

Methods

Abstract Comparative studies of migrant integration, polarization, and segregation have favored various research designs and a range of qualitative and quantitative methods. This section assesses those approaches and explains how the analysis here plays off their strengths and attenuates their weaknesses through triangulation. Five carefully selected global cities are compared: Hamburg, Barcelona, Chicago, Toronto, and Montréal. Migrant concentrations and the most straightforward segregation indices were calculated across the most apposite sub-city units in each city for which relevant data were available between 2000 and 2015. Changes in the most critical aspects of migrants' structural integration have been gauged as well. Extensive fieldwork in the five case cities made it possible to have discussions with migrants and policymakers and to observe public spaces in key migrant neighborhoods.

Keywords Segregation indices · Multiculturalism · Ethnic enclaves
Public spaces · Neighborhoods

EXISTING APPROACHES

The literatures on migrant integration, polarization, and segregation have favored different research designs. Establishing levels of migrants' structural incorporation has entailed both objective and subjective appraisals of the labor market, income, unemployment, educational and housing

conditions, and crime rates. Political and cultural incorporation has been weighed with reference to inclusion within host-society organizations, patronage of recreational and cultural offerings, rates of naturalization and dual citizenship, levels of intermarriage, use of homeland media, degree of fluency in the dominant local language, and formal and informal involvement in political activities (Ireland 2014). In this field, both qualitative and quantitative approaches have been deployed, with the latter typically preferred when scrutinizing the structural dimension—which is more relevant to discussions of socio-spatial segregation and arguably more central to the processes that give rise to satisfactory migrant integration outcomes (see Ireland 2004; Hellgren 2016).

Comparative urban research poses a variety of serious challenges, particularly when equivalent quantitative data are required, and qualitative integration studies have predominated (Ireland 2008). At the local level, several ongoing trends have combined to reduce the impact of this research. Migrant integration is a continuous social and political process of balancing and negotiation, which is impossible to grasp without paying attention to the intended and unintended effects of policies and non-policies. Above all in Europe, there has been a focus on the discursive framing of policies, with heavy reliance on ideal typologies and unsystematic content analysis. This scholarship “often ignores the way in which these frames translate—or not—into concrete practices” (Gebhardt 2015, pp. 4–5). Even then, practices (outputs) are not outcomes, which go largely unexamined (e.g., Falge et al. 2016; Hellgren 2016; Schiller 2016), even at the neighborhood level (e.g., Pastore and Ponzio 2013, 2016). Investigations that refer to civic integration programs alone and conclude that policy convergence is occurring have failed to consider whether the policies in question have the same impact on integration in different national and local contexts (e.g., Caponio et al. 2016; Gebhardt 2016). Policymakers might be interviewed in qualitative integration studies, yet few migrants are, apart from those attending focus groups or active in migrant associations, noteworthy for their limited degree of representativeness.

Weak case selection further blunts the impact of much current urban-level work on integration in North America as well as Europe. Migrants are unevenly distributed across receiving countries in terms of overall numbers and national and class backgrounds, but it is possible in carefully selected cities and neighborhoods to hold intervening variables constant and test hypothesized cause-and-effect relationships. Yet for every instance

of a strong explanation for why case cities were chosen (e.g., Ranci 2011), many more are lacking. A surprisingly large number of cross-city comparisons offer up little or no case defense at all (e.g., Sidney 2014; Becci et al. 2017; De Graauw and Vermeulen 2016) or one that is vague or not clearly geared toward testing the declared hypothesis (e.g., Caponio et al. 2016; Pastore and Ponzo 2016). Cases are regularly selected on the dependent variable, meaning in this case integration and segregation outcomes (e.g., Musterd et al. 2015; Mollenkopf and Pastore 2016).

