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Mechanisms

Primary mechanisms:
- Social networks and social control
- Cultural differences and coordination problems
- In-group favoritism and out-group biases

Social cohesion:
- trust and the capacity for collective action

Mechanisms

In Which Contexts Does This Occur?

Segregation in New York City
Example Crown Heights South

Proportion White
- 0%
- 25%
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Edge Intensity
- 0.00
- 0.25
- 0.50

White residents in Crown Heights South occupy 24 city blocks. The edges are well-defined on the west side of the enclave but fuzzy on the north–east side.

The Contested Boundary Effect

Number of Complaint Calls by Edge Intensity

Note: Results are controlled for: population, area in km$^2$, nr. of other calls (Model I), concentrated disadvantage, crime prone population, residential instability, foreclosures, borough fixed effects, immigrant concentration, multigroup segregation, and all diversity indices (Model III). n = 29,632.
Halo Constellations in Cologne

Halo Effects in Germany
Among Threat Susceptible Sub-Populations

Note: geo-referenced ALLBUS 2014. Results are controlled for: gender, age, education, wage, unemployment, home ownership, East/West, degree of urbanity, population density, average flat size per capita. n= 1,192.
Conclusion

- Segregation is quick to happen, and is often an easy solution.
- But it strengthens a “Sense of Us versus Them”.

Implications for policy design:
- Unfortunately: policy solutions to segregation are scarce.
- But: rental markets are less segregated and more moldable.
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Implications for policy design:
• Unfortunately: policy solutions to segregation are scarce.
• But: rental markets are less segregated and more moldable.

Thanks for your attention!
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A computer vision technique applied to socio-demographics
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# 311 Requests: Neighborhood Conflicts

Time and geo-coded [https://nycopendata.socrata.com/](https://nycopendata.socrata.com/)

### Table: 311 Service Requests from 2010 to Present

- **Unsaved View**
- **Datasets Available**: 1100+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Complaint Type</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>12/06/2013 09:05:17 AM</td>
<td>New York City Police Department</td>
<td>Blocked Driveway</td>
<td>Partial Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>12/06/2013 09:04:42 AM</td>
<td>Department of Health and Mental Hygiene</td>
<td>Indoor Sewage</td>
<td>Sewage Odor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>12/06/2013 09:04:32 AM</td>
<td>New York City Police Department</td>
<td>Illegal Parking</td>
<td>Double Parked Blocking Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>12/06/2013 09:04:23 AM</td>
<td>DOB Inspections - Queens</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Initial - Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>12/06/2013 09:03:21 AM</td>
<td>Department of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Damaged Tree</td>
<td>Branch Cracked and Will Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>12/06/2013 09:03:15 AM</td>
<td>Bureau of Fire Prevention - Highrise Unit - In</td>
<td>Fire Safety Director - F58</td>
<td>On Site Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>12/06/2013 09:00:32 AM</td>
<td>Department of Finance</td>
<td>DOF Literature Request</td>
<td>SCRIE - Application for Seniors Not Enrolled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Threat Susceptible Sub-Populations

- Less educated
- Unemployed
- Home owner
- Strong national identification
- Right-wing oriented

Source: http://www.vocaleurope.eu/pegida-demonstration-dresden/
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311 complaint calls as indicator of community erosion & disorganization?

1. Low network density & social control
   (Shaw & McKay 1942, Miguel 2005)

2. Competing ways of life, tough compromises
   (Kimenyi 2006, Page 2008)

3. Coordination problems & misunderstandings
   (Habyarimana 2007, Desmet et al. 2012)
Alternative Explanation

Analysis of online forum city-data.com, local forum ‘New York City’, keywords: ‘noise’ & ‘neighbor’

“I grew up ghetto, i was hood for the first 20yrs of my life [...] Whenever i see people in my old hood that i grew up with still doing the same **** and even younger people in the area call me a ‘WHITETINO’.”

