University of Groningen

Integration of immigrants, bridging social capital, ethnicity, and locality

Tselios, Vassilis; Noback, Inge; van Dijk, Jouke; McCann, Philip

Published in:
Journal of Regional Science

DOI:
[10.1111/jors.12160](https://doi.org/10.1111/jors.12160)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2015

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Tselios, V., Noback, I., van Dijk, J., & McCann, P. (2015). Integration of immigrants, bridging social capital, ethnicity, and locality. *Journal of Regional Science*, 55(3), 416-441. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jors.12160>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

INTEGRATION OF IMMIGRANTS, BRIDGING SOCIAL CAPITAL, ETHNICITY, AND LOCALITY*

Vassilis Tselios

University of Thessaly, Department of Planning and Regional Development, Pedion Areos, Volos 38334, Greece. E-mail: vtselios@prd.uth.gr

Inge Noback

University of Groningen, Department of Economic Geography, Landleven 19747 AD Groningen, The Netherlands. E-mail: i.noback@rug.nl

Jouke van Dijk

University of Groningen, Department of Economic Geography, Landleven 19747 AD Groningen, The Netherlands. E-mail: jouke.van.dijk@rug.nl

Philip McCann

University of Groningen, Department of Economic Geography, Landleven 19747 AD Groningen, The Netherlands. E-mail: p.mccann@rug.nl

ABSTRACT. This paper analyses a uniquely detailed data set of social integration characteristics of immigrants belonging to four non-native ethnic groups (i.e., Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese, and Antilleans) living in Dutch neighborhoods. It is well known that an individual's level of social integration is related to the ethnic composition and economic development of an immigrant's residential locality, as well as the generation of the immigrant. Yet, what is not known is whether the social and economic characteristics of adjacent or neighboring localities also influence an individual's level of social integration. Using a multilevel hierarchical analysis with spatial interaction effects, we examine the extent to which four social integration aspects of the bridging social capital of these immigrant groups are related to their ethnicity, their generation, their immediate locality, and the effects of the neighboring localities. Our findings regarding the effects of the ethnic concentration and economic development of the immediate locality along with the immigrant's generation broadly concur with existing studies. At the same time, however, we also find that the features of neighboring localities exert an additional influence on an individual's social integration over and above those related to the immigrant's generation and immediate locality. These additional spatial spillover effects are broadly in line with those associated with the immediate locality, but they are also sensitive to particular proxies for social integration which are employed. These spatial spillover effects on social capital and social integration have not been observed before.

1. INTRODUCTION

Social integration refers to the inclusion of individuals in a system, the creation of relationships among individuals and their attitudes toward the society, and the conscious and motivated interaction and cooperation of individuals and groups (Bosswick and

*This paper is part of a larger project "Doing Justice to Superdiversity" in cooperation with the Institute for Integration and Social Efficacy, commissioned by the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations, the Netherlands. Furthermore, we would like to thank Richard H. Rijnks for his excellent work as research assistant.

Received: March 2013; revised: June 2014; accepted: June 2014.

Heckmann, 2006). Esser (2002) proposes four basic forms of social integration: acculturation, placement, interaction, and identification. This paper focuses on interactive integration, which is a key component of social capital (Putnam, 1993, 1995, 2007). The integration of immigrants into a host society or country is a particular case of social interaction and integration, but one which potentially affects many wider aspects of societal cohesion and civic engagement (Bosswick and Heckmann, 2006). The interactive integration of immigrants refers to the acceptance or inclusion of immigrants in the primary societal relationships and social networks of the host society and the process of building personal relationships with members of the host society (Bosswick and Heckmann, 2006). Indicators of the interactive integration of immigrants include social networks and ties with natives and are seen as key elements of the “bridging” aspect of social capital.

The broad field of research on immigrants’ integration (e.g., Brubaker, 2001; Fix, Zimmermann, and Passel, 2001; Alba and Nee, 2003) suffers from two major limitations. A first limitation is that the conceptual arguments relating to the integration of immigrants and bridging social capital are rather more well-defined (Putnam, 1993, 1995, 2007) than the empirical approaches, thereby somewhat limiting the impacts of existing empirical findings. The reason for this is largely related to the fact that while there have been a number of initiatives aimed at standardizing social capital measures,¹ translating the social integration concepts into empirical indicators is rather difficult, due in part to the multidimensional nature of the concept. In order to overcome these limitations, this paper therefore uses a range of different indicators of social relations, contacts and ties with native people as proxies for the social integration of immigrants.

A second limitation of this field of research is that although in addition to individual characteristics, many papers examine the association between neighborhood and/or municipality characteristics and social integration, no study so far has controlled for, or allowed for, any additional spatial interactions or spillovers related to adjacent (neighboring) neighborhoods and adjacent municipalities. Given that so much emphasis in economic geography today is put on the role of spatial interaction and spatial spillover effects of all kinds, the lack of any such analysis is rather surprising, notwithstanding the significant data requirements. This paper aims to respond to both these challenges.

The aim of this paper is, therefore, to investigate the extent to which an immigrant’s level of social integration is a function of the immigrant’s characteristics, the characteristics of the immediate neighborhood or municipality in which the immigrant lives, and also the characteristics of the adjacent neighborhoods or municipalities. For the purposes of this paper, any effects associated with the locality where the immigrant lives are termed “local effects” and any effects associated with adjacent localities, we term “neighboring effects,” respectively. Moreover, we discuss the impacts of both the local effects and the neighboring effects at two different spatial scales, namely that of the suburban neighborhood scale and also the urban municipality scale. Finally, we examine the moderating influence of ethnicity and generation.

More specifically, using the case study of the Netherlands, we determine to what extent differences in social integration of the four largest non-Western ethnic minority groups (i.e., Turks, Moroccans, Antilleans, and Surinamese) are the result of: (a) the characteristics of the immigrants, such as ethnicity, generation, gender, age, country and level of education, and employment (Level 1), (b) the ethnic concentration and economic development of the neighborhood where the immigrants live and of the neighboring neighborhoods (Level 2), and (c) the ethnic concentration and economic development of

¹These initiatives include the World Values Survey, the World Bank Doing Business Index, and the Heritage Foundation Freedom Index, along with various EU-based indices.

the municipality where the neighborhood is located and of the neighboring municipalities (Level 3). We also examine whether the above geographical characteristics (Level 2 and 3) affect the social integration of immigrants: (i) of different ethnic groups and (ii) of first- and second-generation immigrants, in different ways. We finally test whether the findings are robust to the introduction of a number of individual, neighborhood, and municipality characteristics.

The novelty of our research is fourfold. First, this investigation has been carried out using a uniquely detailed data set, which facilitates the use of a variety of proxies for immigrants' integration features of bridging social capital within a consistent framework. This allows us to identify the extent to which the empirical results regarding social integration depend on the four proxies employed. These four proxies are: relations in spare time with native Dutch people; more relations with native Dutch people than ethnic groups; the degree of contact with native Dutch people; and the quality of contact with native Dutch people.

Second, we examine the spatial interaction effects associated with social integration. Our proxies for social integration do not contain any spatial dimension as they consist of immigrants' answers to survey questions regarding their contact with native Dutch people, without any reference whatsoever to the spatial scale of such contacts.² However, much of the existing literature suggests that social integration is influenced by locality, no matter whether social integration contains information on the spatial scale of interactions, and this paper therefore attempts to examine the extent to which the social integration observations are also conditioned by locality and geography by exploiting the information regarding the residential location of the respondent.

Third, in the analysis, we suggest a multilevel model which allows us to analyze the effects of both the individual and geographical factors simultaneously within a hierarchical nested context (van Oort et al., 2012). The standard hierarchical models represent one major alternative way of capturing spatial effects, focusing on the multilevel aspects of association that are a reality of many spatial processes (Corrado and Fingleton, 2012). We further explore the standard hierarchical models incorporating neighboring effects and achieving better identification. Our multilevel model embodies differential spatial dependence within and between areas. Our approach, therefore, aims to disentangle individual effects from both local and neighboring effects, and to do this at the different spatial scales of both suburban neighborhoods and also urban municipalities, in order to identify which spatial scales appear to be the most meaningful for discussions regarding social integration. The local effects of ethnic concentration and economic development, which are the most important geographical variables in the literature on social integration, have already been examined in numerous studies using a variety of different approaches (see, for the Netherlands, Gijsberts, and Dagevos, 2007; Tolsma, van der Meer, and Gesthuizen, 2009; Schmeets and te Riele, 2010; Vervoort, Flap, and Dagevos, 2011; Gijsberts, van der Meer, and Dagevos, 2012), but no study has estimated the neighboring effects. Both neighborhoods and municipalities are contiguous territories and studies which do not address this lead to bias in outcomes. This paper addresses this issue by considering the neighboring

²Empirical studies in spatial data analysis could be generally grouped into two categories: (a) those that use spatial data as inputs, but have no spatial content in the output and the results cannot be mapped, and (b) those that use spatial data as inputs and produce spatial outputs. This study falls into the first category. Similarly, Gijsberts and Dagevos (2007) use spatial data as inputs (i.e., ethnic concentration in neighborhoods) and no spatial content in the output (i.e., mutual stereotypical attitudes proxied by the question "what do ethnic minorities and the indigenous Dutch think about one another?"). Vervoort et al. (2011) also use spatial data as inputs (i.e., ethnic composition in neighborhoods) and no spatial content in the output (i.e., contacts with native friends and coethnic friends).

effects.³ This is the first study which attempts to explore the local neighborhood, neighboring neighborhood, local municipality, and neighboring municipality effects. Moreover, our approach examines not only *which* local and neighboring effects matter, but also for *whom* these effects matter.

