

Migration and Residential segregation: A Worldwide phenomenon in the literature

Dr. Vijaya Khairkar

Associate Professor, Savitribai Phule Pune University

Abstract: Residential segregation of immigrants has been a long-standing concern in many developed and developing countries. Segregation is a separation from the main, large areas of cities based on ethnicity, language, caste, income, race, work, etc. Migrants carry sending region with them in the form of their ideas of ethnic goods, language, festival celebration style it leads to parallel societies in the receiving countries. Segregation is understood concerning the broader organization of society. Topics such as migration and Residential segregation its prevalence, potential benefits, and negative externalities are characterized by both vastness and heterogeneity of contents. Therefore, it can be complex to pinpoint the seminal works of each area of study. The main policy concern is the assimilation, inclusion of migrates in the main urban areas. Anti-segregation Policies should be adopted by governance in the cities. Thus, the cracks of segregation should be closed on the map of every city and restore the acculturated residents. People will mingle in the melting pot of metros where people will meet each other from every walk of life.

Keywords: Migration, Residential segregation, Acculturation, Conflicts.

Introduction:

Migrants in receiving regions prefer to live in a homogenous group to enjoy life with similar people. Sense of security is another reason to form an enclave. However, amidst conflict, social unrest, and riots the enclaves are easy targets for non-migrant residents. Immigrants living in segregated areas are less satisfied with the neighborhood. This is consistent with the housing discrimination rather than self-selection plays an important role in immigrant residential segregation. In the literature on neighborhood effects, the residential concentration of minorities is seen as a major obstacle to their integration, while the residential segregation literature emphasizes the opposite causal direction, by focusing on the effect of integration on levels of (de-)segregation. Ghettos are a very popular group of migrants in the USA from the inception of segregation literature. Residential segregation of immigrants has been a long-standing concern in many developed and developing countries. Segregation is a separation from the main, large areas of cities based on ethnicity, religion, language, caste, income, race, work, etc. Migrants carry sending region with them in the form of their ideas of ethnic goods, language, festival celebration style it leads to parallel societies in the receiving countries. Segregation is understood concerning the broader organization of society. Topics such as migration and Residential segregation its prevalence, potential benefits, and negative externalities are characterized by both vastness and heterogeneity of contents. Therefore, it can be complex to pinpoint the seminal works of each area of study. The main policy concern is the assimilation, inclusion of migrates in the main urban areas. Anti-segregation Policies should be adopted by governance in the cities.

The author has examined research papers dealt the residential segregation from European countries to the United States of America and other countries. More than ten such research paper has been analyzed to understand the migrants' experiences of residential segregation based on class, caste, ethnicity, language, region. The selected paper has a diverse dimension of worldwide residential segregation.

Residential segregation by migrants, in different areas

This paper entitles, "Racial residential segregation, socioeconomic disparities, and the White-Black survival gap". aims to assess the link between racial segregation and white- black survival gap in adults living in the same surrounding at the same time the author's goal is to calculate the effect of socioeconomic inequality in racial residential segregation. Racial differences are still wide irrespective of the efforts put in by public health workers to reduce these disparities. These differences are more psychological than social. eliminating the racial residential segregation and enhancing the Black socio-economic status up to the levels of white socio-economic status would eliminate the white black survival gap.

Ioana Popescu and others in their research aim to evaluate the association between racial residential segregation, a prominent manifestation of systemic racism, and the White-Black survival gap in a contemporary cohort of adults, and to assess the extent to which socioeconomic inequality explains this association. This was a cross-sectional study of White and Black men and women aged 35– 75 living in 102 large US Core Based Statistical Areas. The main outcome was the White-Black survival gap, used 2009– 2013 CDC mortality data for Black and White men and women to calculate age-, sex- and race adjusted White and Black mortality rates. We measured segregation using the Dissimilarity index, obtained from the Manhattan Institute. We used the 2009– 2013 American Community Survey to define indicators of socioeconomic inequality. We estimated the CBSA-level White-Black gap in the probability of survival using sequential linear regression models accounting for the CBSA dissimilarity index and race-specific socioeconomic indicators. Authors analyzed , Black men and woman had a 14% and 9% lower probability of survival from age 35 to 75 than their white counterparts. Residential segregation was strongly associated with the survival gap, and this relationship was partly, but not fully, explained by socioeconomic inequality. At the lowest observed level of segregation, and with the Black socioeconomic status assumed to be at the White SES level scenario, the survival gap is essentially eliminated. Conclusion White-Black differences in survival remain wide notwithstanding public health efforts to improve life expectancy and initiatives to reduce health disparities. Eliminating racial residential segregation and bringing Black socioeconomic status to White SES levels would eliminate the White-Black survival gap. It is found that residential segregation was strongly associated with the survival gap which

