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**Abstract:** Since the 1980s, the internal migrant flow has become a constant social phenomenon in China, and "social integration" problems have attracted academic attention. Shanghai is the most representative city of migrants in China, so the social integration in Shanghai is so important that deserve more attention. In this paper, hierarchical linear model is used, both local residents and new migrants are taken into account, and community-level residential segregation is included into the model in order to reexamine psychological integration in Shanghai at individual and community levels. We find that the degree of Shanghai residents’ psychological integration was influenced by both individual characteristics and community-level variables. As an important factor affecting on social integration, residential segregation has great impact on the degree of psychological integration in Shanghai.
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**INTRODUCTION**

According to the Sixth National population census of the People’s Republic of China, there are 261,386,075 people living in places different from their household registration; meanwhile, they have been away from their household registration places for more than 6 months. Compared with that in the fifth national census in 2000, this number has increased 81.03% from 116,995,327. Obviously, the number of internal migrants is increasingly growing. The main directions of migration flows are from rural to urban, and from underdeveloped to developed cities. However, new migrants have a certain impact on the local residents’ work and lifestyle, which also result in segmentations and conflicts, as well as social prejudice and discrimination. This paper will examine the relationship between residential segregation and psychological integration from individual and community levels. Hence, this analysis is guided by the following questions: Is there evidence that migrants have a lower degree of psychological integration? What has been the impact of residential segregation on psychological integration? How does residential segregation affect the individual characteristics?

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

This review begins with definitions and theoretical foundation of social integration in the West, after that, the residential segregation is related to social integration. Because of the household registration system, internal migrants in China are different from immigrants in the West though some concepts and measures can be used in this analysis. Finally, this review also includes some domestic researches in order to deal with unique characteristics of migrants in China.

1. **Social Integration and Theoretical Foundation in the West**

The Classic Assimilation Model proposed by Park and Burgess (1921; 1969) defines “assimilation” as “the process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups, and by sharing their experiences and history are incorporated with them in a common cultural life.” The terms “integration” and “assimilation” are often used interchangeably. In American literatures on spatial segregation, for instance, spatial assimilation and residential integration are regarded as synonymous (Alba and Nee, 1997). In general, there are 3 major theories of social integration: assimilation, multiculturalism, and segmented assimilation.

***Assimilation theory*** is mainly applied for studying international migration, and a complete theoretical system has been developed. At the earliest, Park believed that assimilation was a naturally-occurring process that vulnerable group constantly abandons their original culture and behavior patterns, gradually adapts to the mainstream society, and finally obtains the same opportunities and rights as the mainstream group (Park, 1928). As shown in Figure 1, Gordon has made a systematic analysis of this concept, and conceives seven dimensions. However, the main differences among the dimensions are presented by "structural integration" and "acculturation"(Gordon, 1964). Spatial assimilation is also firmly linked to immigrant integration from a theoretical standpoint (Alba and Nee, 1997; Massey, 1985). Spatial assimilation theory posits that upon arrival in a new country, immigrants will initially reside in immigrant enclaves, usually located in poor sections of the inner city where housing is cheap. As immigrants improve their economic positions and adapt to the host society’s language, customs, norms, and values (a process known as acculturation), real and/or subjective differences between themselves and dominant group members will disappear. Once social distance diminishes, the spatial gap between immigrants and natives will also close. Spatial assimilation has been recognized as an important sub-stage in immigrants’ progression toward full incorporation in receiving societies (Alba and Nee, 1997; Marston and Van Valey, 1979).
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Figure 1 Model of Spatial Assimilation: Predictors of Residential Integration and Links with Structural and Subsequent Forms of Assimilation (Gordon, 1964)

Different from assimilation theory which states that immigrants will eventually abandon their traditional cultures to adapt to mainstream society, ***multiculturalism theory*** is used to describe the multi-ethnic, multi-cultural and multi-lingual society. When applied to the international migration field, multiculturalism emphasizes forming a multiple social and economic order. If the host culture is more inclusive, new migrants will tend to maintain their own cultural values, meanwhile reshape identities and values (Portes et al., 1980). It is generally considered that a variety of cultures and values will adapt to each other, that is, different social groups interact and adapt to one another, and all social participants finally have equal rights (Kallen, 1956; Glazer, 1997). Some scholars establish a research framework from angles of immigrants and citizens based on multiculturalism (Spoonley, Peace, Butcher, O 'Neill, 2005).

