Heterogeneous Good

Foundations • The Valuation Engineer

Bert Craytor• May 29, 2026
Version 0.1.0-draft

Formal definition. Heterogeneous goods are goods that are not interchangeable because each is a distinct bundle of characteristics that buyers value separately, and whose characteristics are not separately traded.

Intuitive framing. A homogeneous good is one where any item will do: a barrel of WTI crude, a bushel of No. 2 yellow corn, a kilowatt-hour from the grid, a share of a given stock. The grading standards or specifications behind these goods exist precisely to make individual items interchangeable, so that prices apply to the category rather than to the particular item. A heterogeneous good is one where the specific item matters — *this* house, not *that* house; *this* used car, not the one next to it.

Two features make a good heterogeneous in the technical sense. First, buyers care about multiple distinguishable attributes that vary across items in the market. Second, those attributes are bundled by the production technology of the good; they are not separately purchasable. You cannot buy 200 square feet of gross living area on its own. You cannot acquire a school district independently of a parcel of land. The characteristics arrive bundled, and the market sets a price on whole bundles rather than on the characteristics themselves.

Real estate is the canonical heterogeneous good and exhibits the property unusually strongly. Locational characteristics are perfectly non-replicable: no two parcels can occupy the same location, so every property has at least one attribute (its coordinates) that distinguishes it from every other property in the market. Physical, legal, and environmental attributes layer additional dimensions of variation onto a vector that, taken as a whole, is unique to each property.

Where appraisers encounter it. Every adjustment in the sales comparison approach is an implicit acknowledgment that the subject and the comparables are heterogeneous goods. If properties were homogeneous, sale prices would already be directly comparable; no grid would be needed. The grid is an attempt to decompose the price of a bundle into priceable components and to reassemble the indicated value by adjusting for differences in the bundle composition.

The cost approach handles heterogeneity by reconstructing the bundle from its components — foundation, framing, finishes, depreciation — and pricing each separately. The income approach handles it by abstracting the bundle into a single cash-flow profile, with capitalization and yield rates absorbing bundle-level heterogeneity into a market-derived multiplier. All three valuation approaches are methodological responses to the underlying fact that real estate is a heterogeneous good. They differ in how they navigate that fact, not in whether they confront it.

Appraisers also encounter heterogeneity informally whenever they reason about comp selection, paired-sales analysis, or "apples-to-apples" comparisons. The instinct to find comparables that are similar in as many attributes as possible is a practitioner's response to heterogeneity: minimize the bundle distance between subject and comp, and the unobserved component of the bundle contributes less to the difference in sale prices.

Why it matters for defensibility. The heterogeneity of real estate is the reason valuation methodology must exist as a discipline. If properties were interchangeable, market value would be directly observable from posted prices; valuation would reduce to lookup. Because they are not,

value must be inferred from the prices of related-but-not-identical properties, and every inference step is a methodological choice that has to be justified.

Acknowledging heterogeneity formally clarifies several practice questions that USPAP and Standards Rule defensibility hinge on. Comp selection is the choice of items in characteristics space close enough to the subject that the implicit prices recovered from them generalize. The reasonableness of an adjustment depends on whether the underlying implicit price is supportable from market evidence. The reconciliation between approaches reflects the appraiser's judgment about which approach navigates the heterogeneity of *this* property most credibly. Each of these defensibility questions is sharper once "heterogeneous good" is named as the underlying condition.

Worked appraisal example. Two recent sales in the same Pacifica, California neighborhood:

Attribute	Comp A	Comp B
GLA (sf)	1,650	1,650
Bedrooms / Baths	3 / 2	3 / 2
Lot (sf)	9,000	7,200
View	Yes	No
Sale price	$1,425,000	$1,280,000

Under a homogeneous-goods framing, these are the same property: identical GLA, identical room count, same neighborhood. Under the heterogeneous-goods framing, they are distinct bundles, differing in two characteristics (lot and view) that buyers value separately. The $145,000 price difference is the *joint* contribution of those two attributes — two implicit prices entangled in a single pair.

Recovering the implicit prices individually requires more pairs, ideally varying one attribute at a time. Three or four additional sales spanning the view/no-view and large-lot/small-lot combinations begin to identify the implicit prices separately. With enough variation across enough comps, hedonic regression performs the disentanglement formally; with limited variation, the appraiser is constrained to bracketed paired-sales reasoning whose reliability depends explicitly on how close the bundles are to one another in characteristics space.

The example illustrates why heterogeneity is the root condition: even two "identical" houses are not identical, and the methodological apparatus of appraisal exists precisely to handle the distance between them.

Cross-references: characteristics space; *hedonic price function*; *implicit price.*