was partly because of socio-economic equality. The observation at the lowest level of residential segregation shows that, when the black socioeconomic status is assumed to be at the white socio-economic level, then the survival gap can be eliminated.

W. A. V. Clark in 1986, studied the Significant levels of separation between blacks and whites still exist in large American cities, and debate about the causes of that residential separation has been considerable. A balanced analysis of the factors that might explain residential segregation - economic status (affordability), social preferences, urban structure, and discrimination - suggests that no one factor can account for the patterns that have arisen in U.S. metropolitan areas. Empirical estimation of the impact of economic status suggests that 30–70 percent of racial separation is attributable to economic factors. However, economic factors do not act alone, but in association explanatory weight for present residential patterns. Survey evidence from both national and local studies shows that black households prefer neighborhoods that are half black and half white, while whites prefer neighborhoods ranging from 0 to 30 percent black. The debate about causes seems most polarized over the role of discrimination. Although comments in the literature often focus on the past use of racially restrictive covenants by state-regulated agencies and discriminatory acts by realtors and financial institutions, the documented individual cases of discrimination do not appear to be part of massive collusion to deny housing opportunities to minorities. A review of the evidence from social science investigations demonstrates that there are multiple causes of racial residential separation in U.S. metropolitan areas.

Douglas s. Massey, and Nancy a. Denton, in their paper, explained five distinct axes of measurement: evenness, exposure, concentration, centralization, and clustering. Twenty indices of segregation are surveyed and related conceptually to one of the five dimensions. Using data from a large set of U.S. metropolitan areas, the indices are intercorrelated and factor analyzed. Orthogonal and oblique rotations produce pattern matrices consistent with the postulated dimensional structure. Based on the factor analyses and other information, one index was chosen to represent each of the five dimensions, and these selections were confirmed with principal components analysis. The paper recommends adopting these indices as standard indicators in future studies of segregation. As per D. R. Williams and C. Collins, studies of Racial residential segregation are a cause of racial health disparities. The physical separation of the races by enforced residence in certain areas is an institutional mechanism of racism that was designed to protect whites from social interaction with blacks. Despite the absence of supportive legal statutes, the degree of residential segregation remains extremely high for most African Americans in the United States. The authors review evidence that suggests that segregation is a primary cause of racial differences in socioeconomic status (SES) by determining access to education and employment opportunities. SES, in turn, remains a fundamental cause of racial differences in health. Segregation also creates conditions inimical to health in the social and physical environment. The authors conclude that effective efforts to eliminate racial disparities in health must seriously confront segregation and its pervasive consequences.