Fourth, the findings of our research are that: (a) Antilleans are the most socially integrated, (b) immigrants living in local neighborhoods characterized by a high percentage of foreigners and low economic development exhibit low levels of all proxies for social integration, (c) the negative association between immigrants' integration and ethnic concentration in municipalities is higher than those in neighborhoods and this is higher than those in neighboring neighborhoods, but this is sensitive to the proxies for social integration, and (d) the possible local and neighboring effects differ between ethnic and generation groups.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. After a very brief comment on our research strategy and novelty, the next section discusses the literature on local and neighboring effects on the social integration of immigrants. Section 3 proceeds to introduce the empirical model, to describe the data and the variables employed in the model, and presents some descriptive statistics. Section 4 discusses the results and interprets the main findings of the research questions that our study attempts to answer. Section 5 concludes.

2. SOCIAL INTEGRATION, ETHNICITY, IMMIGRATION, AND NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS

The determinants of the social integration of immigrants have been a major concern for researchers and policymakers for more than a century. The characteristics of the residential and/or municipality context play an important role in explaining social integration. Both the ethnic concentration of an area and its economic development have been linked to social integration (Gijssberts and Dagevos, 2007; Vervoort et al., 2011).

The Local Effects

International immigrants are particularly concentrated in urban areas (Ottaviano and Peri, 2013). Their social contacts with natives are thought to be conducive to their successful integration in the host society in several ways, such as economically, culturally and in terms of their acceptance (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006; Heath, Rothon, and Kilpi, 2008; Vervoort et al., 2011). However, high ethnic residential concentration hinders the social integration of ethnic minorities, because the statistical chance of meeting natives in high ethnic residential areas is low (Vervoort et al., 2011). Another reason is that people usually prefer to interact with those who resemble them, who share the same ethnic heritage, have the same social status, and hence share experiences and tastes (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook, 2001; Tolsma et al., 2009). Although there are potential benefits from social contacts with coethnics, such as social and emotional support and opportunities for an "ethnic career" (Wilson and Portes, 1980) and employment opportunities to find a job constraining social mobility (Wiley, 1967; Pinkster, 2007), there are important negative consequences for social integration when members of ethnic minorities stay within their

³For example, the standard neighborhood model assumes that no interaction occurs among neighborhoods and thus neighborhoods with identical characteristics in ethnic concentration and economic development but dissimilar neighboring neighborhoods are considered equivalent (Dietz, 2002; Bolster et al., 2007).

own ethnic group, as they have fewer resources and less access to the resources of family and friends than natives (Vervoort et al., 2011). As for natives, they often feel threatened when the number of ethnic minorities in a residential area is high, and this is likely to result in lower willingness on the part of natives to engage in contact with ethnic minorities (Blalock, 1967; Vervoort et al., 2011).

Another factor is the fact that high ethnic residential concentration is often observed to go hand in hand with low-income neighborhoods. Ethnic minorities are often concentrated in deprived areas that are economically disadvantaged and poor (Heath et al., 2008). At the same time, immigrants are usually located in areas where not only the inhabitants' ethnicity is similar to their own ethnicity, but also the inhabitants' economic characteristics resemble their own (Schelling, 1969, 1971). Living in deprived neighborhoods itself has a negative effect on residents' life chances over and above the effect of their individual characteristics (van Ham and Manley, 2010). Economic disadvantage in a neighborhood makes residents more fearful and results in fewer social contacts in general (Sampson, Morenoff, and Gannon-Rowley, 2002), and when community members have fewer individual and collective resources, they are less likely to communicate with others (Ross, Mirowsky, and Pribesh, 2001; Gijsberts et al., 2012).

The Neighboring Effects

A major step forward in the study of geographical interactions is the investigation of spillover effects. In the existing empirical studies, each area (either neighborhood or municipality) has been viewed as an independent entity and the potential for observational interactions and externalities across space has largely been ignored. This paper addresses this issue by taking into account not only the local effects, but also the neighboring effects associated with any ethnic concentration and economic development features within adjacent neighborhoods and municipalities. This is very important from a social, economic, and empirical perspective.

From a social perspective, social activities and many aspects of life in general may be situated outside one's direct locality, either one's own neighborhood or municipality. Social scientists often treat arbitrary administrative units as neighborhoods (Dietz, 2002), but a neighborhood is a local and, at the same time, a contiguous territory. Neighborhoods are not mutually exclusive and every part of a city is in a neighborhood, but an activity can take place simultaneously in multiple neighborhoods (Spielman, 2011). From an economic perspective, there are many possible spatial interactions and externalities operating between localities, including labor migration, capital mobility, forward and backward linkages, technology transfers, and knowledge spillovers, among others (Armstrong, 2002; Rodríguez-Pose and Tselios, 2009). These interactions often generate groups of geographically interdependent areas; the smaller the geographical distance between areas, the higher is the expected intensity of the interactions. Thus, interactions among small neighborhoods are expected to be stronger than among larger-scale municipalities, although both sets of interactions are likely to be a major source of spatial dependence. We employ a spatial weights matrix to incorporate possible externalities in the form of spatial spillovers. We do not enter variables in our regression model that proxy spillovers, because such an approach itself requires strong identifying assumptions and it therefore possesses no real advantage compared to employing a spatial weights matrix (Harris, Moffat, and Kravtsova, 2011; Corrado and Fingleton, 2012).⁴ From an empirical perspective, ignoring the spatial dependence will lead to biased estimates in modeling social integration and

⁴For a review of spatial econometrics, see Partridge et al. (2012).

thus to misleading conclusions. A major problem in the studies of geographical effects is the investigation of the most relevant scale of an area (Lee, Oropesa, and Kanan, 1994; van Ham and Manley, 2010), and given the theoretical arguments about social integration, this paper addresses this problem by adding the neighboring effects as well as the local effect to the determinants of social integration. Overall, our suggested model specification has a theoretical foundation (i.e., social and economic perspective) and has been driven by data-analytic considerations (i.e., empirical perspective).

The Role of Ethnicity and Generations

Up to this point, we have focused on the question of *which* geographical effects (i.e., local and neighboring effects) matter. Yet, at least as interesting is the question of *for whom* these effects matter. This question remains inconclusive, and in this subsection we examine whether ethnic concentration and economic development are likely to affect the social integration of immigrants of different groups in different ways.

First, we do indeed expect that the relationship between geographical effects and social integration will vary across different ethnic groups. A possible explanation is that localities offer their inhabitants the resources (e.g., socioeconomic infrastructure) to meet and mingle, but different ethnic groups may receive and assess these resources differently (Tolsma et al., 2009). An immigrant's decision on where to live depends on the interaction between that person's own characteristics and the characteristics of the local and adjacent population (Schelling, 1969) and these interactions, or the perception of these interactions, may differ according to ethnicity. People belonging to the same area tend to behave similarly, but the propensity of a person to behave in a certain way varies with the dominant behavior in the group, such as the ethnic group (Kandori, 1992). Our analysis allows us to throw light on these issues.

Second, we expect that the relationship between geographical effects and social integration will vary between first- and second-generation immigrants. It is widely known that second-generation immigrants are more socially integrated than first-generation immigrants (Gijssberts et al., 2012). In the case of European countries, such as the Netherlands, first-generation immigrants, especially the national origins of third-country migrants, arrived in Europe to work in jobs for which employers could not recruit local people from the national majority communities (e.g., labor-intensive public services or factory work in large cities; Davies et al., 2011). Such immigrants typically find work in low-wage industries and occupations and tend to be constrained to look for housing where the costs of accommodation are the lowest, such as in areas with high ethnic concentrations and low levels of economic development. Second- and subsequent-generation individuals, however, often benefit from the fact that those first-generation immigrants who developed successful employment trajectories often chose to move away to more prosperous localities than those which they had originally entered. Moreover, even the offspring of those immigrants who still remained in the same localities are often more deeply involved in the local social environment than their parents. Therefore, different intergeneration groups may receive and access the resources and opportunities of localities differently, depending on such choices. Our analysis also allows us to throw light on these issues.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY USING NETHERLAND'S SURVEY-BASED DATA

Our research strategy is aimed at investigating the relationships between immigrants' social integration, ethnicity, generation, and the characteristics of the neighborhoods and municipalities in which they live as well as the neighboring localities. In order to undertake the analysis, we apply a multilevel model to a uniquely detailed survey-based

data set of bridging social capital characteristics of immigrants belonging to different non-native ethnic groups. The data are derived from the 1998 survey of the “Sociale Positie en Voorzieningengebruik Allochtonen” (SPVA-1998), which focuses on native Dutch people along with the four largest non-Western ethnic minority groups in the Netherlands, i.e., Turks, Antilleans, Moroccans, and Surinamese, in order to measure the social integration features of social capital and the microeconomic determinants of these. This survey-based information is complemented with data from Statistics Netherlands in order to measure the local and adjoining neighborhood and municipality influences. Only a few Dutch studies have previously focused on ethnic concentration and economic development at the same time (Gijsberts and Dagevos, 2007; Vervoort et al., 2011),⁵ but none have provided as comprehensive an analysis, including neighboring effects, as is developed here.