Casual case defense plagues the literature on global cities, too. Those at the very top tier—London, New York City, Tokyo, Hong Kong, and Paris—still receive due scholarly devotion. As the concept has been stretched and academic researchers, consulting groups, and journalists have come up with competing lists of global cities, precision and consistency have been sacrificed (see Leff and Petersen 2015). Arguments that all cities are globalizing in important ways (Amen et al. 2006) and that “global cities are not all global in the same way” (Moore 2016, p. 373) have opened the door to consideration of almost any urban center. Applying the “global” label to each of a pair of cities, no matter how disparate, can be presented without further justification as authorizing comparisons between them on nearly any subject: see, for example, Velasco Caballero and De los Ángeles Torres (2013) on Chicago and Madrid; Foner et al. (2014) on Amsterdam and New York City; Marr (2016) on Detroit and Lagos. Edited volumes (e.g., Amen et al. 2006; Crul and Mollenkopf 2012; Tammaru et al. 2016) not infrequently present either loose grab-bags of city cases or collections not resulting from scientifically defensible or entirely convincing calculations.

Nina Glick Schiller and Ayse Çağlar (2009) have made the case that migrants act as urban scale-makers and that “pathways of migrant incorporation” both affect and are affected by a given city’s position in the “networks of capital” that comprise the global system (pp. 191–192). Underplayed in their discussion is the fact that in any city, certain places and activities are more globalized than others; it is misleading to treat urban centers as somehow bounded. This perspective has nonetheless been influential in encouraging researchers at least to keep issues of comparable global positioning in mind when constructing their research designs.

The bulk of the work dealing with socio-spatial polarization and segregation relies on resolutely quantitative methods. A raft of measures and indices has been concocted to assess the five identified dimensions of residential segregation (Massey and Denton 1988), augmented with

geographic information and mapping. The types of data that must be amassed render comparative (especially cross-national) studies problematic. The most popular segregation measure is the dissimilarity index (the level of spatial inequality between population categories in a given area). The values change depending on the scale of the neighborhoods, enumeration districts, boroughs, postal codes, or census tracts used (known as the modifiable areal unit problem) and say nothing about the causes of the observed patterns or their differing meanings for members of the minority and majority populations (Lloyd et al. 2015). The isolation index (the likelihood of meeting someone of one's own category in one's own area) and the exposure index (the likelihood of meeting someone of the other category in one's own area) also vary with unit scale (Musterd 2011).

These and other more intricate statistical measures only estimate chances of encounters, not actual contacts or their quality: "interaction suffuses these studies as an imputed variable" (Duneier 2013). As illuminating as this body of work has been, it has not been able to impart insight into how people of different backgrounds live together or how diversity works on a day-to-day basis in urban centers. Some prominent segregation scholars now acknowledge that statistical analyses "simply fail to fully consider the rich reality of contemporary cities, with all their different historical layers and contemporary diversity in their key institutions," and they have begun to experiment with ways to incorporate the "unique characteristics of place (the *genius loci*)" into their projects (Tammaru et al. 2016, pp. 10–11).

They might want to consider looking for that spirit in public spaces. New Urbanists and advocates of "smart growth" and sustainability have all championed urban designs that encourage mixing by income and household type in housing. The accent has been on physical and functional fit with surrounding areas, diverse unit types, and the provision of shared open spaces (Thibert 2007). A parallel line of analysis has started with the observation that residential spaces are not the only sites in which social integration occurs. Even in those with mixed populations, interactions occur primarily when people have similar backgrounds or interests and are direct neighbors (Phillips 2007). Schools, workplaces, local markets, recreation and sports facilities, parks, community centers and gardens, public libraries, language classes, and other public spaces may be even more consequential as spots where encounters take place (Amin 2008; Audunson et al. 2011; Kalandides and Vaiou 2012; Morén-Alegret and Wladyka 2016).