Masayoshi Oka and David W. S. Wong explained in their work entitle, Capturing the two dimensions of residential segregation at the neighborhood level for health research explain the Two conceptual and methodological foundations of segregation studies are that (i) segregation involves more than one group, and (ii) segregation measures need to quantify how different population groups are distributed across space. Therefore, the percentage of the population belonging to a group is not an appropriate measure of segregation because it does not describe how populations are spread across different areal units or neighborhoods. In principle, evenness and isolation are the two distinct dimensions of segregation that capture the spatial patterns of population groups. To portray people's daily environment more accurately, segregation measures need to account for the spatial relationships between areal units and to reflect the situations at the neighborhood scale. For these reasons, the use of local spatial entropy-based diversity index (*SHi*) and local spatial isolation index (*Si*) to capture the evenness and isolation dimensions of segregation, respectively, are preferable. However, these two local spatial segregation indexes have rarely been incorporated into health research. Rather ineffective and insufficient segregation measures have been used in previous studies. Hence, this paper empirically demonstrates how the two measures can reflect the two distinct dimensions of segregation at the neighborhood level, and argues conceptually and set the stage for their future use to effectively and meaningfully examine the relationships between residential segregation and health. Segregation is the extent to which individuals of various groups occupy and experience different social environments. As the condition involves more than one group, measuring the levels of segregation needs to account for the spatial interaction of different population groups. Otherwise, segregation measures without accounting for spatial relationships would leave out the essence of segregation. Unlike the global segregation measures that overlook the important variations at the local level, local segregation measures draw attention to the situations at the neighborhood scale. In particular, two local spatial segregation indexes highlighted in this paper provide effective and meaningful measurements of the two distinct dimensions of segregation: (i) the local spatial entropy-based diversity index (*SHi*) for the evenness dimension, and (ii) the local spatial isolation index (*Si*) for the isolation dimension. From an analytical point of view, the use of *SHi* will help elucidate the relationship between racial/ethnic integration (or, its counterpart, racial/ethnic similarity) and health, whereas the use of *Si* will help elucidate the relationships between racial/ethnic and/or socioeconomic isolation and health. These two local spatial segregation indexes can be used in ESDA, assisting the formulations of hypotheses to be tested, and examining the relationship between residential segregation and health. However, they have rarely been incorporated into health research. Hence, future studies should explore the use of *SHi* and *Si* to better understand both the protective and adverse effects of residential segregation on health.

Dolores Acevedo-Garcia and others examine the research evidence on the effect of residential segregation on health, identify research gaps, and propose new research directions. Four recommendations are made based on a review of the sociological and social epidemiology literature on residential segregation: (1) develop multilevel research designs to examine the effects of the individual, neighborhood, and metropolitan-area factors on health outcomes; (2) continue examining the health effects of residential segregation among African Americans but also initiate studies examining segregation among Hispanics and Asians; (3) consider racial/ethnic segregation along with income segregation and other metropolitan area factors such as poverty concentration and metropolitan governance fragmentation; and (4) develop better conceptual frameworks of the pathways that may link various segregation dimensions to specific health outcomes.

A large body of sociological and policy literature strongly suggests that residential segregation has been a key factor in creating substantial inequalities in opportunity across space (i.e., neighborhoods) and individuals along racial/ethnic lines. Ecological health studies have shown that segregation is positively associated with mortality rates and certain health outcomes among African Americans. However, only multilevel research designs will allow us to examine the effects of the individual, neighborhood, and metropolitan area factors on health outcomes.

Authors continue to address the health effects of residential segregation on African Americans but also initiate comparative studies examining the segregation of Hispanics and Asians. Racial/ethnic segregation is a key factor, but one that should be considered along with other metropolitan area characteristics such as income segregation, poverty concentration, and metropolitan governance fragmentation. It will also be important to develop better conceptual frameworks of the pathways that may link various segregation dimensions to specific health outcomes.

As per the ideas of David Williams and others, in recent decades, there has been remarkable growth in scientific research examining the multiple ways in which racism can adversely affect health. This interest has been driven in part by the striking persistence of racial/ethnic inequities in health and the empirical evidence that indicates that socioeconomic factors alone do not account for racial/ethnic inequities in health. Racism is considered a fundamental cause of adverse health outcomes for racial/ethnic minorities and racial/ethnic inequities in health. This article provides an overview of the evidence linking the primary domains of racism—structural racism, cultural racism, and individual-level discrimination—to mental and physical health outcomes. For each mechanism, we describe key findings and identify priorities for future research. We also discuss evidence for interventions to reduce racism and describe research needed to advance knowledge in this area.