The SPVA-1998 data survey begins with an initial sample of 14,972 individuals who filled out the personal questionnaire. A total of 14,967 individuals (as we do not know the location [i.e., neighborhood] for five individuals) live in 345 neighborhoods⁶ and in 13 municipalities (20.88 percent in Amsterdam, 20.07 percent in Rotterdam, 13.83 percent in Den Haag, 10.06 percent in Utrecht, 5.51 percent in Eindhoven, 5.94 percent in Enschede, 3.88 percent in Almere, 2.97 percent in Alphen aan den Rijn, 4.16 percent in Bergen op Zoom, 3.65 percent in Hoogezand-Sapp., 3.08 percent in Delft, 3.80 percent in Dordrecht, and 2.18 percent in Tiel). Of 14,809 individuals (158 missing observations on ethnicity), 2,843 or 19.20 percent are native Dutch people, 3,754 or 25.35 percent are Turks, 3,110 or 21.01 percent are Moroccans, 3,408 or 23.01 percent are Surinamese, and 1,694 or 11.44 percent are Antilleans. Of 11,784 immigrants (182 missing observations on generation status), 8,851 or 75.11 percent are first-generation immigrants and 2,933 or 24.89 percent are second-generation immigrants (–6th year).⁷

Econometric Specification: A Multilevel Model

The multilevel econometric specification developed in this paper is based on the argument that immigrants (Level 1) are “nested” within suburban neighborhoods (Level 2), which are themselves “nested” within urban municipalities (Level 3), and the characteristics of each of these levels of nesting may individually and also collectively influence the social integration behavior of immigrants. Our multilevel approach allows us to analyze the effects of both the individual (Level 1) and geographical (Levels 2 and 3) factors simultaneously within this hierarchical nested context (van Oort et al., 2012), while also controlling for dependences in the data resulting from respondents being located in the same local neighborhood and in the same municipality. In our hierarchical model, the observed outcomes (i.e., proxies for immigrants’ social integration) depend on variables organized in a nested hierarchy. “*Failure to recognize these effects emanating from different hierarchical levels can lead to incorrect inference*” (Corrado and Fingleton, 2012, p. 211). Our model also incorporates spatial externalities. These additional effects may reduce the omitted variable bias.

The multilevel model adopts the following form:

$$SocInt_i = \beta_0 + IND_i\beta_1 + NEIG_r\beta_2 + WNEIG_r\beta_3 + MUN_s\beta_4 + ZMUN_s\beta_5 + \omega_i,$$

⁵Gijsberts and Dagevos (2007) focus on ethnic diversity rather than ethnic concentration and only examine this at the suburban local neighborhood level rather than at the urban municipality level.

⁶In this paper, administrative areas (four-digit postcodes) are used to define local neighborhoods.

⁷First-generation immigrants were born abroad and did not come to the Netherlands before the age of six years and second-generation immigrants were born in the Netherlands or came to the Netherlands before the age of six (Martens, 1998).

where $SocInt_i$ is a proxy for the social integration of immigrant i , IND_i is a vector of variables for immigrant i , $NEIG_r$ is a vector of variables for the local neighborhood r where the immigrant lives, $WNEIG_r$ is a vector of variables for the (average) neighboring neighborhoods of neighborhood r , MUN_s is a vector of variables for municipality s , $ZMUN_s$ is a vector of variables for the (average) neighboring municipalities of municipality s , and ω_i is the error term. The error term includes the individual-level random variation, the neighborhood-level random variation, and the municipality-level random variation. The specification of the interneighboring and intermunicipality interactions (spatial interactions) is represented by a spatial weights matrix W and Z , respectively. These matrixes capture both the social interactions, as social activities may be situated outside one's direct locality (i.e., neighborhood or municipality), and the economic interactions, as capital and labor mobility and technology transfers create economic interdependences among localities. Moreover, the literature on urban and suburban spatial spillovers suggests that these socioeconomic interactions may be a major source of spatial dependence.⁸ The inclusion of interdependence between neighborhoods as well as between municipalities in the form of spatial effects has two main advantages: (i) it reduces a possible omitted variable bias and (ii) it introduces a source of exogenous variation (Corrado and Fingleton, 2012). However, it is possible that having controlled for the measurable compositional effects, there are still unobservable spatial effects which are captured in the error term (Corrado and Fingleton, 2012).

From an empirical point of view, the specification proposed here allows for the effects of local neighborhood and municipality factors to be examined simultaneously and this is advantageous in that it offers the necessary flexibility in our approach to spatial matters for the following reasons. The urban municipality level may be too large for a discussion of the variable of interest and the unobserved heterogeneity may therefore create an ecological fallacy, so it might have been more relevant to use the suburban neighborhood level. Conversely, the neighborhood level may be too small, so the spatial autocorrelation detected could be an artifact that arises from slicing homogeneous zones in respect to the variable considered, so it might have been more relevant to use the urban municipality level (Ertur and Le Gallo, 2003). With no prior theoretical grounds on which firmly to base these opposing arguments, we therefore adopt an open-minded and flexible approach.

The β_0 is the constant (fixed intercept). The vector coefficient β_1 captures the individual effects on social integration, the vector coefficients β_2 and β_3 capture the local neighborhood and neighboring-neighborhood effects, and the vector coefficients β_4 and β_5 capture the municipality and neighboring-municipality effects. A significant vector coefficient on a variable at the local neighborhood or at the neighboring-neighborhood level will in all likelihood signal the presence of spillover effects at the neighborhood level, while a significant vector coefficient on a variable at the municipality or at the neighboring-municipality level will in all likelihood signal the presence of spillover effects at the municipality level. Overall, the vector coefficient β_1 represents the individual effects on the social integration of immigrants and the vector coefficients β_2 , β_3 , β_4 , and β_5 represent the geographical effects. To estimate the effects and standard errors of the variables at the individual, neighborhood, and municipality level, we use a maximum likelihood estimator.⁹ The standard errors and variance parameters are not *determined* by the number of respondents per neighborhood and municipality.

⁸Spatial dependence can also arise from a variety of measurement problems.

⁹We also tested the robustness of our results using an OLS estimator and clustering of data. Both estimators allow for intraterritorial correlation and relax the usual requirement that the observations be independent. These results are robust and can be provided by the authors upon request.

In a hierarchical model without spatial dependencies, individuals within the same area are affected in the same way by all the other members of the area, implying that each individual within the area has the same weight. This model also assumes that the interindividual interactions do not spill across area boundaries (i.e., neighborhood boundaries and municipality boundaries). Our hierarchical model overcomes this restriction, because it introduces externalities between areas (i.e., out-group contextual effects; Corrado and Fingleton, 2012).

We also aim to see whether ethnicity and the intergenerational status moderate the association between immigrants' integration and the characteristics of the local or neighboring localities. We use two-way interactions in our regression analysis to test: (a) the joint effect of ethnicity and locality characteristics and (b) the joint effect of the generation status and locality characteristics. In other words, the vector coefficients β_2 , β_3 , β_4 , and β_5 may vary across the values of either ethnicity and/or the immigrant generation status.

Variables

Like most studies in this field, our empirical specification is cross-sectional, which makes it difficult to make statements about the causality and endogeneity of the relationships. Following Banerjee and Duflo (2003), in order to minimize this potential risk, the spatial factors we employ are time-lagged variables (three-year lags).¹⁰ Nevertheless, the results are viewed as correlations given the short lags of the explanatory variables. Finally, to test whether there are multicollinearity problems involved, we perform a perturbation analysis (Belsley, 1991).

Dependent variables. Four dependent variables derived from the survey are used to proxy aspects of immigrants' social integration features of bridging social capital. In the survey, people (both immigrants and native Dutch people) were asked to grade their relations in spare time with natives (1st proxy), to identify if they have more or less relations with natives than ethnic groups (2nd proxy) and to grade the degree and quality of contact with natives (3rd and 4th proxy). Of 14,809 individuals, 12,063 answered at least one of the above four questions: 329 or 2.73 percent native Dutch people, 3,657 or 30.32 percent Turks, 3,031 or 25.13 percent Moroccans, and 1,673 or 13.87 percent Antilleans. These contacts can take place either in private life (e.g., in spare time, as the 1st proxy refers to) or in public life (e.g., in jobs). All the variables are categorical, but they are considered as ratio variables in order to use linear regression models. Moreover, a linear function model—in contrast to ordered logit—provides variances at the individual, neighborhood, and municipality levels. We do not include native Dutch respondents (329 observations) in the analysis, because the focus of analysis is on immigrants' social integration, as it is widely known that native Dutch people have the most and best contacts with native people. Thus, our sample consists of 11,734 immigrants. Each variable (proxy for social integration) is based on an assumption about the level of integration of an immigrant. For example, immigrants for whom the frequency of their relations in spare time with native people are reported as being “often” are assumed to be more socially integrated than immigrants with no such relations. A summary overview of all the dependent variables with their assumptions can be found in Table 1.¹¹

¹⁰Unfortunately, the data availability does not allow us to investigate causality in more detail (for a review on the empirics on social capital, see Durlauf, 2002).