A third universal theory of immigrant incorporation is ***segmented assimilation***. This perspective focuses on divergent patterns of incorporation among contemporary immigrants (Portes and Zhou, 1993; Zhou, 1999). Individual- and structural-level factors affect the incorporation process, and there is an important interaction between the two levels. Individual-level factors include education, career aspiration, English language ability, place of birth, and age at the time of arrival, and length of residence in the United States. Structural factors include racial status, family socioeconomic background, and place of residence (Zhou, 1999). The host society offers uneven possibilities to different immigrant groups, and segmented assimilation theory posits that recent immigrants are being absorbed by different segments of American society, ranging from affluent middle-class suburbs to impoverished inner-city ghettos, and that "becoming American" may not always be an advantage for the immigrants themselves or for their children (Iceland & Scopilliti, 2008).

1. **Linking of Residential Segregation and Social Integration**

Residential segregation refers to similar urban residents intensively live in a certain area, dissimilar residents separate from one another, and even generates discrimination or hostile attitude, because of the race, religion, occupation, lifestyle, culture or wealth differences (Blau, 1977). Drawing on the wealth of research rooted in the long history of immigration in the US, urban sociologists and urban geographers first mapped the residential patterns of minority ethnic groups and documented their segregation and concentration (Huttman, 1991; Peach, 1975; Phillips, 1998; van Kempen and Özüekren, 1998). These studies indicate that minority ethnic groups tend to be concentrated in a small number of poorer neighborhoods, live in the worst houses. Given this negative picture, subsequent studies began to search for positive trends, charting the dynamics of communities and the emerging diversity in residential patterns overtime (Bolt and van Kempen, 2003; Clark and Drever, 2000; Özüekren and van Kempen, 2002). Both the assimilation process and residential segregation are primary emphases in the literature on race and ethnic relations. The basis for conceptualizing residential segregation as an integral component of the assimilation process is noted in the classic ecological statements of Park (1950) and Hawley (1944). Both argue that the degree of physical separation between two groups is closely associated with the nature of social relations between them.

Some scholars have argued that minority ethnic integration may be limited by residential segregation. The reasoning is that neighborhoods with a concentration of minority ethnic and/or poor households may restrict the opportunities of their residents (Friedrichs et al., 2003; Kearns and Parkinson, 2001; Musterd, 1998). There is a widespread belief amongst policy-makers in many European countries that ethnic residential segregation hampers the integration and participation of minority ethnic groups in society (Harrison et al. 2005). Most literature on neighborhood effects looks at the effects of concentrated poverty, while only a few studies look at the consequences of living in ethnic residential concentrations (Galster, 2007; van der Laan Bouma-Doff, 2007; Buck, 2001; Galster et al., 1999; Clark and Drinkwater, 2002).

The view that segregation is the outcome of the lack of socio-economic and/or cultural integration has been criticized by various academics on numerous grounds. Firstly, the link between socio-economic integration and residential segregation is much weaker than is often suggested (Musterd, 2005). Secondly, the conclusion that concentration is the product of self-segregation is often based on a flawed analysis of segregation patterns. Thirdly, little attention is given to the self-segregation of members of the host majority. Finally, many studies on ethnic segregation do not fully take account of the factors beyond the household level that constrain relocation choices. Segregation does not, by itself, have much effect on assimilation (Bahr and Gibbs, 1967; Jiobu and Marshall, 1971; Arbaci and Malheiros, 2010).