Dexter H. Locke and others in their Residential housing segregation and urban tree canopy in 37 US Cities paper observed that Redlining was a racially discriminatory housing policy established by the federal government's Home Owners' Loan Corporation (HOLC) during the 1930s. For decades, redlining limited access to homeownership and wealth creation among racial minorities, contributing to a host of adverse social outcomes, including high unemployment, poverty, and residential vacancy, that persist today. While the multigenerational socioeconomic impacts of redlining are increasingly understood, the impacts on urban environments and ecosystems remain unclear. To begin to address this gap, we investigated how the HOLC policy administered 80 years ago may relate to present-day tree canopy at the neighborhood level. Urban trees provide many ecosystem services, mitigate the urban heat island effect, and may improve the quality of life in cities. In our prior research in Baltimore, MD, we discovered that redlining policy influenced the location and allocation of trees and parks. Our analysis of 37 metropolitan areas here shows that areas formerly graded D, which were mostly inhabited by racial and ethnic minorities, have on average ~23% tree canopy covers today. Areas formerly graded A, characterized by U.S.-born white populations living in newer housing stock, had nearly twice as much tree canopy (~43%). Results are consistent across small and large metropolitan regions. The ranking system used by Home Owners' Loan Corporation to assess loan risk in the 1930s parallels the rank order of average percent tree canopy cover today. Trees and tree canopy are not distributed equitably. Recent meta-analyses show that lower-income urban areas and areas with more racial minorities have less tree canopy cover and environmental injustice that can exacerbate health problems for already disadvantaged groups.

Using survey data from the German Socio-Economic Panel, this study shows that immigrants living in segregated residential areas are more likely to report discrimination because of their ethnic background. This applies to both segregated areas where most neighbors are immigrants from the same country of origin as the surveyed person and segregated areas where most neighbors are immigrants from other countries of origin. The results suggest that housing discrimination rather than self-selection plays an important role in immigrant residential segregation. In the policy debate, it is often believed that a lack of immigrant assimilation is due to the self-selection of immigrants into segregated residential areas. The results of this study suggest that housing discrimination rather than self-selection plays an important role in immigrant residential segregation. Immigrants living in highly segregated areas are much more likely to report high discrimination than those living in non-segregated areas. The positive link between segregation and perceived discrimination also indicates a specific mechanism of discrimination. It suggests that discriminatory restrictions of immigrant location choices rather than outright hostility of native neighbors are the driving force of residential segregation. In the latter case, we would have found that immigrants living in segregated areas are less likely to report discrimination as those areas protect against "everyday" discrimination by native neighbors. Yet, our estimates suggest the opposite relationship. Of course, our finding does not mean that immigrants living in native-dominated areas experience no discrimination at all in their neighborhoods. It rather means that from the immigrants' viewpoint the advantages of living in a native-dominated neighborhood outweigh the disadvantage of discriminatory treatment by prejudiced native neighbors. As a consequence, immigrants perceive the restrictions that force them to live in segregated areas as discrimination. We note that our analysis applies to West Germany. It would be interesting to extend the analysis to East Germany as xenophobic tendencies appear to be particularly high in East Germany (Krueger and Pischke 1997). This requires that sufficient information will be available in future waves of the SOEP.

Veronique Dupont focuses in his paper on the pattern of social-spatial differentiation and segmentation of the metropolitan area of Delhi. The main objective is to analyze the mechanisms of residential segregation and the factors that explain it both at the micro and macro-level. In the context of the Indian society and its caste system traditionally associated with strong social and spatial segregation, we try to appraise the extent to which the metropolitan nation process in Delhi engenders original forms of spatial segmentation or perpetuates and strengthens the traditional forms of socio-spatial divisions. At the level of the global spatial organization of the urban agglomeration, our objective is twofold: to analyze the factors that shaped the urban landscape and introduced spatial discontinuity, from physical barriers to the different historic periods and the impact of town planning; to analyze the residential pattern of different segments of the urban population, to detect whether certain economic and socio-cultural attributes generate a pattern of segregation. We then pursue a more detailed investigation at the level of a zone, based on the case study of Mayur Vihar– Trilokpuri in east Delhi. We analyze the residential practices developed by different socio-economic groups, their

strategies as regards the occupation of the geographical and economic space, their tendency to residential clustering that leads to a pattern of social segregation at the level of the neighborhood. In this perspective, the links between the urban policies at the macro-level and the individuals' residential practices at the micro-level are also examined. Hence, Delhi is a cosmopolitan city where the economical base is diversified. Different rulers kept the footprint of their culture in Delhi from the ancient period. As a capital city and major administrative center of India, pre-independent and post-independent eras experienced the migrants attracted towards Delhi were mainly from surrounding states. However, a significant proportion of international migrants are arriving in Delhi.