Scholars have explored what makes for effective projects and management of public spaces and collective facilities (e.g., Borja 1998; Peña Astorga 2003; Koutrolikou 2012) and what causes others to fail (e.g., Vedrédi 2014). The exchanges that occur in those areas are not of the same depth, ranging from superficial contact to the more durable connections captured in network analysis (Creswell 1996). Even everyday meetings and practices shape and are shaped by the urban context and “can be regarded as the main element from which people derive their representations of cities and neighbourhoods” (Pastore and Ponzo 2016, pp. 183–184). In this “[e]thnic mixing in public life,” tolerance is learned; “ethnic pluralism becomes visible” (Hellgren 2016, p. 163); and people who have “few opportunities for such interaction elsewhere can relax, imitate, and experience a sense of civility” (Duneier 2013). At issue, in other words, is cosmopolitanism: “when does living side by side ... lead to creative, ‘real’ intercultural conviviality alongside everyday, taken-for-granted forms of cosmopolitanism, and when does it lead to antagonisms and separations?” (Werbner 2015, pp. 569–570).

Spatial issues are generally explored at the level of the neighborhood or sub-neighborhood. Depending on the research question, it can make sense to shift the focus to the city as a whole, since the “overall sociospatial structure or lay-out of cities has a major impact on the functioning of the urban public sphere” (Cassiers and Kesteloot 2012, p. 1910). The “spatial imaginary” of a city or urban area can contribute to fragmentation or to a shared sense of spatial ownership (Mitchell 2011, p. 418). For logical reasons, researchers interested in public spaces have been more likely to adopt covert and overt observational and low-reliability ethnographic techniques (e.g., Anderson 2012) than statistical ones.

MULTIPLE METHODS AND DEFENSE OF CASES

This study endeavors to pull together several of the various strands of research on local-level migrant integration, segregation, and public spaces, playing off their methodological strengths and attenuating their weaknesses through triangulation. The goal is to explain how the relationship between the spatial and social segregation/integration of migrants has played out so far in the twenty-first century. Have patterns of residential settlement changed in tandem with migrants’ structural integration, and has socio-spatial polarization worsened during the recent hard economic times? What, if anything, can global cities really do

Table 2.1 The case cities

<i>City</i>	<i>Total city population</i>	<i>Metro region population</i>	<i>Non-national share of total city population (%)</i>
Hamburg, Germany	1,800,000	5,000,000	13.4
Barcelona, Spain	1,600,000	4,900,000	17.7
Chicago, USA	2,700,000	8,700,000 ^a	18.0
Montréal, Canada	1,700,000	3,900,000	11.3
Toronto, Canada	2,700,000	5,500,000	15.0

^aIn Illinois only. *Source* National and local statistical offices (2011, 2012)

to counteract the effects of powerful social and economic forces that feed exclusion, social dislocation, and disorder and to reconcile the contradictions associated with ethno-cultural diversity?

Answers are sought here through comparison of developments in five North American and European cities: Hamburg, Barcelona, Chicago, Toronto, and Montréal (see Table 2.1). Each is the economic hub of its region and a recognized first-tier global city, although clearly below Saskia Sassen's (1991) and others' very top centers and laboring in the shadow of a more powerful neighbor: Berlin for Hamburg, New York City for Chicago and Toronto, Madrid for Barcelona, and Toronto (and New York City) for Montréal. All of the cases are globally integrated to an equivalent degree, positioned similarly enough in pertinent rankings of world centers to be considered peers. Chicago and Toronto habitually place a little higher than the other three in purely economic and financial standings; the cultural, creative, and regional weight of Barcelona and Montréal and Hamburg's status as a preeminent transport and media hub level the playing field (see Kotkin et al. 2014).

Most of the five case cities have been compared to each other, e.g., Barcelona and Montréal (Tremblay and Battaglia 2012); Chicago and Toronto (Eidelman 2016); Hamburg and Barcelona (Clark 2012); and Montréal and Toronto (Sancton 2004; Grenier and Nadeau 2011). Several of them regularly share ideas on migration (Lunn and Vonk 2014), and Chicago has "sister city" relationships with Hamburg and Toronto. Hamburg's emerging HafenCity neighborhood will have a Chicago Square in honor of the connection. The City of Toronto's 10-year "Culture Plan for the Creative City," adopted in 2003, referred

directly to Barcelona, Chicago, and Montréal (along with Milan and San Francisco) as its competitors (Boudreau et al. 2009).