¹¹The correlation coefficient between these proxies is low. It can be provided by the authors upon request.

TABLE 1: Summary Statistics of the Proxies for Immigrants' Integration

Proxies	Variable	Scales	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Low Integration	High Integration
1st	Relations in spare time with native Dutch people	1 "Never" 2 "Occasionally" 3 "Often"	10,145	1.9376	0.7660	1	3
2nd	More relations with native Dutch people than ethnic groups	1 "More ethnic groups" 2 "Equal"	6,801	1.8062	0.7456	1	3
3rd	Degree of contact with native Dutch people	3 "More native Dutch people" 1 "None" 2 "Few" 3 "Many"	5,447	2.1577	0.7072	1	4
4th	Quality of contact with native Dutch people	4 "Very many" 1 "Almost not at all" 2 "Bad" 3 "Ordinary" 4 "Good" 5 "Very good"	4,599	3.8576	0.5426	1	5

FIGURE 1: Distribution of Standardized Immigrants' Integration.

The distribution of our sample across ethnic groups and between first- and second-generation immigrants is shown in Figure 1.¹² This figure displays the following features:

¹²This figure displays the standardized immigrant's integration proxy. The standardized integration proxies allow us to compare them with each other, because the value of the standardized proxies does not depend on the number of categories. The standardized integration proxy is an integration proxy that has

(a) Antilleans are the most socially integrated for all proxies, Turks are the least integrated for the “more relations with native Dutch people than ethnic groups” and “quality of contact with native Dutch people” proxies, and Moroccans are the least integrated for the “relations in spare time with native Dutch people” and “degree of contact with native Dutch people” proxies. (b) The second-generation immigrants are more socially integrated than the first-generation immigrants. Overall, both Antilleans and the second-generation immigrants are the most socially integrated. The results above are just a first indication that aspects of the social integration of immigrants related to bridging social capital are linked to ethnic groups and to generation groups.

Independent variables.

(a) Individual level (Level 1)

In the SPVA-1998 survey, immigrants were interviewed about their socioeconomic status and information was collected about their age, sex, length of residence in the Netherlands, education, employment, income, etc. The main independent variables at the individual level used in this paper were chosen after considering the literature and the existing empirical studies on social integration, as well as the number of observations. The main individual-level characteristic variables are: ethnicity, generation, gender, age, country of education, educational attainment, and employment.

(b) Neighborhood level (Level 2)

Information at the neighborhood and neighboring-neighborhood level (Level 2) was derived from record data from Statistics Netherlands (1995), which we were able to merge with the SPVA-1998 survey by using the neighborhood classification adopted by Statistics Netherlands. This classification is based on the four-digit postcode areas. These areas are a rather good approximation of what people understand to be their direct local environment (Volker, Flap, and Lindenberg, 2007). There were 3,733 suburban local neighborhood areas in 1995. Two independent variables at the local neighborhood level are considered as the main independent variables. These are the percentage of foreigners (or, more specifically, the number of foreigners per inhabitant) within the local neighborhoods and also within the neighboring-neighborhood localities, and these reflect the ethnic concentration features,¹³ and also the income per capita of neighborhoods and of the neighboring neighborhoods (divided by 1,000), which reflect the economic development features. The effect of the neighboring neighborhoods can be assumed to represent the indirect effects on the local environment.

An initial step of the exploratory spatial data analysis is to map the percentage of foreigners (for 1,365 neighborhoods) and income per capita (for 3,269 neighborhoods) to gain a spatial view of the data and to see whether both variables are randomly distributed over space or if there are similarities between neighborhoods.¹⁴ The mapping illustrates that

been rescaled to have a standard deviation of one. For a standardized integration proxy, each case's value on the standardized proxy indicates its difference from the mean of the integration proxy in the number of standard deviations.

¹³Unfortunately, we do not have record information about the percentage of ethnic minorities by each ethnic group separately in 1995 in order to construct the Herfindahl index for ethnic diversity at the neighborhood level. Nevertheless, for the Dutch case, the measures of ethnic concentration and ethnic diversity are highly correlated (Vervoort et al., 2011).

¹⁴The spatial distribution of ethnic concentration and economic development can be provided by the authors upon request.

in many cases neighboring localities tend to register similar degrees of ethnic concentration and economic development. The next step of the exploratory spatial data analysis is to include tests for, and visualization of, both “global” (test for clustering) and “local” (test for clusters) statistics (Anselin, 1995), using different spatial weights matrices, which contain information on the “neighborhood” structure of each neighborhood, such as the p -order contiguity and the q -nearest neighbors. We specify the different spatial weights matrices in a rational manner that attempts to represent as far as possible real socioeconomic processes, because spatially lagged variables may reflect true interaction and are not simply a surrogate for some omitted variables and measurement errors (Corrado and Fingleton, 2012). We anticipate various forms of spatial weights matrices, because spillovers have diverse origins (Corrado and Fingleton, 2012). We argue that the smaller the geographical distance between areas, the higher is the expected intensity of the interactions. This means that the higher the value of p and q , the higher the distance, and thus the lower the interactions. We test for unevenness in ethnic and income distributions using both global and local variants of Moran’s contiguity ratio and, finally, we calculate the variables regarding the percentage of foreigners of the neighboring neighborhoods and also the income per capita of the neighboring neighborhoods.

(c) Municipality level (Level 3)

Information at the municipality and neighboring-municipality level (Level 3) was also derived from record data from Statistics Netherlands (1995), which we were also able to merge with the SPVA-1998 survey. There were 633 municipalities in 1995. Two independent variables at the municipality level are considered as the main independent variables. These are the percentage of foreigners (or the number of foreigners per inhabitant) of the municipalities and also of the neighboring municipalities (598) and the income per capita of the municipalities and also of neighboring municipalities (633). The exploratory spatial data analysis shows that municipalities with similar ethnic and income conditions tend to be clustered.

After considering a wide range of values for p and q , we ended up with q -nearest neighbors and more specifically with $q = 3, 5$, and 7 as the most appropriate spatial weights scheme, in order to minimize the number of neighborhoods and municipalities which have no neighbors (“islands”), especially due to the missing observations regarding the percentage of foreigners, while also controlling for high spatial autocorrelation and minimizing the effects of spatial outliers.¹⁵ Overall, these spatial weights schemes allow us to see whether the socioeconomic interactions among localities level play an important role in shaping and containing social ties and thus in social integration of immigrants.

After merging the databases at the individual, neighborhood, and municipality levels and also after removing immigrants with missing observations on ethnicity, generation, gender, age, country of education, educational attainment, and employment, we ended up with 10,204 immigrants, who live in 341 neighborhoods and 13 municipalities. A total of 3,219 or 31.55 percent are Turks, 2,630 or 25.77 percent are Moroccans, 2,901 or 28.43 percent are Surinamese, and 1,454 or 14.25 percent are Antilleans. A total of 8,195 or 80.31 percent are first-generation immigrants and 2,009 or 19.69 percent are

¹⁵For example, the Moran’s I index for municipality income per capita for the three nearest neighbors is 0.4092, for the five nearest neighbors is 0.3939, and for the seven nearest neighbors is 0.3681. The Moran’s I index for ethnic concentration in municipality for the three nearest neighbors is 0.1447, for the five nearest neighbors is 0.1239, and for the seven nearest neighbors is 0.1210. We observe that the higher the distance, the lower the interactions.

second-generation immigrants. Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics for the main individual, (neighboring-) neighborhood and (neighboring-) municipality variables used in the analysis.

The correlation matrix of the geographical factors¹⁶ shows high and negative correlation between the percentage of foreigners and income per capita of neighborhoods and of neighboring neighborhoods (e.g., -0.8223 and -0.6718 , respectively). These correlations are taken into account in the perturbation analysis and in the interpretation of the regression results.

(d) Controls (Levels 1, 2, and 3)

We include a set of control variables to capture some relevant individual, neighborhood, and municipality features and to deal with important sources of heterogeneity. It is necessary to take these features into account to partial out their relative effects and to study the extent to which the relationship between immigrants' integration and ethnic concentration and economic development at the neighborhood and at the municipality levels still exists after controlling for them. Moreover, many factors determine the locational choices for international immigrants, which should be taken into account in relevant studies (Rodríguez-Pose and Ketterer, 2012). Finally, the inclusion of control variables reduces the omitted variable bias which arises when unobserved variables are correlated with included variables.