(user: silverbullnyc, 22 March 2014, 08:43 PM)

• 109 threads containing 4,474 comments
• 803 comments (ca. 18%) entail complaints about neighbors
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Analysis of online forum city-data.com, local forum ‘New York City’, keywords: ‘noise’ & ‘neighbor’

“I grew up ghetto, i was hood for the first 20yrs of my life [...] Whenever i see people in my old hood that i grew up with still doing the same **** and even younger people in the area call me a ‘WHITETINO’.”

(user: silverbullnyc, 22 March 2014, 08:43 PM)

• 109 threads containing 4,474 comments
• 803 comments (ca. 18%) entail complaints about neighbors
  → 57% entail group reference
    (e.g. drug addicts or teenagers)
    → 257 complaints (56%) explicitly mention ethno-racial background of accused. The next common categories are persons of low socio-economic status (35%) and children/teenagers (13%).
  → Implicit ethno-racial categorizations make up another 16%.
### Alternative Explanation

**Additional regression results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disorder Civic Controls</th>
<th>Noise Calls 2010</th>
<th>Night Calls 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edge intensity</strong></td>
<td>1.180***</td>
<td>1.664***</td>
<td>1.269***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.185)</td>
<td>(0.309)</td>
<td>(0.187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edge intensity</strong>²</td>
<td>−1.792***</td>
<td>−2.639***</td>
<td>−1.884***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.383)</td>
<td>(0.740)</td>
<td>(0.385)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Control variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multigroup segregation (H)</td>
<td>−0.106***</td>
<td>−0.122***</td>
<td>−0.113***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic polarization (EP)</td>
<td>−0.081***</td>
<td>−0.009</td>
<td>−0.073***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic diversity (HHI)</td>
<td>0.220***</td>
<td>0.145***</td>
<td>0.210***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical disorder¹</td>
<td>−0.007***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic action</td>
<td>0.028***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough fixed effects</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.770***</td>
<td>−0.859***</td>
<td>0.804***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>29,631</td>
<td>29,631</td>
<td>29,631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Standard errors in parentheses;  ***$p < 0.01$,  **$p < 0.05$,  *$p < 0.1*$

Tabelle 3: OLS Regression mit räumlicher Autokovariate des Zusammenhangs zwischen Xenophobie und Halo-Konstellation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Modell 1a</th>
<th></th>
<th>Modell 1b</th>
<th></th>
<th>Modell 2a</th>
<th></th>
<th>Modell 2b</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beta</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>beta</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>beta</td>
<td>se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halo Konstellation</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-1.317</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-0.907</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Räumliche Autokovariate</td>
<td>0.697***</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>6.822</td>
<td>0.462***</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>4.063</td>
<td>0.724***</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevölkerung</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-2.096</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-2.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittlere Wohnungsgröße</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.515</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemeindetyp (Referenz: Landgemeinde)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleinstadt</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>1.354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittelstadt</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Großstadt</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>-0.270</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>-0.242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alter</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>1.293</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>1.267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geschlecht</td>
<td>-0.109*</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-1.670</td>
<td>-0.108*</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-1.660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bildung (Referenz: niedrig)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mittel</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>-0.946</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>-1.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gehoben</td>
<td>-0.434***</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>-3.353</td>
<td>-0.460***</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>-3.548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoch</td>
<td>-0.691***</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>-5.065</td>
<td>-0.699***</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>-5.128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>netto Berufseinkommen</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>1.475</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>1.558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbeitslos</td>
<td>0.339*</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>2.299</td>
<td>0.337*</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>2.288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neue Bundesländer</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wohneigentum</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>-0.746</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>-0.721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konstante</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>1.514</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quelle: Mit Zensus 2011 georeferenzierter ALLBUS 2014, eigene Berechnungen. n= 1,192; * p < 0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01, **** p < 0.001
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Definitions of Social Cohesion

• Considers the opportunities for **Well-being of all its members**
• Fights against **Marginalization**
• Creates a **Sense of Belonging**
• Promotes **Trust**
• Offers an opportunity for **Social Mobility**
The main challenge to solving the problems of social cohesion: The Attributional Hotpot
The main challenge to solving the problems of social cohesion: The Attributional Hotpot

Don’t play the Attributional Blame Game!
Diversity usually starts with a migration story! The lucky ones might take a plane...
For others, the journey can be much more perilous!
Patterns of Settlement: A Neighbourhood that has looked like this:
Might start to look like this:
Or over time even like this:
The question is which ones represent a cohesive community?
The question is which ones represent a cohesive community?