Besides their similar overall and non-national populations, these urban centers all have shares of foreign-born residents ranging from a third (Hamburg) to a half (Toronto) and have gained reputations for being welcoming of migrants. Importantly, among those residents in each are members of five national groups: Poles, Romanians, Serbs, Pakistanis, and Ghanaians. They represent a combination of traditional/ongoing and newer migration inflows. They take in both Muslims and sub-Saharan Africans, albeit not simply lumped into multinational collections or assumed to be defined solely by their religion or regional origins, as is too often the case (e.g., Vang 2012; Koenig 2015). The migrants' backgrounds are not always identical: distance and admissions policies have resulted in the migration of people with skill levels and educational qualifications that tend to be lower on average in Europe than in the USA and lower in the USA than in Canada (Maruszewska 2007; CMM 2013; Siddiqi et al. 2013).

Another present-day trend in migrant integration studies is a forceful reaction against treating ethnic groups as bounded entities. When they become the unit of analysis, goes the criticism, the heterogeneity of both the city's social fabric and migrant populations is obscured (Schiller and Çağlar 2009), distinctions based on migration status and ethnicity come to seem natural and immutable instead of socially constructed (Dahinden 2016), a label is imposed that prevents genuine mutual understanding (Pitter 2016), and the forces and processes that produce identities and boundaries are ignored (Falge et al. 2016). As valid as such observations may be, it is not clear that starting with social classes, neighborhoods, cities, or other standard social science categories does not merely shift the problem instead of resolving it.

It has long been recognized that whereas some people migrate already equipped with clear senses of ethnic, national, and/or regional identity, others develop them only in the settling-society context (see Ireland 1994). To understand micro-level, bottom-up boundary formation, it would be necessary to conduct full-fledged cohort studies with freshly arrived migrants—not the content analysis, policymaker and activist interviews, participant observation, focus groups, and social network analysis presently favored. Another tack, the one taken in this study, is to address “both the patterns characterising country of origin migrant groups in different spatial contexts and the multiple migrant and non-migrant groups who share space in residential neighbourhoods, in order

to understand the constitutive role of both country of origin factors and of settlement sites” (Gidley and Caputo 2013, p. 25). As Andreas Wimmer (2007) reminds us, “there is no reason why a study design should not start by taking individuals from a particular country as the unit of observation,” so long as one avoids the “fallacy of assuming communitarian closure, cultural difference, and strong identities” (p. 28). A migrant’s country of origin—which is not the same as his or her ethnicity—factors into the legal status and rights that he or she enjoys in North American and European receiving societies, and settlement patterns as well as official monitoring of them both reflect and reaffirm the import of their original nationality.

Quantitative and qualitative methods were adopted here. Microsoft Excel 2013 enabled computation of migrant concentrations. The most straightforward, most commonly used indices of segregation were calculated using STATA 13 with data made available by local statistical offices: the dissimilarity, isolation, and exposure indices. Even though the latter two indices are probabilistic complements in this context, discussing both of them reinforces what is learned about segregation in the case cities. All of the indices were constructed across the smallest units in each city for which useful data were available across the study period and which have sociopolitical meaning for residents and policymakers (i.e., neighborhood, district/borough, community area, or ward).