1. **Migrants in the Background of *Hukou* System and Social Integration in China**

In the early 1980s, China began to carry out the economic reform that resulted in economic growth and prosperity, especially in the provinces and autonomous cities of eastern China. As one of the four direct-controlled municipalities, Shanghai is the most representative city, not only because it is a global financial center, but also because of the large population. In particular, it is one of the cities with the largest migrant population in China. According to the Shanghai Statistical Report 2013, the migrants’ population in Shanghai reached as high as 9.9 million, accounting for 41% of total population. Shanghai’s economic boom has attracted many migrants from rural areas, towns and small cities.

However, such internal migration is unique to many countries, migration in China has not been a purely autonomous decision made by individuals, but influenced by the institution, such as *hukou* (household registration) system (Chan & Zhang, 1999; Fan, 2008). This system is used to record the whereabouts of households and manage the provision of local social services and benefits. As the household registration system became loose after reform and opening up, a large number of the population from rural areas or small cities have moved into cities like Shanghai. Without the approval to register with local jurisdictions, migrants are deprived of many social and economic benefits, including access to certain types of housing, which are restricted to people with local *hukous* (Huang, 2004; Logan, Bian, & Bian, 1999). In July 2014, China’s State Council announced what some Chinese media have called “the end of the *hukou* system”, but Shanghai will still “strictly control the scale of the population”, using a points-based system favoring the educated and wealthy. This indicates that the inequality between migrants and local residents in Shanghai will continue for a long time, and nobody can predict the end.

Although migration in China has its own unique background of *hukou* system, migrants in China also need to face a problem as the immigrants in the West do, that is, social integration. Since the 1980s, Scholars at home and abroad were drawn by China's migrant flow, and introduced the concept of “social integration” into domestic migrant research field. Some scholars believe that social integration is a two-way concept, that is, migrants and local residents achieve integration through interaction (Ren Yuan and Wu Minle, 2006); while others emphasize migrants to integrate into the environment on their own initiative (Tong Xing and Ma Xiheng, 2008; Zhou Hao, 2012). Different scholars have studied different dimensions, with some definitions emphasizing cultural and emotional integration while others focusing on economic and social integration. Some studies have given priority to the integration process, and some definitions have stated that social integration is not only the process, but also the result. However, the concept of social inclusion includes: group differences as entrants and the process that this group adapts to the host society, interacts with each other and finally achieves integration. In this process, there exist exclusions, obstacles and conflicts among different groups, between migrants and the host society (Ren Yuan and Qiao Nan, 2010).

In general, most scholars have reached a consensus regarding the following views on the social integration: (1) integration is not a static state, but a dynamic process challenging the current status. (2) Social integration is not only the aim, but also the means. (3) Social integration cannot be achieved by coercive power because it is not only institutional, but also subjective integration. (4) Social integration is multi-dimensional, including economic, political, social, institution, cultural, and psychological integration. (5) Social integration is also multi-level, not only nationwide and city level, but also transnational integration, including macro, mezzo, and micro level (Garida, Huang Kuangshi, 2009: 23).

1. **Review of Influence Factors**

In recent years, many scholars from fields of economics, sociology, demography, and political science have conducted in-depth studies of social integration. Most researchers are focusing on the analysis of influence factors of social integration, mainly including social networks and social capital, human capital, and institutional analysis.

In terms of ***social networks*** and ***social capital***, American sociologist Portes (1998) first stressed the importance of social capital in immigration researches. He believed that every step in the immigration process is related to social capital or social networks, such as deciding whether to migrate, where to migrate, and how to adapt to host life. Since then, Nee and Sanders’s researches on social capital of US immigration family have proved the essential role of social capital for immigrants. Moody and White have provided a definition of the structural integration, and believe that the structure of social networks has a significant effect on social integration (Moody & White, 2003). The strength of social integration can be evaluated through the number of positive interaction and closeness degree, some scholars measure social network density as group-level of social integration (Friedkin, 2004). Among domestic studies, Zhao Yandong (2002) proposed that social capital is extremely important for migrant workers in the process of attaining economic status and its effect may be more significant than that of human capital. Lei Kaichun(2011) found that although the local social capital is more conducive to new migrants’ social integration, the degree and direction of the effect are somewhat different. Yue Zhongshan’s research shows that non-relatives has a significantly positive impact on cultural and psychological integration of migrant workers, but the impact on the socio-economic integration is limited (Zhongshan Yue et al., 2011).