Vijaya Khairkar in her paper entitled, "segregation of migrants groups in Pune city India, studied the formation of a linguistic enclave in Pune city. Pune is a rapidly growing million city in India. This growth is largely due to the contribution made by migration. People have come from all the states of the Indian Union. Among the states, the first five contributors were Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Kerala, and Rajasthan. Migrants from different states, prefer to stay together for security, cultural affinity, and to retain their identity. Hence an effort is made to demarcate and study the enclave formed by the migrants. To identify the enclave, a city survey map was used. As per the study, Pune is an interesting location to have studied linguistic segregation. The research has shown that the construction activity of Pune city has attracted more migrants from Karnataka, whereas most of the migrants from Rajasthan and Gujarat are engaged in Trade and Commerce activity. When the Migrants enter the urban way of life, they are new to the entire urban environment. In such a situation various aspects like security, the common language of sending State, other than Marathi, common social ties, and regional affinity influence their activity and the migrants tend to live in the groups (segregation). They feel more secure when they live in a group. In India Race is not dominating factor while adopting segregation philosophy. However, caste and language, and region are the factors that are a dimension of forming enclaves or living in segregation. To analyze the formation of enclaves of migrants within the city a separate sample of 500 households has been taken into consideration. Migrants from the first six sending regions according to the number of migrants who arrived in Pune city have been considered for selection of household. Secondary data from the Census of India (migration table) was used for this selection. To select enclave formation of wards ward wise data from Pune municipal corporation have been used. Well-structured, pre tested questionnaires have been used to collect the primary data from linguistic segregation of migration in Pune city.

The negative approach of residential segregation by migrants

Apart from the above papers, the papers, which have mentioned a negative approach towards segregation of migration have been discussed in this paper. 'neighborhood effects' are associated with the segregation of minority ethnic groups and the urban poor. For example, the work of Massey & Denton (1989) and Friedrichs *et al.* (2003) in the USA, Musterd (1998) in the Netherlands, and Kearns & Parkinson (2001) in the UK has demonstrated that living in a highly segregated inner-city neighborhood often limits residents' chances of escaping poverty, deprivation and isolation due to poor social networks, limited local resources and constrained job opportunities. Others have highlighted the link between residential segregation and social exclusion in other spheres of opportunity. For example, Johnston *et al.* (2002), Somerville & Steele (2002), and Harrison with Phillips (2003) have argued that residential segregation within deprived inner-city areas can generate 'cumulative disadvantage' for black and minority ethnic groups living in Britain. Andersen (2002) has explored the mutually reinforcing association between segregated, disadvantaged ethnic groups and 'excluded places' in Denmark, whilst Permentier *et al.* (2008) have shown that there is a very strong negative association between ethnic concentration and neighborhood reputation.

Meanwhile, political and policy discourses have long depicted spatial segregation, and particularly that of black and minority ethnic groups, in negative terms (Bolt *et al.*, 2010; Phillips, 2007). It is therefore not surprising to find a wide array of housing and urban policy measures that seek to stimulate greater mixing across income groups and between ethnic communities. These range from urban renewal and social diversification programs such as Hope VI in the USA (cf. Goetz, 2003; Popkin *et al.*, 2009), which aim to promote mutual understanding between social groups and social mobility for the urban poor, to dispersal programs aimed at desegregating minority ethnic groups in particular. The creation of areas of mixed housing tenure, sometimes called 'balanced communities', is a popular strategic intervention in many European countries (Goodchild & Cole, 2001; Graham *et al.*, 2009; Veldboer *et al.*, 2002) and in Australia (Arthurson, 2007; Wood, 2003).