At those levels, it was statistics on non-nationals (that is, migrants) that were available across the cases (see Rechel et al. 2013). It seemed reasonable to posit that these people would have been the component of migrant-origin populations most vulnerable to and illustrative of the forces of polarization and segregation. Wherever feasible, changes in the most critical and visible aspects of their structural integration (namely, in the areas of employment, poverty, and social assistance rates) have been gauged across the relevant sub-city units and not in blanket figures (compare Musterd 2003). Less systematic analysis has been provided concerning migrants’ health status and the socio-spatial polarization and integration of naturalized and second-generation residents—as well as of migrant-origin populations in the suburban areas surrounding each case city. Extensive fieldwork was conducted in all five of them, which made it possible to have discussions with migrants and policymakers and to observe public spaces in key neighborhoods. The goal was not to compare results directly across the case cities but to assess fluctuations in each of them between 2000 and 2015. Structural integration deficits and levels of segregation could

remain significant and troubling, occasionally to an even greater degree in a city where relatively smaller declines were registered than in another city. Given that the integration process relates to shrinking the disparity between the migrant and non-migrant populations, what are under consideration here are the positive and negative trends over time.

As comparable and comparably positioned global cities, Hamburg, Barcelona, Chicago, Toronto, and Montréal could be expected to see their migrant populations (in general and their Polish, Romanian, Serbian, Pakistani, and Ghanaian ones specifically) experience similar pressures toward socio-spatial polarization—which should be relatively strong across the board, given each city’s high global ranking and thus exposure. Research on such forces has been underscoring the modulating impact of welfare-state policies on residential segregation and, by extension, migrant integration (see Friedrichs et al. 2003; Gidley and Caputo 2013). It has been maintained that migrants fare worst overall under liberal welfare regimes (with the US variant less encompassing than the Canadian, and Ontario’s less so than Québec’s) and better under more comprehensive ones (and best under continental corporatist regimes like Germany’s, then the Mediterranean variant as found in Spain) (Musterd and Deurloo 2002; Musterd 2011; Ranci 2011; Ireland 2014). This study’s operating hypothesis was thus that ethnic segregation and socio-spatial polarization should have escalated and structural integration should have deteriorated more between 2000 and 2015 under the more liberal welfare regimes: the corresponding order would thus be Chicago, Toronto, Montréal, Barcelona, and then Hamburg.

In the end that sequence did not hold up. Only Hamburg maintained its expected status as the city in which migrants overall and from the five case nationalities experienced the fewest negative social and spatial effects from the latest economic crisis. Migrants in Barcelona fared worse than hypothesized. Those in Montréal fared better. More striking than those findings was that neither residential segregation nor structural integration indicators (that is, the gap between migrants and native-stock residents) worsened noticeably in any of the cities over the study period. Where integration levels underwent a modest dip (Toronto and Chicago) or even a sharper drop (Barcelona), pre-downturn conditions had returned for the most part by 2015. What mattered more was where migrants were moving and how their relocations fit in with broader trends toward socio-spatial polarization. Cities and national welfare states

appeared to have minimal bearing on outcomes, and it was often small, adaptive urban policies that did the most to improve the quality of life and social relations for migrants and the unintended consequences of their more ambitious actions that did the most harm.

REFERENCES

- Amen, Mark M., Kevin Archer, and Martin M. Bosman (eds.). 2006. *Relocating Global Cities*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Amin, Ash. 2008. Collective Culture and Urban Public Space. *City* 12 (1): 5–24.
- Anderson, Elijah. 2012. *The Cosmopolitan Canopy*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Audunson, Ragnar, Sophie Essmat, and Svanhild Aabø. 2011. Public Libraries: A Meeting Place for Immigrant Women? *Library & Information Science Research* 33 (3): 220–227.
- Becci, Irene, Marian Burchardt, and Mariachiara Giorda. 2017. Religious Super-Diversity and Spatial Strategies in Two European Cities. *Current Sociology* 65 (1): 73–91.
- Borja, Jordi. 1998. Citizenship and Public Space. Ciutat Real, Ciutat Ideal. Urbanitats, No. 7, Centro de Cultura Contemporànea de Barcelona, Barcelona. <http://www.publicspace.org/en/text-library/eng/11-ciudadania-y-espacio-publico>. Accessed 5 Jan 2017.
- Boudreau, Julie-Anne, Roger Keil, and Douglas Young. 2009. *Changing Toronto: Governing Urban Neoliberalism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Caponio, Tiziana, Olga Jubany Baucells, and Berta Güell. 2016. Civic Integration Policies from Below. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39 (5): 878–895.
- Cassiers, Tim, and Christian Kesteloot. 2012. Socio-Spatial Inequalities and Social Cohesion in European Cities. *Urban Studies* 49 (9): 1902–1924.
- Clark, Greg. 2012. Can Immigration Fuel Urban Growth? MIPIM Global Real Estate Experts, August 23. <http://blog.mipimworld.com/2012/08/can-immigration-fuel-urban-growth/#.VTlQI5VFDSE>. Accessed 30 May 2017.
- Communauté Métropolitaine de Montréal (CMM). 2013. Le Grand Montréal parmi les principaux pôles d'immigration en Amérique du Nord. *Perspective Grand Montréal* 24 (December), 8.
- Creswell, Tim. 1996. *In Place/Out of Place. Geography, Ideology, and Transgression*. London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Crul, Maurice, and John Mollenkopf (eds.). 2012. *The Changing Face of World Cities*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Dahinden, Janine. 2016. A Plea for the 'De-migrantization' of Research on Migration and Integration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39 (13): 2207–2225.