In terms of ***human capital***, Chiswick (1978) and Borjas (1987) have introduced the concept of "human capital" into immigration studies, and regarded the level of education, work experience, and other labor skills of immigrant as their human capital. Zhou Min et al. (2004) investigated the new Chinese immigrant community and found that new immigrants with strong human capital can integrate into American mainstream society better. Another survey shows that vocational training influence migrant workers becoming industrial or service workers significantly (Yao Xianguo et al., 2006). Zhao Yandong et al (2002) believe that the impact of vocational training on the migrants’ economic status has no difference with the effect of formal education. The explanation is that vocational training cannot only help migrants to attain a new human capital, but also provide an effective way to supplement and transformation of the original human capital. Zhang Wenhong and Lei Kaichun through utilizing exploratory factor analysis have explored the internal structure and influential factors of migrants’ social inclusion. The overall level of their social inclusion is still low, and the influence factors mainly include gender, marital status, party membership, years of education, monthly income, residence time, birth place and occupational status (Zhang Wenhong and Lei Kaichun, 2008).

***Institutional analysis*** focuses on the impact of the household registration system on social integration. *Hukou* is considered as "social closure" system, which means a part of the resident is rejected to share social resources of the city (Li Qiang, 2002). A direct consequence of the *hukou* is migrant workers’ identities are separated from occupational status. *Hukou* differences increase not only the life and development cost of migrant workers in urban, but also the difficulty of integration into urban society. Because of the *hukou* differences, the urban residents’ sense of superiority caused by inequality undermines the confidence and efforts of migrants for integrating into the city. Household registration system hinders the upward social mobility of migrant workers. Among various ways to social mobility, including occupational, economic, political, educational, and marital channels, the household registration system becomes an obstacle in the way to the social mobility of migrant workers (Li Qiang, 2002). A survey in Shanghai shows that most migrant workers hold negative attitudes to host society, which are not their real intentions, but rather a kind of rational decision-"self-knowledge". Restrictions from institution and the unequal and instable employment force them to become passers-by in the city (Ren Yuan, 2003). Because migrant workers cannot obtain official identity in the city, they would consider rural home as the permanent one for residence. "Interrupted urbanization" is different from complete urbanization in Europe and America, which means the migrants integrating and settling in the city (Li Qiang, 2000).

In summary, social integration is not only the focus of sociology, economics, demography, and political science, but also the core field of policy practice. There is no a unified definition of social integration, but the measurement covers multiple dimensions. John Goldlust and Anthony H. Richmond (1974) have divided the indicator of social integration into seven categories, covering both objective and subjective levels. Zhou Hao (2012) have reviewed the measurements of social integration, and found that this concept is multidimensional. Despite the fact that different scholars have different definitions and measurements, there are some common dimensions. For example, almost all studies include economic integration, cultural integration, identity and psychological integration. This paper will only focus on psychological integration out of three considerations: firstly, the psychological integration is the most intuitive indicator of social integration, and the highest level among the dimensions. Stanley (2008) proposed that immigrants’ emotional attachment is the end of national identity. Zhu Li (2002) divided social integration into the economic, social, and psychological dimensions, among which psychological integration is the highest level. Secondly, the data in this paper only cover economic and psychological integration. Finally, previous studies told us that residential segregation is so closely related to the economic status that it is difficult to estimate causal relationships between them. However, psychological integration is measured by respondents' attitudes. The relationship between residential segregation and psychological integration can be identified according to the chronological order.

