	0.021	3.053	0.002	0.385	2079
Franklin	0.012	1.449	0.006	1.049	406
Gadsden	-0.007	-1.305	-0.007	-1.246	896
Gilchrist	0.001	0.318	0.004	0.795	616
Glades	0.010	1.321	0.005	2.179	377
Gulf	0.005	0.738	0.000	-0.045	803
Hamilton	-0.024	-2.641	-0.010	-0.894	209
Hardee	0.016	0.799	-0.006	-0.607	429
Hendry	0.001	0.133	0.002	0.402	1019
Hernando	0.005	2.066	-0.001	-0.477	12916
Highlands	0.005	3.307	0.002	1.799	5602
Hillsborough	0.001	4.253	0.000	-1.075	84884
Homes	0.020	1.271	0.054	0.927	260
Indian River	0.003	5.615	0.001	2.129	15752
Jackson	0.005	1.328	-0.001	-0.416	1019
Jefferson	0.010	1.005	0.004	1.205	347

Lafayette	0.000	-0.385	0.002	0.963	88
Lake	0.008	7.504	0.000	0.241	27782
Lee	0.006	9.975	0.000	0.076	67051
Leon	0.001	1.631	0.000	-0.687	12533
Levy	0.008	2.018	0.009	1.974	1799
Liberty	0.000	1.639	0.000	1.044	110
Madison	-0.009	-1.532	-0.012	-1.318	314
Manatee	0.001	0.936	-0.001	-1.935	33560
Marion	0.000	1.025	0.000	0.948	23893
Martin	0.008	7.496	0.001	1.438	14523
Monroe	0.002	1.474	0.001	1.017	3270
Nassau	0.006	3.837	0.000	-0.490	7613
Okaloosa	0.006	4.156	0.000	0.460	13283
Okeechobee	0.012	1.788	-0.008	-3.279	1476
Orange	0.001	3.357	0.000	0.073	61609
Osceola	0.002	1.378	-0.001	-1.176	18079
Palm Beach	0.004	14.701	0.001	2.460	99645
Pasco	0.000	31.938	0.000	26.422	40322
Pinellas	0.003	5.986	0.000	-1.010	65454
Polk	0.010	4.869	-0.001	-0.510	53376
Putnam	0.005	0.925	0.002	0.402	3339
Saint Johns	0.002	2.473	-0.001	-0.905	21566
Saint Lucie	0.003	1.993	-0.002	-1.078	22147
Santa Rosa	0.008	5.758	0.000	-0.536	16699
Sarasota	0.000	0.853	0.000	-0.710	34560
Seminole	0.003	4.352	0.000	-0.216	25255
Sumter	0.002	6.564	0.001	2.628	22355
Suwannee	0.000	0.014	-0.006	-1.546	1136
Taylor	0.000	1.549	0.000	0.405	614
Union	0.012	0.743	-0.002	-0.887	159
Volusia	0.011	7.571	-0.001	-0.708	35386
Wakulla	-0.003	-0.710	0.022	1.825	680
Walton	0.007	2.661	0.000	-0.281	4354
Washington	0.003	0.856	0.008	1.562	685

	Table B7 Disability Exemption Value Ratio				
County	**female**	**t-stat**	**male**	**t-stat**	**Obs**
Alachua	-0.002	-2.423	0.002	1.636	10565
Baker	-0.009	-1.134	0.003	0.244	930
Bay	-0.007	-2.345	-0.004	-1.279	10626
Bradford	0.006	0.842	0.002	0.430	771
Brevard	-0.002	-0.877	0.005	2.804	43188

Broward	-0.019	-1.727	-0.017	-1.750	338
Calhoun	-0.077	-1.035	-0.092	-1.123	185
Charlotte	-0.011	-2.780	0.012	1.596	20070
Citrus	-0.009	-2.310	0.002	0.486	7844
Clay	-0.003	-1.811	0.000	-0.033	14877
Collier	-0.003	-4.717	0.000	0.510	26136
Columbia	-0.006	-1.404	0.000	-0.064	2361
Dade	0.000	-0.712	0.000	-0.213	51
Desoto	-0.005	-1.436	-0.003	-0.752	766
Dixie	0.001	0.164	0.011	1.894	375
Duval	0.000	-0.421	0.002	2.229	46743
Escambia	-0.003	-2.335	-0.001	-1.352	16169
Flagler	-0.004	-0.934	0.014	1.698	2079
Franklin	-0.002	-1.294	0.011	1.220	406
Gadsden	-0.023	-1.745	-0.019	-1.186	896
Gilchrist	-0.013	-1.388	-0.009	-0.990	616
Glades	-0.053	-1.364	-0.006	-0.172	377
Gulf	-0.004	-0.626	0.007	0.662	803
Hamilton	0.006	0.163	-0.013	-0.384	209
Hardee	-0.002	-1.005	0.014	1.205	429
Hendry	-0.007	-1.496	-0.003	-0.557	1019
Hernando	0.001	0.192	0.009	3.402	12916
Highlands	-0.022	-1.035	-0.013	-0.634	5602
Hillsborough	-0.003	-2.244	0.002	1.377	84884
Homes	-0.050	-3.533	-0.005	-0.236	260
Indian River	-0.006	-5.563	0.003	1.698	15752
Jackson	-0.010	-1.753	-0.007	-1.274	1019
Jefferson	-0.003	-1.709	-0.003	-1.289	347
Lafayette	-0.002	-1.029	-0.002	-1.087	88
Lake	-0.006	-6.517	0.008	4.015	27782
Lee	-0.005	-6.829	0.000	0.301	67051
Leon	0.000	0.085	0.002	1.447	12533
Levy	0.005	1.268	0.014	3.777	1799
Liberty	-0.029	-1.413	-0.024	-1.504	110
Madison	-0.019	-2.276	-0.007	-0.448	314
Manatee	-0.002	-0.944	0.001	0.801	33560
Marion	-0.004	-1.686	0.006	2.300	23893
Martin	-0.002	-1.702	0.001	0.626	14523
Monroe	-0.005	-3.861	0.002	1.335	3270
Nassau	-0.003	-1.938	0.001	0.564	7613
Okaloosa	-0.004	-1.901	-0.002	-1.125	13283
Okeechobee	-0.024	-2.338	-0.012	-1.100	1476
Orange	0.001	0.631	0.004	4.220	61609

Osceola	-0.001	-0.669	0.005	2.386	18079
Palm Beach	-0.001	-4.361	0.002	4.533	99645
Pasco	-0.005	-5.548	0.003	2.227	40322
Pinellas	-0.001	-1.352	0.004	3.605	65454
Polk	0.001	1.039	0.005	4.479	53376
Putnam	-0.007	-1.080	-0.002	-0.334	3339
Saint Johns	-0.003	-1.499	0.000	0.220	21566
Saint Lucie	-0.005	-1.691	0.001	0.467	22147
Santa Rosa	-0.004	-2.073	-0.002	-0.880	16699
Sarasota	-0.003	-1.638	0.001	0.956	34560
Seminole	-0.001	-1.446	0.001	1.104	25255
Sumter	-0.008	-11.044	0.002	0.819	22355
Suwannee	-0.007	-1.096	0.020	1.408	1136
Taylor	-0.024	-1.371	-0.030	-1.145	614
Union	-0.007	-0.843	-0.010	-1.554	159
Volusia	-0.008	-8.411	0.004	2.996	35386
Wakulla	-0.006	-0.965	-0.001	-0.117	680
Walton	-0.004	-2.466	0.003	1.110	4354
Washington	-0.011	-2.839	-0.008	-1.470	685