- De Graauw, Els, and Floris Vermeulen. 2016. Cities and the Politics of Immigrant Integration: A Comparison of Berlin, Amsterdam, New York City, and San Francisco. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42 (6): 989–1012.
- Duncier, Mitchell. 2013. Elijah Anderson on Race Relations and Public Space, November 12. <http://cosmopolitancanopy.com/2013/11/>. Accessed 6 Jan 2017.
- Eidelman, Gabriel. 2016. Failure When Fragmented: Public Land Ownership and Waterfront Redevelopment in Chicago, Vancouver, and Toronto. *Urban Affairs Review*, November 2. doi:10.1177/1078087416671429. Accessed 26 Feb 2017.
- Falge, Christiane, Carlo Ruzza, and Oliver Schmidtke. 2016. *Migrants and Health: Political and Institutional Responses to Cultural Diversity in Health Systems*. London: Routledge.
- Foner, Nancy, Jan Rath, Jan Willem Duyvendak, and Rogier van Reekum. 2014. *New York and Amsterdam: Immigration and the New Urban Landscape*. New York: New York University Press.
- Friedrichs, Jürgen, George Galster, and Sako Musterd. 2003. Neighbourhood Effects on Social Opportunities. *Housing Studies* 18 (6): 797–806.
- Gebhardt, Dirk. 2015. Cities and Immigrant Citizenship. Grup de Recerca Interdisciplinari sobre Immigració (GRITim) Working Paper Series No. 26, Winter, GRITim, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona.
- Gebhardt, Dirk. 2016. When the State Takes Over: Civic Integration Programmes and the Role of Cities in Immigrant Integration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42 (5): 742–758.
- Gidley, Ben, and Maria Luisa Caputo. 2013. Residential integration—Towards a Sending Country Perspective. Research Report Position Paper INTERACT RR 2013/04, European University Institute, San Domenico di Fiesole.
- Grenier, Gilles, and Serge Nadeau. 2011. Immigrant Access to Work in Montreal and Toronto. *Revue canadienne des sciences régionales* [Canadian Journal of Regional Science] 34 (1): 19–32.
- Hellgren, Zenia. 2016. Immigrant Integration as a Two-Way Process: Stakeholder Discourses and Practices in Stockholm and Barcelona. *Psychosociological Issues in Human Resource Management* 4 (1): 143–167.
- Ireland, Patrick R. 1994. *The Policy Challenge of Ethnic Diversity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ireland, Patrick R. 2004. *Becoming Europe: Immigration, Integration, and the Welfare State*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Ireland, Patrick R. 2008. Comparing Responses to Ethnic Segregation in Urban Europe. *Urban Studies* 45 (7): 1333–1358.
- Ireland, Patrick R. 2014. Welfare States and Migrant Incorporation Trajectories. In *An Introduction to Immigrant Incorporation Strategies*, ed. Marco