Based on previous studies, we can find that most researchers have focused on how migrants integrate into host society, and that social integration is not considered as a two-way interaction. However, it is an essential perspective for the two-way interactive process of social integration, and the local residents’ attitude cannot be ignored. In the next step, we will take attitudes of both new migrants and local residents into account, and consider social integration as a process of two-way interaction. In addition, previous researches about the impact factors of social integration have focused on social capital, human capital, and institutional constraints. In view of the domestic migrant enclaves appeared in recent years, we will try to add a new factor - residential segregation, and explore the relationship between residential structure and psychological integration. Studies of residential segregation in China are focusing on GIS analysis, and have described only residential patterns. Therefore, this article is trying to bring community-level residential segregation into the analysis of psychological integration, explore the relationship between them, and fill this gap.

**RESEARCH PROBLEMS & HYPOTHESES**

This paper is to discuss the relationship between residential segregation and psychological integration. To analyze this relationship, we need to take both individual level and community level into account, and argue how the residential structure of community influences personal recognition of social integration.

Firstly, in terms of the individual level, this paper involves two groups, namely, the new migrants and local residents. So, are there any differences between the two groups regarding psychological integration? Are the new migrants’ feelings towards exclusion similar to those of local residents? According to the previous literatures, migrants come to a new environment, and feel alienated and unwelcome, thus choose to live with other migrants. Therefore, migrants’ feelings towards psychological integration are different from those of local residents’. Meanwhile, migrants believe that local residents do not welcome them. Previous studies only focused on migrants and their feelings. However, this article will give consideration to both local residents and migrants, and compare their feelings.

**Hypothesis 1:** New migrants’ degree of psychological integration is significantly lower than that of local residents.

Secondly, does residential segregation between local residents and new migrants affect their psychological integration? Previous studies have paid attention to the connection between residential segregation and socio-economic integration. Some researchers argue that living in migrant enclaves has a negative impact on their incomes, but others show that residential segregation is not related to social integration significantly. So, does residential segregation significantly affect psychological integration? Residential segregation may form an insurmountable barrier for communication between local residents and new migrants, and hinder the process of social integration on the spatial dimension. This paper will measure the residential segregation between local residents and new migrants at community level.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is a significantly negative correlation between community isolation level and the degree of residents’ psychological integration.

Thirdly, in terms of the community level, according to the proportions of new migrants and local residents in the community, the community types can be divided into local residents’ settlement and new migrants’ enclave. The higher the degree of residential segregation between local residents and new migrants is, the less communication between them and the worse the integration feelings between them will be. It is more difficult for new migrants who stay in migrant enclaves to enter the "mainstream society" than those living in local residents’ settlement. Therefore, living in local residents’ settlement will be more conducive for new migrants integrating into the host society, increase the degree of psychological integration, and thereby boost the overall degree of community.

**Hypothesis 3:** The degree of psychological integration in local residents’ settlement is higher than that in new migrants’ enclaves.

Finally, since both individual and community levels are taken into account, is there any interaction between the two levels? Does residential segregation as a community-level factor affect individual-level factors? And does residential segregation influence new migrants and local residents’ attitudes towards psychological integration?

**Hypothesis 4:** As with the degree of psychological integration, there are interactions between individual characteristics and community level; residential segregation also has impact on individual characteristics.

**FRAMEWORK, DATA & MODEL**

Operationalization of specific views and hypotheses is a key point of quantitative researches while reasonable choices of variables determine the scientificity and rationality of a research. Here below is design process of this research:

1. **Framework**

This study focuses on psychological integration of new migrants and local residents in Shanghai, especially on the impact of residential segregation on psychological integration. Therefore, two groups—both local residents and new migrants are involved, and their attitudes towards social integration constitute the dependent variable of this article. The key independent variable of individual level is registered residence place, which is used to define whether the respondents are local residents or new migrants, and the independent variable of community level is residential segregation. Controlling the effects of other individual characteristics, we will research how residential segregation affects psychological integration of local residents and new migrants. Thus chart below is the framework designed for this paper:

Community Level: Residential Segregation

Psychological Integration

psychological integration

Individual Level: Local Residents New Migrants

1. **Data**

The data we use in this study are from the survey of Social Development and Construction in Urban and Rural Areas (2012). Sampling procedures are as follows: firstly, according to the “probabilities proportional to size” method (referred to as PPS), we select 6 provinces (Shanghai, Guangdong, Henan, Jilin, Gansu, Yunnan), and assign 1000 samples to each province. Secondly, allocate samples to capital city, prefecture-level cities, county-level cities, counties, and townships of each selected province proportionally, and determine the amount of the individual samples. Thirdly, take samples of neighborhoods or towns from selected cities or counties. Fourthly, select neighborhood or village committees as sampling units. Fifthly, obtain residential addresses from selected committees under the principle of being simple and random, and then select household samples from these addresses based on random number tables. Sixthly, choose appropriate respondents from selected households with “Kish Grid” method. Finally, successfully interview 5,745 respondents who are above 17 years old and working or have retired and living in urban and rural areas. This article only focuses on the status of Shanghai, so just save the samples obtained from Shanghai, including 1,015 respondents.

1. **Measurement and Operationalization**
   1. **Dependent Variable: Psychological Integration**

This variable is measured by a question on the attitude in the questionnaire, that is, do you agree with “migrants are always excluded from locals”? The answers include "completely agree"(score=1), "relatively agree"(score=2), "uncertain"(score=3), "relatively disagree"(score=4) and "completely disagree"(score=5). Agreeing with "migrants are always excluded from locals" represents a lower degree of psychological integration, and disagreeing with "migrants are always excluded from locals" represents a higher degree of psychological integration. Therefore, scores from 1 to 5 represent degrees of psychological integration from the lowest to the highest respectively.

* 1. **Independent Variables at Individual Level**

The core independent variable of individual-level is registered residence place, that is, whether the respondents are local residents or new migrants. Since the 1980s when China was in the midst of economic and social structure dual transitions, urban space was constantly expanded, and the scale of rural-urban migration and social mobility has been increasing. "New migrants" refer to migrants who have achieved regional migration of themselves or their families since the reform and opening up, obtained a relatively stable job and lived in the new settlement, and had the possibility of long-term settlement. Three categories of migrants are included: the first are migrant workers holding agricultural *hukou*; the second are those holding non-agricultural *hukou* from other cities; the third are college graduates from other places (Tong Xing and Ma Xiheng, 2008). Therefore, registered residence place is defined as the standard for defining new migrants, and respondents whose registered residence places are anywhere other than Shanghai are considered as "new migrants", valued "1", meanwhile "local residents" are those who have been registered in Shanghai and their value is "0". In addition, since "migrant workers" are involved, we will take *hukou* types as a control variable, that is, "agriculture *hukou*" and "non-agricultural *hukou*", which account for "0" and "1" respectively.

Because human capital is considered as one of the most important factors in previous studies, respondents' education degree is also involved in the model as a control variable. We have divided respondents’ highest degrees of education into three categories: "primary school and below", "junior", "high school / vocational school / college", and "college and above", recorded as 1-4 points. Additional individual-level control variables include gender, marital status, home-ownership, working conditions, and logarithm of annual income. Gender is divided into male (value=1) and female (value=0). Marital status includes two values: “0” represents having no spouse or partner, and “1” represents having a spouse or partner. Home-ownership refers to a state of owning current house or apartment. If respondents own their houses or apartments which they are living in, it is recorded as “1”. If respondents rent or just stay with friends or relatives in the current house or apartment, it is recorded as “0”. Working conditions are divided into two categories: "1" represents being working currently, and "0" represents having no job nowadays.