The control variables used in this paper were chosen after once more considering the literature and the empirical studies on social integration and data availability issues. The individual control variables have been extracted from the SPVA survey for 1998 and the (neighboring) locality (suburban neighborhood or urban municipality) control variables have been extracted from the Netherlands Statistics for 1995, but most of these controls are highly correlated. These controls are: type of highest obtained educational degree, length of residence in the Netherlands, labor experience in the Netherlands, type of occupation and income levels (Level 1), and degree of urbanization, percentage of people receiving a low income, high income and who are not active, number of inhabitants and total land area, among others (Levels 2 and 3).

4. REGRESSION RESULTS

It is impossible to estimate all the place-specific characteristics and proposed interactions simultaneously, because with so many related variables we would experience problems of collinearity and the standard errors would be large. In order to test the robustness of our results, we deal with this problem as follows. We initially use a model which has explanatory variables at the individual level (Level 1); we then use a model which has explanatory variables at the individual level (Level 1) and the suburban neighborhood level and adding, then, the neighboring-neighborhood level (Level 2); we similarly use a model which has explanatory variables at the individual level (Level 1) and the urban municipality level and adding, then, the neighboring-municipality level (Level 3); and, finally, we use a model which includes all levels (Levels 1, 2, and 3) as explanatory factors. All these models are three-level ones, because the error term includes individual, neighborhood, and municipality random variations. We estimated these models both with and without dummies for ethnicity and immigration generation in order to see whether the individual, neighborhood, and municipality determinants of immigrants' integration

¹⁶This matrix can be provided upon request.

TABLE 2: Descriptive Statistics of the Main Variables

Level	Variable	Year	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Level 1	Turks (base category)	1998	10,204	0.3155	0.4647	0	1
Level 1	Moroccans	1998	10,204	0.2577	0.4374	0	1
Level 1	Surinamese	1998	10,204	0.2843	0.4511	0	1
Level 1	Antilleans	1998	10,204	0.1425	0.3496	0	1
Level 1	First-generation immigrants (base category)	1998	10,204	0.8031	0.3977	0	1
Level 1	Second-generation immigrants	1998	10,204	0.1969	0.3977	0	1
Level 1	Female (base category)	1998	10,204	0.4995	0.5000	0	1
Level 1	Male	1998	10,204	0.5005	0.5000	0	1
Level 1	Age	1998	10,204	35.2310	13.3566	12	89
Level 1	Age squared	1998	10,204	1,419.60	1,074.77	144	7,921
Level 1	Country of education: The Netherlands (base category)	1998	10,204	0.2565	0.4367	0	1
Level 1	Country of education: origin and The Netherlands	1998	10,204	0.2438	0.4294	0	1
Level 1	Country of education: origin	1998	10,204	0.3129	0.4637	0	1
Level 1	Country of education: no education	1998	10,204	0.1868	0.3898	0	1
Level 1	Highest obtained degree so far	1998	10,204	2.2975	2.2296	0	8
Level 1	Unemployed (base category)	1998	10,204	0.5402	0.4984	0	1
Level 1	Employed	1998	10,204	0.4598	0.4984	0	1
Level 2	Number of foreigners per inhabitant of neighborhoods	1995	9,066	0.2433	0.1652	0.0027	0.6500
Level 2	Number of foreigners per inhabitant of neighboring neighborhoods ($q = 5$)	1995	9,066	0.1796	0.1114	0.0140	0.4900
Level 2	Income per capita of neighborhoods	1995	9,332	7.7515	1.2103	4.9460	14.4882
Level 2	Income per capita of neighboring neighborhoods ($q = 5$)	1995	9,332	8.3662	0.8699	6.3329	11.9327
Level 3	Number of foreigners per inhabitant of municipalities	1995	10,204	0.1583	0.0597	0.0500	0.2200
Level 3	Number of foreigners per inhabitant of neighboring municipalities ($q = 5$)	1995	10,204	0.0361	0.0154	0.0100	0.0560
Level 3	Income per capita of municipalities	1995	10,204	8.5216	0.3257	7.7600	9.1890
Level 3	Income per capita of neighboring municipalities ($q = 5$)	1995	10,204	9.4898	0.6215	8.4630	10.5866

are sensitive to the inclusion of these dummies. We also tested whether the results are stable to the inclusion of individual and geographical control variables as well as to the value of q (with $q = 3, 5, 7$) of the spatial weights matrix. For the sake of brevity, we only report the three-level models which include explanatory factors at Levels 1 and 2 or at Levels 1 and 3, with dummies for ethnicity and immigration generation for the value of $q = 5$ of the spatial weights matrix and without the inclusion of additional individual and geographical control variables. The results below were not sensitive to different values of q and to the inclusion of control variables. However, the model which includes all levels, as explanatory factors, simultaneously is distorted by multicollinearity, because the geographical variables are not mutually exclusive.¹⁷

Social Integration, Ethnic Concentration, and Economic Development

Table 3 presents the possible impact of individual, neighborhood, and municipality characteristics on immigrants' integration using a three-level model with spatial interaction effects.

Turning to the individual influences on the social integration aspects of bridging social capital, the regression results show (and as Figure 1 has also indicated) that Antilleans and second-generation immigrants are the most socially integrated groups. It is hardly surprising that second-generation immigrants are the most socially integrated groups, but Antilleans are likely to be the most integrated because they come from the Dutch Caribbean. They have been exposed to Dutch language and culture and are often Christian like the Dutch (Gijssberts and Dagevos, 2005; Martinovic, van Tubergen, and Maas, 2009; Musterd and Ostendorf, 2009). Being familiar with Dutch culture and language leads to a stronger preference to develop contacts with natives (Martinovic et al., 2009), whereas Turks and Moroccans appear to be more oriented toward their own group (Musterd and Ostendorf, 2009).

Gender, age, country, level of education, and employment, seem to matter for the degree of immigrants' integration. More specifically, male immigrants have more social relations and contacts with natives than female ones. Young and elderly immigrants exhibit less social integration regarding the "degree of contact with native Dutch people" proxy. Immigrants who have acquired formal qualifications in the Netherlands display more social integration than either those who have acquired qualifications in their country of origin or those with no educational attainments, and highly educated immigrants exhibit more social integration than less educated immigrants, apart from the "quality of contact with native Dutch people" proxy. Finally, employed people are more socially integrated than unemployed people regarding the "relations in spare time with native Dutch people" and "more relations with native Dutch people than ethnic groups" proxies.

As for Level 2 (Regressions 1–8), the results show that immigrants living in local neighborhoods characterized by a high percentage of foreigners and low economic development exhibit low levels of social integration. This finding is not sensitive to the proxy for immigrants' social integration. Thus, no matter how social integration is measured, high ethnic concentration and low-income neighborhoods hinder the social integration of ethnic minorities. Although there is a high negative correlation between the percentage of foreigners in neighborhoods and their level of income per capita, if we include both variables in the same regression¹⁸ the ethnic effect dominates. The other findings are sensitive to the proxy for social integration. More specifically, the results show a

¹⁷These results can be provided upon request.

¹⁸These results can be provided by the authors upon request.

TABLE 3: Social Integration, Ethnic Concentration and Economic Development

<i>Neighborhood Level</i>	Relations in Spare Time with Native Dutch People		More Relations with Native Dutch People than Ethnic Groups		Degree of Contact with Native Dutch People		Quality of Contact with Native Dutch People	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Turks	Base -0.1200***	Base -0.1218***	Base 0.2460***	Base 0.2441***	Base -0.1035***	Base -0.1066***	Base 0.1125***	Base 0.1119***
Moroccans	0.2820***	0.2878***	0.3218***	0.3185***	0.0327**	0.0333**	0.0634**	0.0652***
Surinamese	0.4184***	0.4316***	0.7063***	0.7031***	0.0683**	0.0697**	0.1183***	0.1193***
Antilleans	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base
1st generation	0.2766***	0.2831***	0.1938***	0.2040***	0.1085***	0.1095***	0.1264***	0.1192***
2nd generation	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base
Female	0.1350***	0.1343***	0.0468***	0.0479***	0.0884***	0.0855***	0.0295**	0.0307*
Male	0.0001	0.0006	0.0015	0.0017	0.0167***	0.0171***	0.0081**	0.0082**
Age	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.0001***	-0.0001***	-0.0001	-0.0001
Age squared								
Country of education:								
The Netherlands	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base
Origin and The Netherlands	-0.0887***	-0.0822***	-0.1697***	-0.1619***	-0.0667*	-0.0665*	0.0581**	0.0591**
Origin	-0.2589***	-0.2564***	-0.2350***	-0.2290***	-0.1120***	-0.1138***	0.0516*	0.0513*
No education	-0.3367***	-0.3345***	-0.1940***	-0.1899***	-0.1723***	-0.1752***	0.0272	0.0231
Highest degree so far	0.0367***	0.0373***	0.0199***	0.0205***	0.0113**	0.0103*	0.0049	0.0055
Unemployed								
Employed	0.0711***	0.0728***	0.0526***	0.0533***	0.0331	0.0343	0.0211	0.0202
Eth. conc. of neighb.	-0.5964***		-0.5917***		-0.5697***		-0.3251***	
Eth. conc. of adj. neighb.	-0.3997***		-0.1489		-0.3498*		0.0270	
Inc. pc of neighb.		0.0405***		0.0334***		0.0399***		0.0268***
Inc. pc of adj. neighb.		0.0401***		0.0583***		0.0514***		-0.0038
Constant	1.9554***	1.1457***	1.5636***	0.6678***	1.9465***	1.0590***	3.5301***	3.2983***
Observations	9,010	9,275	6,038	6,227	4,848	4,994	4,091	4,219