This introductory paper begins by providing a brief overview of the policy rationales for interventions promoting greater social mixing. The ensuing papers will explore the often contentious and politicized debates about desegregation and the effectiveness of varied initiatives in different national contexts, and some reflections are offered on what can be learned from an international perspective. This collection of papers arises from a workshop, which was inspired by Edward Goetz's book *Clearing the Way: Deconcentrating the Poor in Urban America* (2003). Drawing on programs implemented in Minneapolis-St Paul, Goetz challenged the implicit and explicit assumptions of policymakers concerning the positive effects of desegregation programs and underlined the highly politicized process of evaluating the effectiveness of outcomes. Goetz's paper in this volume provides an up-to-date perspective on the progress of HOPE VI in the USA whilst other papers focus on the European context.

Federico Benassi, Corrado Bonifazi, et al in their research work entitled, "Comparing Residential Segregation of Migrant Populations in Selected European Urban and Metropolitan Areas". Studied about residential segregation is a well-studied subject especially after the publication of the pioneering and seminal contribution of OD Duncan and B Duncan (Am Social Rev 41:210–217, 1955) Considering the theoretical and methodological advances made since then, the contribution endeavors are trying to describe and understand the differences in residential segregation with international perspective using 2011 population census data. The contribution analyses the residential segregation of migrants who usually reside in the 493 Functional Urban Areas (FUAs) of selected European Union countries. The analysis is conducted using 2011 census data on a regular grid (100 mt × 100 mt). In the First step, the levels and spatial patterns of residential segregation across all FUAs of France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Netherlands, and The United Kingdom are analyzed. Attention is paid to identifying differences and similarities between the FUAs, among and within the single countries. Further analysis of the relationship between the level of residential segregation in the metropolitan FUAs of the selected EU countries and contextual demographic and socio-economic factors are investigated and results show that even if, the larger metropolitan areas attract more migrants, the highest levels of residential segregation are

observed in smaller urban areas. The territorial distribution of foreigners has always attracted scholars belonging to different social disciplines and stimulated special interest when leading to residential segregation. In general, residential segregation of a minority group, whether it be an ethnic group or any subgroup of the population defined socially or religiously or in other ways denotes a spatial distribution that is different from the one of the rest of the population. The main findings of the study can be summarized as follows: the incidence of migrants varies considerably between countries (with the ones of Northern Europe with comparatively higher levels) and between 493 FUAs analyzed. In this context, the large metropolitan areas remain the areas with the highest share of migrant populations, confirming their attractiveness. This is true for all the countries analyzed here. A similar pattern, with a certain variation, is observed for the EU28 and Non-EU28 migrants. The level of residential segregation—measured by the Index of Dissimilarity—is in most of the countries and FUAs here analyzed higher for the Non-EU28 migrants. Moreover, even if the large metropolitan areas have a higher incidence, the highest levels of residential segregation are recorded in the minor urban areas. We observe a division between the ‘new’ immigration countries (especially Italy and Spain) and ‘old’ ones that record comparatively lower levels of residential segregation of migrants. The economic situation is a key dimension in the observation of residential segregation: a simple regression analysis for the metropolitan FUAs (N = 81) shows that the level of residential segregation is positively correlated with the unemployment rate indicating that economic opportunities facilitate residential integration. Whereas higher general unemployment seems to be of less importance in the case of the incidence and the residential segregation of migrant populations, especially when their country of citizenship or birth is a Non-EU28 country. This might be an indication that these groups refer more to the informal labor market than the formal one.

Data used in the contribution are provided by the Data Challenge on ‘Integration of Migrants in Cities’ (D4I). D4I is an initiative launched at the end of 2017 by the Joint Research Center (JRC) - Knowledge Centre on Migration and Demography (KMCD) of the European Commission to disseminate to scholars and researchers a data set with population estimates for grids allowing the analysis of the concentration of migrants in selected European Union cities at high spatial resolution.