* 1. **Independent Variables at Community Level**

The measurement of residential segregation has a long tradition in previous literatures. The most widespread index is dissimilarity (often referred to simply as D), which is used to measure the “evenness of distribution of races across neighborhoods” (Stearns and Logan 1986). This index describes the evenness of distribution, or alternately the equality of access, of different groups across different neighborhoods. However, this index only measures the overall situation of residential segregation, which means only one dissimilarity index for a city. The latest study began to divide this index into a global index and local index. There is a certain index for each region of the city, in order to reveal interior residential segregation among different areas (Wong, 1996; Wong, 2008). The formula for the local index of dissimilarity is:

Di= 100×（）

Local Di index represents residential segregation between two groups in the ith community, where xi and yi are the number of local residents and new migrants respectively in the ith community. X and Y are the number of locals and migrants in all communities involved in this survey. This index varies from -100 to 100. In the absence of segregation (Di=0), every community would contain the same proportion as all samples as a whole. Di>0 represents that locals are more over-concentrated or over-represented in this community; Di<0 represents that migrants are more over-concentrated or over-represented.

**Table1 Description of variables**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **N** | **Mean** | | **S.D.** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** |
| Psychological Integration | 992 | 3.03 | | 1.08 | 1 | 5 |
| **Individual Level** | | |
| Registered Residence Place | 992 | 0.30 | | 0.46 | 0 | 1 |
| Gender | 992 | 0.53 | | 0.50 | 0 | 1 |
| Marital Status | 992 | 0.79 | | 0.40 | 0 | 1 |
| Education Degree | 992 | 2.75 | | 1.04 | 1 | 4 |
| *Hukou* | 992 | 0.68 | | 0.47 | 0 | 1 |
| Home-ownership | 992 | 0.58 | | 0.49 | 0 | 1 |
| Working Status | 992 | 0.65 | | 0.48 | 0 | 1 |
| Logarithm of Annual Income | 992 | 10.20 | | 1.41 | 0 | 16.12 |
| **Community Level** | | |
| Dissimilarity Index | 38 | 0.00 | | 3.80 | -14.39 | 6.05 |
| Isolation Index | 38 | 1.29 | | 2.75 | 0.005 | 14.14 |

Another common index of residential segregation is isolation index; similarly, this index is also measured for a whole situation. Considering the need for this paper, we design local isolation index according to the local dissimilarity index. The formula is:

Px\*=100×()()

Where xi and ti are the number of new migrants and permanent residents respectively in the ith community. X is the number of new migrants in all communities of this survey, to a certain extent representing the overall level of the city. The higher the isolation index is, the higher the proportion of new migrants in the community will be, which means migrants are more isolated from locals and have fewer opportunities to communicate with locals.

1. **Statistical Model & Analytical Strategies**

The main analysis method is a hierarchical linear model for estimating the impact of individual characteristics and residential segregation on the degree of respondents’ psychological integration. Hierarchical linear model can not only estimate the effect of each level and interactions between levels, but also decompose the variance and covariance of each level (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). This analysis is composed of following four steps: firstly, null model is a type of random intercept model that predicts the individual-level intercept of the psychological integration as a random effect of the community level, with no other predictors at individual level or community level in a two-level model. Secondly, add all the individual-level variables, and assume that the coefficients of regression are fixed. Thirdly, add the community-level variables, the isolation index and dissimilarity index. Fourthly, add the community-level variables to each intercept of independent variables, which is an interaction model of community and individual levels.

**RESULTS & FINDINGS**

According to the analysis strategies of above four steps, we try to test the proposed hypotheses, and report the results as follow:

1. **Decomposition of Psychological Integration (Null Model)**

The advantage of HLM is that overall differences of psychological integration can be decomposed into community and individual levels, and offer a quantitative indicator to indicate the proportions of each level difference account for the overall differences. Model 1 is a null model to decompose the degree of differences of psychological integration, and specific model is as follows:

Level-1: Y=B0+R

Level-2: B0=G00+U0

In the above formula, B0 is the intercept of level-1, R is the random effect, G00 is the fixed effect of level-2 on intercept of level-1, and U0 is the random effect of level-2. This model is not added with any variables, so we can examine the distribution of the total variance.