- Martiniello and Jan Rath, 345–370. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam Press/IMISCOE.
- Kalandides, Ares, and Dina Vaiou. 2012. ‘Ethnic’ Neighbourhoods? Practices of Belonging and Claims to the City. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 19 (3): 254–266.
- Koenig, Matthias. 2015. Incorporating Muslim Migrants in Western Nation States. In *After Integration*, ed. Marian Burchardt and Ines Michalowski, 43–58. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien.
- Kotkin, Joel, Wendell Cox, Ali Modarres, and Aaron M. Renn. 2014. *Size is Not the Answer: The Changing Face of the Global City*. Singapore: Civil Service College.
- Koutrolikou, Penny-Panagioti. 2012. Spatialities of Ethnocultural Relations in Multicultural East London. *Urban Studies* 49 (10): 2049–2066.
- Leff, Scott, and Brittany Petersen. 2015. *Beyond the Scorecard: Understanding Global City Rankings*. Chicago: The Chicago Council on Global Affairs.
- Lloyd, Christopher D., Ian G. Shuttleworth, and David W. Wong (eds.). 2015. *Socio-Spatial Segregation*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Lunn, Rebecca, and Levi Vonk. 2014. *Chicago, United States—A Case Study*. Maastricht: Maastricht School of Governance, Maastricht University.
- Marr, Stephen. 2016. Worlding and Wilding: Lagos and Detroit as Global Cities. *Race and Class* 57 (4): 3–21.
- Maruszewska, Katarzyna. 2007. Motyw zarobkowy w polskiej emigracji okresu przemian społeczno-gospodarczych. In *Przemiany rynku pracy w kontekście procesów społecznych i gospodarczych*, ed. Jarosław Poterański, 146–155. Szczecin: Katedra Mikroekonomii Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego.
- Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy A. Denton. 1988. The Dimensions of Residential Segregation. *Social Forces* 67 (2): 281–315.
- Mitchell, Katharyne. 2011. Marseille’s Not for Burning: Comparative Networks of Integration and Exclusion in Two French Cities. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 101 (2): 404–423.
- Mollenkopf, John, and Manuel Pastor. 2016. *Unsettled Americans*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Moore, Fiona. 2016. City of Sojourners Versus City of Settlers. *Global Networks* 16 (3): 372–390.
- Morén-Alegret, Richard Albert Mas, and Dawid Władyka. 2016. Inter-Group Perceptions and Representations in Two Barcelona Neighbourhoods. In *Inter-Group Relations and Migrant Integration in European Cities*, ed. Ferruccio Pastore and Irene Ponzo, 89–121. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press/IMISCOE.
- Musterd, Sako. 2003. Segregation and Integration: A Contested Relationship. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 29 (4): 623–641.