Is this an inherently cohesive community?

Is this an inherently less cohesive one?
Let’s take Brexit as an Example!

**Allerdale:** 97.6 white British, Voted: Leave the EU, 73% Turnout

**Redcar:** 97.6 white British, Voted: Leave the EU, 74% Turnout

**Staffordshire Moorland:** 97.6 white British, Voted: Leave the EU, 75% Turnout

**Copeland:** 97.3 white British, Voted: Leave the EU, 70% Turnout
Let’s take Brexit as an Example!

**Newham:** 16.7 white British, Voted: Remain in the EU, 59.3% Turnout

**Ealing:** 30.4 white British, Voted: remain in the EU, 70% Turnout

**Harrow:** 30.9 white British, Voted: Remain in the EU, 72.3% Turnout

**Tower Hamlets:** 30 white British, Voted: Remain in the EU, 64% Turnout
Which comes first cohesive communities or integrated individuals
The GEMM (Growth Equal Opportunities, Migration and Markets) project focuses specifically on economic integration: www.gemm2020.eu
Heterogeneity of Migrants: Labour Market Positioning

States around the world have taken to solve the challenges of diversity by answering the question:

“Who should we let in?”
Heterogeneity of Migrants: Labour Market Positioning

The Labour Market Ladder

- Employment probability
- Occupational status

*International Migration Outlook 2017: “More and more countries place an emphasis on providing tailor-made measures for migrants

Immigrants arrive with different education backgrounds, experiences, socio-economic profiles and family characteristics. Not one integration programme fits the needs of all. An increasing number of countries have therefore developed targeted integration pathways to fit individual needs.
Heterogeneity of Migrants: Labour Market Positioning

Usual Responses
- Tightening Migration controls according to migration type
- Investing in the further training of economic migrants

Countries with longstanding targeted integration programmes continue to adjust their frameworks to better fit the needs of new arrivals. Sweden, for example, introduced in 2016 specific supplementary courses for tertiary-educated new arrivals, to speed up their entry into skilled employment.
Migrant Motivations matter for Economic Integration
Even in Europe, huge country variations exist in as to the difference in economic performance of non-economic to economic migrants!
Do Migrants Undercut Majority Members?

• Evidence of undercutting of second generation minority members in the UK: Black Caribbean and Black African.

• Deprivation is a much more powerful predictor of poor labour market outcomes rather than the presence of migrants.

• Increasing share of migrants is associated with longer duration of unemployment for majority members in the more deprived areas.

• Uphold Minimum wage: wagamama scandal
What should politicians prioritize?

• Education
Challenges exist in terms of the recognition of credentials across Europe.
GEMM Field Experiments: 5 countries: Spain, the Netherlands, Germany, Norway, UK: Discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Muslim name compared to majority</th>
<th>Muslim engaged in a religious activity compared to Muslim name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>No significant differences</td>
<td>No significant differences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GEMM Field Experiments: 5 countries: Spain, the Netherlands, Germany, Norway, UK: Discrimination

Devah Pager’s work shows that in the US there is a clear hierarchy of call backs: African Americans with no criminal record have lower call back rates than whites with criminal record!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Muslim name compared to majority</th>
<th>Muslim engaged in a religious activity compared to Muslim name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>No significant differences</td>
<td>No significant differences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Recommendations

• Don’t play the Attributional Blame Game!
• Consider the contextual embeddedness of individuals and laud good examples: if a country is doing something right, if a region or a local community is a great example, talk about it rather than focus on the things that do not work. Resilience in the face of many challenges is not the default option!
• Investing in the human capital of individuals and groups will always pay off!
Thank you!