(Continued)

TABLE 3: Continued

<i>Municipality Level</i>	Relations in Spare Time with Native Dutch People		More Relations with Native Dutch People than Ethnic Groups		Degree of Contact with Native Dutch People		Quality of Contact with Native Dutch People	
	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
<i>Turks</i>	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base
Moroccans	-0.1212 ^{***}	-0.1210 ^{***}	0.2527 ^{***}	0.2524 ^{***}	-0.1046 ^{***}	-0.1057 ^{***}	0.1149 ^{***}	0.1146 ^{***}
Surinamese	0.3031 ^{***}	0.3042 ^{***}	0.3318 ^{***}	0.3293 ^{***}	0.0532 [*]	0.0535 [*]	0.0726 ^{***}	0.0734 ^{***}
Antilleans	0.4356 ^{***}	0.4395 ^{***}	0.7050 ^{***}	0.7050 ^{***}	0.0850 ^{***}	0.0880 ^{***}	0.1276 ^{***}	0.1293 ^{***}
1st generation	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base
2nd generation	0.2740 ^{***}	0.2729 ^{***}	0.2123 ^{***}	0.2119 ^{***}	0.1194 ^{***}	0.1180 ^{***}	0.1168 ^{***}	0.1167 ^{***}
Female	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base
Male	0.1382 ^{***}	0.1384 ^{***}	0.0508 ^{***}	0.0509 ^{***}	0.0762 ^{***}	0.0780 ^{***}	0.0279 [*]	0.0294 [*]
Age	-0.0004 [*]	-0.0004 [*]	0.0001 [*]	0.0002 [*]	0.0168 ^{***}	0.0168 ^{***}	0.0059 [*]	0.0059 [*]
Age squared	0.0000 [*]	0.0000 [*]	0.0001 ^{***}	0.0001 ^{***}	-0.0001 ^{***}	-0.0001 ^{***}	-0.0000 ^{***}	-0.0000 ^{***}
Country of education:								
The Netherlands	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base	Base
Origin and The Netherlands	-0.0838 ^{***}	-0.0846 ^{***}	-0.1521 ^{***}	-0.1523 ^{***}	-0.0525 ^{***}	-0.0527 ^{***}	0.0601 ^{***}	0.0598 ^{***}
Origin	-0.2540 ^{***}	-0.2550 ^{***}	-0.2183 ^{***}	-0.2188 ^{***}	-0.1025 ^{***}	-0.1017 ^{***}	0.0534 [*]	0.0534 [*]
No education	-0.3289 ^{***}	-0.3301 ^{***}	-0.1798 ^{***}	-0.1803 ^{***}	-0.1490 ^{***}	-0.1495 ^{***}	0.0324 [*]	0.0319 [*]
Highest degree so far	0.0387 ^{***}	0.0389 ^{***}	0.0214 ^{***}	0.0213 ^{***}	0.0130 ^{***}	0.0129 ^{***}	0.0075 [*]	0.0077 [*]
Unemployed								
Employed	0.0771 ^{***}	0.0791 ^{***}	0.0634 ^{***}	0.0639 ^{***}	0.0442 ^{***}	0.0464 ^{***}	0.0250 [*]	0.0264 [*]
Eth. conc. of munic.	-1.6378 ^{***}		-0.6842 [*]		-1.1880 ^{***}		-0.4198 [*]	
Eth. conc. of adj. munic.	0.3188 [*]		-1.3507 [*]		-2.3365 [*]		-0.3452 [*]	
Inc. pc of munic.		-0.0045 [*]		0.0674 [*]		0.0635 [*]		0.0165 [*]
Inc. pc of adj. munic.		-0.1085 ^{**}		-0.0541 ^{**}		-0.1215 ^{**}		-0.0520 ^{**}
Constant	2.0088 ^{***}	2.8824 ^{***}	1.5726 ^{***}	1.3792 ^{***}	1.9975 ^{***}	2.3871 ^{***}	3.5800 ^{***}	3.8605 ^{***}
Observations	10,145	10,145	6,801	6,801	5,447	5,447	4,599	4,599

Note: ^{***} $P < 0.01$, ^{**} $P < 0.05$, ^{*} $P < 0.1$.

negative association between immigrants' social integration and ethnic concentration in neighboring neighborhoods regarding the "relations in spare time with native Dutch people" and "degree of contact with native Dutch people" proxies, and a positive association between immigrants' social integration and economic development of neighboring neighborhoods for the "relations in spare time with native Dutch people," "more relations with native Dutch people than ethnic groups" and "degree of contact with native Dutch people" proxies. Hence, social integration is conditioned by spillovers. Both neighborhoods and neighboring neighborhoods seem to play a significant role in the inclusion of immigrants in the host society. Socioeconomic interactions among neighborhoods seem to shape social ties between natives and immigrants. Moreover, the negative relationship between social integration and ethnic concentration in neighborhoods is more important than the association between social integration and ethnic concentration in neighboring neighborhoods, because the latter association is either lower (Regressions 1 and 5) or is not statistically significant (Regressions 3 and 7).

As for Level 3 (Regressions 9–16), the results are sensitive to the proxy for social integration. The ethnic concentration in municipalities is negatively related to the "relations in spare time with native Dutch people," "more relations with native Dutch people than ethnic groups" and "degree of contact with native Dutch people" proxies, and the income per capita of neighboring municipalities is negatively related to "relations in spare time with native Dutch people," "degree of contact with native Dutch people," and "quality of contact with native Dutch people" proxies. The remaining variables at municipality level are not statistically significant. Therefore, an immigrant's level of social integration is a function of the ethnic concentration of the immediate municipality in which the immigrant lives as well as the economic development of the adjacent municipalities. Thus, spillovers matter both at neighborhood (Regressions 1–8) and municipality level (Regressions 9–16).

Comparing Level 2 with 3, we observe that local-municipality ethnic concentration characteristics are more important than local-neighborhood ones, especially for the "relations in spare time with native Dutch people" (Regression 1 vs. 9) and "degree of contact with native Dutch people" (Regression 5 vs. 13) proxies.

Overall, what we find is that the differences in immigrants' integration are associated not only with the characteristics of immigrants (Level 1), but also with the characteristics of the local and neighboring neighborhood (Level 2) and of the local and neighboring municipality (Level 3) in which the individuals live. The ethnic concentration and economic development of the local neighborhood in which an immigrant is resident is itself a good indicator of his/her likely levels of integration in society as a whole, because immigrants living in local neighborhoods characterized by a high percentage of foreigners and low economic development exhibit low levels of all proxies for social integration. Spillovers also play a significant role, but this is sensitive to the proxies for social integration. Despite this, the negative association between immigrants' integration and ethnic concentration in municipalities is higher than those in neighborhoods and this is higher than those in neighboring neighborhoods.

Place-Specific Differences by Ethnic Groups and Generation Groups

Table 3 has presented the results on the question of *which* place-specific effects matter. However, equally interesting is the question *for whom* these place-specific effects matter. To illustrate and test the differences of place-specific factors among ethnic groups (i.e., Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese, and Antilleans), we make use of interaction terms. Table 4 presents the ethnic concentration and economic development effect by ethnic group. First, the results show that the association between *localities* and integration differs between ethnic groups, but this is sensitive to the proxy for social integration. For

TABLE 4: Differences by Ethnic Groups

<i>Neighborhood Level</i>	Relations in Spare Time with Native Dutch People		More Relations with Native Dutch People than Ethnic Groups		Degree of Contact with Native Dutch People		Quality of Contact with Native Dutch People	
	(1) Yes	(2) Yes	(3) Yes	(4) Yes	(5) Yes	(6) Yes	(7) Yes	(8) Yes
Main individual-level variables ^a								
Eth. conc. of neighb.								
Turks	-0.5425***		-0.4724***		-0.6984***		-0.6070***	
Moroccans	-0.5890***		-0.6271***		-0.3704*		-0.2814	
Surinamese	-0.5894***		-0.5518***		-0.6340***		-0.3366***	
Antilleans	-0.7561***		-0.8909***		-0.5205**		0.0371	
Eth. conc. of adj. neighb.								
Turks	-0.2766		0.3203		0.0549		0.3464	
Moroccans	-0.4535***		0.0982		-0.8891***		0.3192	
Surinamese	-0.7234***		-0.7843***		-0.4807*		-0.4164*	
Antilleans	-0.0973		-0.3424		-0.1582		-0.0959	
Inc. pc of neighb.								
Turks		0.0443***		0.0044		0.0539**		0.0441**
Moroccans		0.0253		0.0179		0.0256		0.0031
Surinamese		0.0457***		0.0512***		0.0490***		0.0346**
Antilleans		0.0468***		0.0457**		0.0282		0.0198
Inc. pc of adj. neighb.								
Turks		0.0207		0.0545**		0.0246		-0.0322
Moroccans		0.0251		0.0777**		0.0312		-0.0047
Surinamese		0.0749***		0.0402		0.0602*		0.0245
Antilleans		0.0410		0.0923***		0.0969***		-0.0127
Constant	1.9206***	1.2827***	1.4543***	0.9197***	1.8965***	1.1796***	3.5462***	3.4022***
Observations	9,010	9,275	6,038	6,227	4,848	4,994	4,091	4,219

