**Search Procedure**

A systematic and comprehensive search was done to identify and gather research studies that explored the relationship between affordable housing and property values.

**Search keywords:** ‘Affordable housing,’ ‘low-income housing,’ ‘subsidized housing,’ and ‘mixed-income housing’ were identified as search terms and combined with the term ‘property values.’ For example, the searching was done for “affordable housing” AND ‘property values;’ “low-income housing” AND ‘property values;’ etc. The Boolean search command ‘AND’ was used where applicable.

The systematic search comprised the following steps:

**Step 1. Electronic databases:** Nineteen different electronic databases were identified from a range of areas, including architecture, urban design, planning, social sciences, economics, real estate, business and management. This was followed by the searching of dissertations and theses relevant to the subject from the ProQuest database.

**Step 2. Internet search engines:** Four different Internet search engines, including Google, Google Scholar, Kartoo and Windows Live, were utilized to conduct a comprehensive web search. The first six pages of the results were checked (the first 6 maps for Kartoo). If the webpage listed relevant sources, the links were followed.

**Step 3. Reference documents:** Bibliographies on the topic and reference lists of literature review documents obtained from databases and search engine results were also consulted.

**Step 4. Library catalog search:** Arizona State University library catalog was scanned for any other published books and reports on the topic.

**Step 5. Publication listings:** Amazon.com was searched for any other publications on the topic.

**Step 6. Websites of relevant organizations and research institutions:** Publication lists and websites of relevant organizations and research institutions were checked for additional sources. The list of these organizations was compiled by the principal investigator and can be accessed via the Web Resources section of the ASU Stardust Center website (http://stardust.asu.edu/research_resources/resources.php).

**Step 7. Hand searching:** Hand searching of relevant journals and conference proceedings were done if sources identified in the preceding steps could not be accessed electronically.

If a source was identified but could not be obtained electronically from the university library or via Interlibrary Loan Service, the researcher(s) and/or publisher institution were contacted to request a copy of the study.

**Selection Criteria**

After compiling these studies, inclusion and exclusion criteria were developed and each study was compared against these criteria. In order to be maintained for synthesis, the study had to:

- be published in 1995 or later,
- include public housing, subsidized housing, low-income housing (non-subsidized), federally assisted housing, tax-credit rental development, or affordable housing, and
- examine the value of surrounding property (whether in the form of actual sales price, appraised price or other property value indicator). Other outcome variables (e.g. mobility) could be included; but the essential one needed to be the value of surrounding property.

These studies could include new developments, rehabilitation projects or existing developments.

The studies that were published before 1995 or did not reflect primary research or literature review (such as newspaper articles and annotated bibliographies) were excluded from the analysis/synthesis.

**Studies retained in separate categories:** If a study is not a description of empirical/archival research, but simply a literature review or an essay that references empirical studies, it was excluded from analysis/synthesis, but retained for review check of the synthesis.
Studies examining specialized housing types, such as group homes, nursing homes, or manufactured housing that is specified as affordable or low-income were not included for analysis/synthesis but retained for future research synthesis reports. Mixed-income and HOPE VI developments were also retained for future synthesis project.

**Results of the Search and Filtering Procedure**

As a result of the systematic search, a total of 105 articles, reports, books, and other research documents were identified.

Application of these eligibility criteria resulted in an initial selection of 31 studies for analysis and 15 studies for reference check. Thirteen studies were retained as designating specialized or mixed-income housing. The rest of the studies were excluded due to being published before 1995 (21 studies) and for not being primary research studies or literature review (25 studies).

**Research Analysis Process**

A template data extraction form was developed to consistently summarize and assess the selected studies. The form included 5 sections:

1. **Publication information:** Reference information of the study as well as other references mentioned of importance are listed in this section.

2. **Quality assessment:** This section assesses the quality of the study based on (a) methodological soundness, (b) methodological relevance, (c) construct relevance, and (d) sample relevance. Distinctive strengths and limitations of the study are also identified.

Two independent raters assessed each study’s methodology using 3-point scales for each of the four criteria. When divergent assessments occurred, the raters discussed and re-evaluated the bases for their assessments until consensus was reached. The 4 criteria were established as:

- **Methodological quality:** soundness of study’s methodology appropriate to research domain and study’s research question. Rated as either (3) strong, no or very minor discrepancies; (2) good, a few discrepancies or questions remain about specific methods; or (1) many problems.

- **Methodological relevance:** appropriateness of the research design for addressing the review question. Rated as either (3) study design addresses all critical constructs, and study’s hypothesis/research question is congruent with review question; (2) achieves only one of the two criteria above; or (1) achieves neither of the two criteria above.

- **Construct relevance:** appropriateness of operational definitions to constructs in review question. Constructs considered were: property values; affordable housing; surrounding homes; negative or positive impacts. Operationalization of each construct rated as either: (3) comprehensive and appropriate; (2) appropriate but limited; or (1) not appropriate.

- **Sample relevancy** (of people, place, type of housing, community characteristics, etc.). Rated as either (3) strong generalization (systematic sampling described) (2) qualified generalization (less systematic sampling or incomplete description of sample characteristics); or (1) qualified transferability to similar conditions that the sample represents (e.g. data is specific to New York City but an extensive data set may be possible in other larger cities).

3. **Study characteristics:** In addition to re-verification of study eligibility, this section provides information on study’s aim/purpose/hypotheses, sample size and characteristics, sampling technique, research design, variables, operationalization of constructs, data collection instruments and tools.

4. **Outcome measures and results:** This section describes data analysis method used in the study, any missing data, outcomes of the study, and any limiting and confounding factors.

After the data extraction processes of the selected studies were completed, 21 studies were retained for research synthesis process and 10 studies were excluded. This exclusion is due to the following reasons:

- Even though the reports passed the initial eligibility criteria, they failed to pass the re-verification step after in-depth analysis due to their emphasis on other variables (such as neighborhood quality) instead of property values, examining the impact of other housing types (instead of affordable housing) on property values, and using secondary data.

- The studies are omitted due to weak methodologies, i.e. failing to pass the ‘quality assessment’ step of the data analysis.

- The findings of the research are discussed in other studies by the same author or research organization in more detail, i.e. elimination for preventing repetitive information.