- Musterd, Sako. 2011. The Impact of Immigrants' Segregation and Concentration on Social Integration in Selected European Contexts. *Documents d'Anàlisi Geogràfica* 57 (3): 359–380.
- Musterd, Sako, and Rinus Deurloo. 2002. Unstable Immigrant Concentrations in Amsterdam. *Housing Studies* 17 (3): 487–503.
- Musterd, Sako, Szymon Marcińczak, Maarten van Ham, and Tiit Tammaru. 2015. Socio-Economic Segregation in European Capital Cities. IZA Discussion Paper No. 9603, December, Bonn.
- Pastore, Ferruccio, and Irene Ponzio. 2013. *Understanding Conflict and Integration Outcomes of Intergroup Relations and Integration Policies in Selected Quarters of Five European Cities*. Concordia Discors Synthesis Report. Turin: Forum Internazionale ed Europeo di Ricerche sull'Immigrazione.
- Pastore, Ferruccio, and Irene Ponzio. 2016. Boundaries, Barriers and Bridges: Comparative Findings from European Neighbourhoods. In *Inter-Group Relations and Migrant Integration in European Cities*, ed. Ferruccio Pastore and Irene Ponzio, 177–199. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press/IMISCOE.
- Peña Astorga, Gabriela de la. 2003. Co-presencia y visibilidades en juego: la Plaza de Cataluña en Barcelona. *Zainak* 23: 487–511.
- Pitter, Jay. 2016. Introduction. In *Subdivided: City-Building in an Age of Hyper-Diversity*, ed. Jay Pitter and John Lorinc, 5–12. Toronto: Coach House Books.
- Phillips, Deborah. 2007. Ethnic and Racial Segregation: A Critical Perspective. *Geography Compass* 1 (5): 1138–1159.
- Ranci, Costanzo. 2011. Social Cohesion and Economic Competitiveness in Six Global European Cities. Paper Presented at the Research Committee on Sociology of Urban and Regional Development RC21 Conference, July 7–9, in Amsterdam. <http://www.rc21.org/conferences/amsterdam2011/edocs/Session%208-1-Ranci.pdf>. Accessed 24 Feb 2017.
- Rechel, Bernd, Philipa Mladovsky, David Ingleby, Johan P. Mackenbach, and Martin McKee. 2013. Migration and Health in an Increasingly Diverse Europe. *Lancet* 381 (April): 1235–1245.
- Sancton, Andrew. 2004. Beyond the Municipal: Governance for Canadian Cities. Policy Options Politiques, February 1. <http://policyoptions.irpp.org/issues/canadas-cities/beyond-the-municipal-governance-for-canadian-cities/>. Accessed 8 Feb 2017.
- Sassen, Saskia. 1991. *The Global City*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Schiller, Maria. 2016. *European Cities, Municipal Organizations, and Diversity*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schiller, Nina Glick, and Ayse Çağlar. 2009. Towards a Comparative Theory of Locality in Migration Studies. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35 (2): 177–202.

- Siddiqi, Arjumand, India J. Ornelas, Kelly Quinn, Dan Zuberi, and Quynh C. Nguyen. 2013. Societal Context and the Production of Immigrant Status-Based Health Inequalities. *Journal of Public Health Policy* 34 (2): 330–344.
- Sidney, Mara. 2014. Settling in: A Comparison of Local Immigrant Organizations in the United States and Canada. *International Journal of Canadian Studies* 49: 105–133.
- Tammaru, Tiit, Sako Musterd, Maarten van Ham, and Szyman Marcińczak. 2016. A Multi-Factor Approach to Understanding Socio-Economic Segregation in European Capital Cities. In *Socio-Economic Segregation in European Capital Cities*, ed. Tiit Tammaru, Szymon Marcińczak, Maarten van Ham, and Sako Musterd, 1–29. London: Routledge.
- Thibert, Joël. 2007. *Inclusion and Social Housing Practice in Canadian Cities*. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Tremblay, Diane-Gabrielle, and Angelo Battaglia. 2012. El Raval and Mile End: A Comparative Study of Two Cultural Quarters. *Journal of Geography and Geology* 4 (1): 56–74.
- Vang, Zoua M. 2012. The Limits of Spatial Assimilation for Immigrants' Full Integration. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 641 (1): 220–246.
- Vedrédi, Katalin. 2014. Development and Use of Public Space—The Case of St. Stephen Square of Szeged. *Revista Forum Geographic* (University of Craiova, Romania) 13 (1): 119–129.
- Velasco Caballero, Francisco, and María de los Ángeles Torres, (eds.). 2013. *Ciudades globales e inmigrantes*. Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Werbner, Pnina. 2015. The Dialectics of Urban Cosmopolitanism. *Identities* 22 (5): 569–587.
- Wimmer, Andreas. 2007. *How (Not) To Think about Ethnicity in Immigrant Societies*. Oxford: Centre on Migration, Policy and Society.

Migrant Integration in Times of Economic Crisis
Policy Responses from European and North American
Global Cities

Ireland, P.R.

2017, XVI, 117 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-58099-9