(Continued)

TABLE 4: Continued

<i>Municipality Level</i>	Relations in Spare Time with Native Dutch People		More Relations with Native Dutch People than Ethnic Groups		Degree of Contact with Native Dutch People		Quality of Contact with Native Dutch People	
	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
<i>Main individual level variables^a</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Eth. conc. of munic.								
Turks	-0.9170*		0.6775		-0.8044		-0.2508	
Moroccans	-1.4739***		0.0616		-1.6067**		1.1211	
Surinamese	-1.8935***		-1.7946***		-1.4147**		-1.2605**	
Antilleans	-2.1387***		-1.3014**		-0.8218		-0.3095	
Eth. conc. of adj. munic.								
Turks	0.5298		-1.9737		-1.3225		-1.6250	
Moroccans	-0.8259		0.3499		-1.1454		-2.2741	
Surinamese	-1.1610		-2.4526		-4.3792		-0.5385	
Antilleans	0.6239		-1.3383		-2.3936		1.7912	
Inc. pc of munic.								
Turks		-0.2292***		-0.0835		-0.0267		-0.1003
Moroccans		-0.1354		-0.0439		-0.2128**		0.0450
Surinamese		0.1545*		0.1818**		0.2000**		0.1038
Antilleans		0.1686*		0.1319		0.1827*		0.0190
Inc. pc of adj. munic.								
Turks		0.0704		0.0757*		0.0418		0.0011
Moroccans		-0.2028***		-0.0285		-0.1952***		-0.0169
Surinamese		-0.2106***		-0.2109***		-0.2140***		-0.1434***
Antilleans		-0.0319		-0.0117		-0.0879		-0.0279
Constant	1.8940***	3.1290***	1.3973***	1.4491**	1.9049***	1.6334**	3.6154***	4.3604***
Observations	10,145	10,145	6,801	6,801	5,447	5,447	4,599	4,599

Note: ^aEthnicity, generation, sex, age, country of education, level of education, and employment.

*** $P < 0.01$, ** $P < 0.05$, * $P < 0.1$.

example, the residential ethnic concentration effects seem to be more relevant for Antilleans regarding the “relations in spare time with native Dutch people” and “more relations with native Dutch people than ethnic groups” proxies, and more relevant for Turks regarding the “degree of contact with native Dutch people” and “quality of contact with native Dutch people” proxies. Second, the association between *adjacent localities* (spillovers) and integration differs between ethnic groups, but this is also sensitive to the proxy for social integration. For example, the adjacent residential ethnic concentration effects seem to be more relevant for Surinamese than for Moroccans regarding the “relations in spare time with native Dutch people” proxy, and relevant for Surinamese only regarding the “more relations with native Dutch people than ethnic groups” and “quality of contact with native Dutch people” proxies. Overall, the results show that a person’s social integration depends on the interaction between that person’s ethnicity and the localities and adjacent localities.

Finally, Table 5 presents the differences in geographical effects between first- and second-generation immigrants. The results show that: (a) the association between *localities* and integration differs between generation groups and (b) the association between *adjacent localities* (spillovers) and integration differs between generation groups. Both findings are sensitive to the proxy for social integration. Therefore, the results do not show robust evidence that there are differences in the geographical effects between first- and second-generation immigrants. However, they do show that each geographical scale plays a role in shaping social ties between immigrants and natives.

Overall, the results suggest that different ethnic and generation groups receive and access different social integration resources and opportunities associated with different local characteristics, although these differences are not robust to the proxies for social integration.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Our models are based on four proxies for the social integration of immigrants with respect to their social relations and contacts with native Dutch people, each of which reflects different aspects of bridging social capital. These proxies are: relations in spare time with native Dutch people; more relations with native Dutch people than ethnic groups; the degree of contact with native Dutch people; and the quality of contact with native Dutch people. Our results regarding the impacts of an immigrant’s generation and the features of the immigrant’s residential locality are in line with existing studies and also robust to the choice of proxy for social integration. For the first time, however, we also find that there are spillover effects from neighboring localities which impact on an individual’s social integration and which operate over and above the immediate effects associated with the immigrant’s residential locality and generation. Mostly, these spillover effects are in line with the immediate effects but they are sensitive to the proxy for social integration which is employed. Moreover, these spillovers vary according to the spatial scale and according to the ethnicity in question. Not surprisingly, these spillover effects are less prominent than the direct effects but nevertheless they are still prevalent. Overall, our findings suggest immigrants living in areas with high concentrations of immigrants and low levels of economic development and which are also surrounded by similar types of areas will exhibit lower levels of social integration than immigrants in similar areas surrounded by more prosperous localities with low ethnic concentrations. Presumably, this is because the geographical structure reduces the opportunities for interactions with other types of people. Spatial structure matters for social integration and our results cast a new light on the debates regarding mixed neighborhoods (Bolt and van Kempen, 2013) implying that the social features of neighboring localities also exert and influence.

TABLE 5: Differences by Generation

<i>Neighborhood Level</i>	Relations in Spare Time with Native Dutch People		More Relations with Native Dutch People than Ethnic Groups		Degree of Contact with Native Dutch People		Quality of Contact with Native Dutch People	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Main individual-level variables^a	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Eth. conc. of neighb.								
1st generation	-0.5793***		-0.5442***		-0.6144***		-0.3441***	
2nd generation	-0.6707***		-0.7401***		-0.2080		-0.1797	
Eth. conc. of adj. neighb.								
1st generation	-0.3623**		-0.0981		-0.2864		0.0524	
2nd generation	-0.5595***		-0.2759		-0.8679*		-0.1658	
Inc. pc of neighb.								
1st generation		0.0366***		0.0226*		0.0432***		0.0283***
2nd generation		0.0555***		0.0640***		0.0210		0.0195
Inc. pc of adj. neighb.								
1st generation		0.0446***		0.0617***		0.0507***		-0.0034
2nd generation		0.0212		0.0440		0.0566		-0.0069
Constant	1.9493***	1.1439***	1.5515***	0.7380***	1.9391***	1.0327***	3.5272***	3.2795***
Observations	9,010	9,275	6,038	6,227	4,848	4,994	4,091	4,219
Municipality Level	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Main individual level variables ^a	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Eth. conc. of munic.								

(Continued)

TABLE 5: Continued

<i>Neighborhood Level</i>	Relations in Spare		More Relations with		Degree of Contact		Quality of Contact	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1st generation	-1.5900 ^{***}		-0.6449		-1.2068 ^{**}		-0.3960	
2nd generation	-2.1940 ^{***}		-0.7949		-1.0301		-0.5984	
Eth. conc. of adj. munic.								
1st generation	-1.0189		-1.0247		-2.0393		-0.5233	
2nd generation	-1.1196		-2.3149		-4.7053		1.0095	
Inc. pc of munic.								
1st generation		0.0037		0.0774		0.0606		0.0326
2nd generation		-0.0292		0.0431		0.1087		-0.1327
Inc. pc of adj. munic.								
1st generation		-0.1010 ^{**}		-0.0442		-0.1150 ^{**}		-0.0591 ^{**}
2nd generation		-0.1412 ^{***}		-0.0835 [*]		-0.1818 ^{**}		0.0202
Constant	1.9852 ^{***}	2.7365 ^{***}	1.5544 ^{***}	1.1939 ^{**}	1.9878 ^{***}	2.3467 ^{***}	3.5838 ^{***}	3.7917 ^{***}
Observations	10,145	10,145	6,801	6,801	5,447	5,447	4,599	4,599

Note: ^aEthnicity, generation, sex, age, country of education, level of education, and employment.

*** $P < 0.01$, ** $P < 0.05$, * $P < 0.1$.

While our findings arise from a uniquely detailed data set and are derived from a very detailed spatial-hierarchical multilevel analysis, our study is not without its limitations. First of all, one should not regard survey data, such as the SPVA survey, as capturing all aspects of social integration or social capital (Durlauf, 2002). Social capital and social integration arguments depend on underlying psychological and sociological relations that are difficult to quantify and qualify (Durlauf, 2002), and there are many subtleties involved in the elicitation from conventional survey data of subjective responses, particularly regarding the types of qualitative measures which are then translated into the sorts of quantitative measures needed for statistical analysis (Manski, 1990; Durlauf, 2002), as is the case here. Notwithstanding these caveats, however, we believe that the level of detail in our analysis, along with the methodology we have employed, means that our analysis represents a significant step forward in our understanding of the relationship between the social integration of immigrants, their bridging social capital, their ethnicity, and the location of their residence.