This data set was produced based on ad hoc extractions of the 2011 Population and Housing Census data provided by the National Statistical Institute of 8 EU member states France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Spain, The Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. The results of the spatial processing of the original data is an estimation of the population by place of birth or by citizenship, depending on the country, for a uniform grid (cells of 100 by 100 meters) in the countries involved in the This means that data should be perfectly comparable from a geographical point of view. We refer to the JRC Technical Report for details about methods applied for the processing of the original data and other technicalities regarding the estimation of the data used here. However, it is important to underline that data stem from two different statistical concepts to reveal the origin of migrants: the country of citizenship and the country of birth. Both approaches are based on information provided by the 2011 general population censuses.

Conclusion:

Segregation/enclave formation are prevalent for many years in different societies whether advanced or not advanced, the criteria of forming these separate groups by minorities or migrants are different. Migrants remain, outsiders because they seclude themselves from the main flow. The survival gap is set into an individual’s mind, due to the constant mention of inferior socio-economic status at one’s home amidst family members and near and dear ones. The thought of being from a lower socioeconomic status is constantly at the back of an individual’s mind. Thus, paving a path for an inferiority complex in his/her mind, which in turn creates differences on social racial, or socio-economic all these differences are based on the psychology of that individuals. In the metro cities, some areas found which are not suitable in the urbanism as a result conflict are visible in the cities. The main policy concern is the assimilation, inclusion of migrates in the main urban areas. Anti-segregation Policies should be adopted by governance in the cities. Initial period migrants and non-migrants will face conflicts. Interdependence, the problem facing scenario, a need-based relationship may eliminate the conflict and integration will prevalence in the societies. assimilation to a different culture, typically the dominant one. The process of acculturation may impact both the social and psychological well-being of people in the region. Mix neighborhood is the solution for the problem. Cities should act as a melting pot where people will meet each other from every walk of life.

References:

1. Arthurson, K. (2007) Social mix and social interaction: do residents living in different housing tenures mix? [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
2. Andersen, H. 2002. Excluded places: the interaction between segregation, urban decay and deprived neighbourhoods. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 19: 153–169. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Google Scholar]
3. Atkinson, R. and Kintrea, K. 2002. ‘Opportunities and Despair, It’s All in There’, or, ‘Every Area Has Its Problems’: *Everyday Experiences of Area Effects*, Glasgow: Department of Urban Studies, University of Glasgow. [Google Scholar]
4. Bolt, G., Özüekren, A. Ş. and Phillips, D. 2010, Forthcoming. Linking integration and residential segregation. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(2): 169–186. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
5. Bolt, G., van Kempen, R. and van Weesep, J. 2009. After urban restructuring: relocations and segregation in Dutch cities. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 100(4): 502–512. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
6. Bourdieu, P. 1986. “The forms of capital”. In *Handbook of Theory and Research for Sociology and Education*, Edited by: Richardson, J. G. 241–258. New York: Greenwood Press. [Google Scholar]
7. Burns, D., Forrest, R., Flint, J. and Kearns, A. 2001. *Empowering Communities: The Impact of Registered Social Landlords on Social Capital*, Edinburgh: Scottish Homes. [Google Scholar]
8. Campbell, K., Marsden, P. and Hurlbert, J. 1986. Social resources and socioeconomic status. *Social Networks*, 8(1): 97–117. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
9. Clark W. A. V. (1986): Residential segregation in American cities: a review and interpretation. *Population Research and Policy Review* volume 5, pages 95–127.