REFERENCES

- Alba, Richard D. and Victor G. Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Anselin, Luc. 1995. "Local Indicators of Spatial Association – LISA," *Geographical Analysis*, 27, 93–115.
- Armstrong, Harvey W. 2002. "European Union Regional Policy: Reconciling the Convergence and Evaluation Evidence," in J. R. Cuadrado-Roura and M. Parellada (eds.), *Regional Convergence in the European Union: Facts, Prospects, and Policies*. Berlin. New York: Springer. pp. 211–230.
- Banerjee, Abhijit V. and Esther Duflo. 2003. "Inequality and Growth: What Can the Data Say?" *Journal of Economic Growth*, 8, 267–299.
- Belsley, David A. 1991. *Conditioning Diagnostics, Collinearity and Weak Data in Regression*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Blalock, Hubert M. 1967. *Toward a Theory of Minority-Group Relations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bolster, Anne, Simon Burgess, Ron Johnston, Kelynn Jones, Carol Propper, and Rebecca Sarker. 2007. "Neighborhoods, Households and Income Dynamics: A Semi-Parametric Investigation of Neighborhood Effects," *Journal of Economic Geography*, 7, 1–38.
- Bolt, Gideon and Ronald van Kempen. 2013. "Introduction Special Issue: Mixing Neighborhoods: Success or Failure?" *Cities*, 35, 391–396.
- Bosswick, Wolfgang and Friedrich Heckmann. 2006. "Integration of Migrants: Contribution of Local and Regional Authorities." *European Foundation For the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions*. Ireland: Cities for Local Integration Policy Network.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 2001. "The Return of Assimilation? Changing Perspectives on Immigration and its Sequels in France, Germany, and the United States," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24, 531–548.
- Corrado, Luisa and Bernard Fingleton. 2012. "Where is the Economics in Spatial Econometrics?" *Journal of Regional Science*, 52(2), 210–239.
- Davies, Rhys, Clair Wilkins, Eric Harrison, Elissa Sibley, and David Owen. 2011. "Quality of Life in Ethnically Diverse Neighbourhoods." Dublin, Ireland: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.
- Dietz, Robert D. 2002. "The Estimation of Neighborhood Effects in the Social Sciences: An Interdisciplinary Approach," *Social Science Research*, 31, 539–575.
- Durlauf, Steven N. 2002. "On the Empirics of Social Capital," *Economic Journal*, 112, F459–F479.
- Ertur, Cem and Julie Le Gallo. 2003. "An Exploratory Spatial Data Analysis of European Regional Disparities, 1980–1995," in B. Fingleton (ed.), *European Regional Growth*. Berlin: Springer. pp. 55–98.
- Esser, Hartmut. 2002. *Soziologie. Spezielle Grundlagen. Band 2: Die Konstruktion der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt, New York: Campus.
- Fix, Michael, Wendy Zimmermann, and Jeffrey S. Passel. 2001. *The Integration of Immigrant Families in the United States*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, Immigration Studies.
- Gijsberts, Mérove, and Jaco Dagevos. 2005. *Uit elkaars buurt: de invloed van etnische concentratie op integratie en beeldvorming*. Den Haag: Sociaal En Cultureel Planbureau.
- . 2007. "The Socio-Cultural Integration of Ethnic Minorities In The Netherlands: Identifying Neighborhood Effects on Multiple Integration Outcomes," *Housing Studies*, 22, 805–831.

- Gijsberts, Mérove, Tom van der Meer, and Jaco Dagevos. 2012. "Hunkering Down' in Multi-Ethnic Neighborhoods? The Effects of Ethnic Diversity on Dimensions of Social Cohesion," *European Sociological Review*, 28, 527–537.
- Harris, Richard, John Moffat, and Victoria Kravtsova. 2011. "In Search of 'W'," *Spatial Economic Analysis*, 6, 249–270.
- Heath, Anthony F., Catherine Rethon, and Elina Kilpi. 2008. "The Second Generation in Western Europe: Education, Unemployment, and Occupational Attainment," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34, 211–235.
- Kandori, Michihiro. 1992. "Social Norms and Community Enforcement," *Review of Economic Studies*, 59, 63–80.
- Lee, Barrett A., R. S. Oropesa, and James W. Kanan. 1994. "Neighborhood Context and Residential Mobility," *Demography*, 31, 249–270.
- Manski, Charles F. 1990. "The Use of Intentions Data to Predict Behavior: A Best-Case Analysis," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 85, 934–940.
- Martens, Edwin P. 1998. "Minderheden in Beeld SPVA-98." P1570 *Steinmetz Archive Documentation Set: Report, Questionnaire, Codebook*. Amsterdam: Netherlands Institute for Scientific Information Services (NIWI).
- Martinovic, Borja, Frank van Tubergen, and Ineke Maas. 2009. "Changes in Immigrants' Social Integration during the Stay in the Host Country: The Case of Non-Western Immigrants in the Netherlands," *Social Science Research*, 38, 870–882.
- McPherson, Miller, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and James M. Cook. 2001. "Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 415–444.
- Musterd, Sako and Wim Ostendorf. 2009. "Residential Segregation and Integration in the Netherlands," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35, 1515–1532.
- Ottaviano, Gianmarco and Giovanni Peri. 2013. "New Frontiers of Immigration Research: Cities and Firms," *Journal of Regional Science*, 53(1), 1–7.
- Partridge, Mark D., Marlon Boarnet, Steven Brakman, and Gianmarco Ottaviano. 2012. "Introduction: Whither Spatial Econometrics?" *Journal of Regional Science*, 52(2), 167–171.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. and Linda R. Tropp. 2006. "A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 751–783.
- Pinkster, Fenne M. 2007. "Localised Social Networks, Socialisation and Social Mobility in a Low-Income Neighborhood In The Netherlands," *Urban Studies*, 44, 2587–2603.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1993. "The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life," *The American Prospect*, 13, 35–42.
- . 1995. "Bowling Alone, Revisited," *Responsive Community*, 5, 18–33.
- . 2007. "E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century the 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture," *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30, 137–174.
- Rodríguez-Pose, Andrés and Tobias D. Ketterer. 2012. "Do Local Amenities Affect the Appeal of Regions in Europe for Migrants?" *Journal of Regional Science*, 52(4), 535–561.
- Rodríguez-Pose, Andrés and Vassilis Tselios. 2009. "Education and Income Inequality in the Regions of the European Union," *Journal of Regional Science*, 49(3), 411–437.
- Ross, Catherine E., John Mirowsky, and Shana Pribesh. 2001. "Powerlessness and the Amplification of Threat: Neighborhood Disadvantage, Disorder, and Mistrust," *American Sociological Review*, 66, 568–591.
- Sampson, Robert J., Jeffrey D. Morenoff, and Thomas Gannon-Rowley. 2002. "Assessing "Neighborhood Effects": Social Processes and New Directions in Research," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28, 443–478.
- Schelling, Thomas C. 1969. "Models of Segregation," *American Economic Review*, 59, 488–493.
- . 1971. "Dynamic Models of Segregation," *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 1, 143–186.
- Schmeets, Hans and Saskia te Riele. 2010. "A Decline of Social Cohesion in the Netherlands? Participation and TRUST, 1997–2010." Paris: International Conference on Social Cohesion and Development, 20 January 2010
- Spielman, Seth E. 2011. "Using High-Resolution Population Data to Identify Neighborhoods and Establish Their Boundaries." mimeo.
- Tolsma, Jochem, Tom van der Meer, and Maurice Gesthuizen. 2009. "The Impact of Neighborhood and Municipality Characteristics on Social Cohesion in the Netherlands," *Acta Politica*, 44, 286–313.
- van Ham, Maarten and David Manley. 2010. "The Effect of Neighborhood Housing Tenure Mix on Labour Market Outcomes: A Longitudinal Investigation of Neighborhood Effects," *Journal of Economic Geography*, 10, 257–282.
- van Oort, Frank G., Martijn J. Burger, Joris Knobben, and Otto Raspe. 2012. "Multilevel Approaches and the Firm Agglomeration Ambiguity in Economic Growth Studies," *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 26, 468–491.
- Vervoort, Miranda, Henk Flap, and Jaco Dagevos. 2011. "The Ethnic Composition of the Neighborhood and Ethnic Minorities' Social Contacts: Three Unresolved Issues," *European Sociological Review*, 27, 586–605.
- Volker, Beate, Henk Flap, and Siegwart Lindenberg. 2007. "When Are Neighborhoods Communities? Community in Dutch Neighborhoods," *European Sociological Review*, 23, 99–114.
- Wiley, Norbert F. 1967. "The Ethnic Mobility Trap and Stratification in Theory," *Social Problems*, 15, 147–159.
- Wilson, Kenneth L. and Alejandro Portes. 1980. "Immigrant Enclaves: An Analysis of the Labor Market Experiences of Cubans in Miami," *American Journal of Sociology*, 86, 295–319.