10. Douglas s. Massey, Nancy a. Denton, (1988) The Dimensions of Residential Segregation. *Social Forces*, Volume 67:2, December 1988.
11. D. R. Williams and C. Collins (2001): Racial residential segregation: a fundamental cause of racial disparities in health. *Public Health Rep.* 2001 Sep-Oct; 116(5): 404–416.
12. W. A. V. Clark (1986): Residential segregation in American cities: a review and interpretation. *Population Research and Policy Review* volume 5, pages 95–127.
13. Duncan, O., & Duncan, B. (1955). A methodological analysis of segregation indexes. *American Sociological Review*, 41, 210–217.
14. Dolores Acevedo-Garcia, Theresa L. Osypuk, et al (2003): Future Directions in Residential Segregation and Health Research: A Multilevel Approach. *Am J Public Health.* 2003 February; 93(2): 215–221.
15. Dexter H. Locke, Billy Hall, J. Morgan Grove, Et All (2021): Residential housing segregation and urban tree canopy in 37 US Cities *Urban Sustainability* volume 1, Article number: 15 (2021).
16. Veronique Dupont (2012): Socio-spatial differentiation and residential segregation in Delhi: a question of scale? *Geoforum*, Volume 35 (2004) 157–175.
17. Dill, Verena Et All (2011) Ethnic Residential Segregation and Immigrants' Perceptions of Discrimination in West Germany. SOEP papers on Multidisciplinary Panel Data Research, No. 416, Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (DIW), Berlin.
18. Vijaya Khairkar (2008): segregation of migrant's groups in Pune city India. *Anthropologist*, 10(2) 155-16.
19. Ioana Popescu, Erin Duffy Joshua Mendelsohn, Jose J. Escarce (2018): Racial residential segregation, socioeconomic disparities, and the White-Black survival gap. *PLoS ONE* 13(2): PP 1-15.
20. Federico Benassi, Corrado Bonifazi, et al (2020): Comparing Residential Segregation of Migrant Populations in Selected European Urban and Metropolitan Areas. *Spatial Demography* volume 8, pages 269–290
21. Fortuijn, J., Musterd, S. and Ostendorf, W. 1998. International migration and ethnic segregation: impact on urban areas. *Urban Studies*, 35(3): 367–370. [Google Scholar]
22. Friedrichs, J., Galster, G. and Musterd, S. 2003. Neighbourhood effects on social opportunities: the European and American research and policy context. *Housing Studies*, 18(6): 797–806. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
23. Goetz, E. 2003. *Clearing the Way: De-concentrating the Poor in Urban America*, Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press. [Google Scholar]
24. Goodchild, B. and Cole, I. 2001. Social balance and mixed neighbourhoods in Britain since 1979: a review of discourse and practice in social housing. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 19: 103–121. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
25. Graham, E., Manley, D., Hiscock, R., Boyle, P. and Doherty, J. 2009. Mixing housing tenures: is it good for social well-being?. *Urban Studies*, 46(1): 139–165. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
26. Kearns, A. and Parkinson, M. 2001. The significance of neighbourhood. *Urban Studies*, 38(12): 2103–2110. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
27. Massey, D. and Denton, N. 1989. Hyper-segregation in US metropolitan areas: black and hispanic segregation along five dimensions. *Demography*, 26(3): 373–393. [Crossref], [PubMed], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
28. Masayoshi Oka and David W. S. Wong (2014): Capturing the two dimensions of residential segregation at the neighborhood level for health research. *Public Health*, 25 August 2014.
29. Musterd, S. and van Kempen, R. 2007. Trapped or on the springboard? Housing careers in large housing estates in European Cities. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 29(3): 311–329. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar].
30. Musterd, S. 1998. *Urban Segregation and the Welfare State*, London: Routledge. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
31. Peach, C. 1996. Does Britain have ghettos? *Transactions, Institute of British Geographers*, NS 22: 216–235. [Google Scholar]
32. Permentier, M., van Ham, M. and Bolt, G. 2008. 'Same neighbourhood ... Different views?' A confrontation of internal and external neighbourhood reputations. *Housing Studies*, 23(6): 833–855. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
33. Phillips, D. 2007. Ethnic and racial segregation: a critical perspective. *Geography Compass*, 1(5): 1138–1159. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
34. Popkin, S., Levy, D. and Buron, L. 2009. Has Hope VI transformed residents' lives? New evidence from the Hope VI Panel Study. *Housing Studies*, 24(4): 477–502. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
35. Somerville, P. and Steele, A., eds. 2002. *Race, Housing and Social Exclusion*, London: Kingsley. [Google Scholar]
36. Veldboer, L., Kleinhans, R. and Duyvendak, J. W. 2002. The diversified neighborhood in Western Europe and the United States: how countries deal with the spatial distribution of economic and cultural differences. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 3(1): 41–64. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
37. Wood, M. 2003. A balancing act? Tenure diversification in Australia and the UK. *Urban Policy and Research*, 21(1): 45–56. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Google Scholar].