Model 1 provides the estimates for both the fixed effects and the random effects in the model. The estimate of G00 is 3.0368 with a standard error of 0.0435. This indicates that the mean degree of psychological integration in Shanghai is 3.0368 points. The random effect section shows the decomposition of the variance into its individual-level and community-level components. The reported chi-square value is 60.0349 with 37 degree of freedom. The *p-*value of 0.010 shows the variance at the community level is statistically significant at about 1% level of significance. The information can be used to calculate the “interclass correlation coefficient” (referred to simply as ICC) given by 0.0289/(0.0289+1.1458)=0.0246. This coefficient shows the proportion of variance in psychological integration that is attributable to differences at the community level. In this model, 2.46% of the variance in psychological integration is due to differences at the community level.

1. **Characteristics of Individual Level**

Based on Model 1, Model 2 is added with individual-level variables, but the community-level variables are not involved. In order to explain the results easier, all independent variables of individual level are group centered according to mean value of communities. Specific models are as follows:

Level1: Y=B0 + B1\*Registered Residential Place + B2\*Education Degree + B3\*Hukou

+ B4\*Working Status + B5\*Logarithm of Annual Income + R

Level2: B0=G00+U0

B1=G10

…

B8=G80

Where B0 is the intercept of level-1. Since each independent variable is in accordance with the mean value of communities, the intercept here represents the average degree of psychological integration of the community. Other B coefficients represent the effects of the level-1 individual characteristic, which shows systematic deviation for average psychological integration degree of community caused by the individual characteristics, and their explanation methods are same as those for conventional regression coefficients. Level-1 R represents the random error of the certain respondent, that is, a part of the difference that cannot be explained by systemic effects of an average degree of community and individual characteristics.

Model 2 shows that the differences between new migrants and local residents regarding psychological integration degree are significant. The new migrants’ psychological integration degree is 0.3058 points lower than that of local residents’, and at 1% level of significance. In other words, compared with local residents, new migrants tend to agree with "migrants are always excluded from locals". Thus hypothesis 1 has been verified, that is, the psychological integration degree of local residents is significantly lower than that of new migrants. In addition, education degree, *hukou*, and working status show significant differences to different extents. If respondents’ education degrees increase by 1 unit, the degree of integration psychological will reduce by 0.1538 points, that is, respondents who have a higher degree of human capital tend to agree with "migrants are always excluded from locals". Compared with agricultural hukou, respondents of non-agricultural hukou tend to disagree with "the migrants are always excluded from locals". Meanwhile, the degree of non-agricultural *hukou* respondents’ psychological integration is 0.2520 points higher than the agricultural *hukou*. The psychological integration degree of respondents who are currently working is 0.1451 points lower than that of those who are unemployed. From model 2, we also find that the level-1 variation reduces to 1.0927 after individual-level variables are added, and the individual-level variables can effectively explain the partial differences of psychological integration.

1. **Characteristics of Community Level**

Based on model2, isolation index and residential dissimilarity index are added to model3 and model4 respectively. Because of different meanings and high correlation between isolation and dissimilarity indexes, we have built two models as follows:

Level1: Y=B0 + B1\*Registered Residential Place + B2\*Education Degree + B3\*Hukou

+ B4\*Working Status + B5\*Logarithm of Annual Income + R

Level2: B0=G00+G01\*Isolation Index/ G02\*Dissimilarity Index+U0

B1=G10

…

B8=G80

This model is the random intercept model where differences between communities vary according to mean value of dependent variables. Moreover, community-level independent variables are included into the level-2 intercept model, and G coefficients represent the effects of community-level variables. In addition, the level-2 intercept model also includes random fluctuation, which means this model allows other particularities of each community.

Compared with model 2, model 3 includes a community-level variable—isolation index. According to model3, the degree of psychological integration is significantly and negatively correlated with isolation index, which means the average degree of community’s psychological integration decreases by 0.0370 points with one unit increases in the isolation index. The higher the isolation degree of new migrants in the community is, the more serious the residential segregation and the lower average the score of psychological integration at community level will be. Thus the hypothesis 2 has been tested, and there is a significantly negative correlation between community isolation level and the degree of residents’ psychological integration. Compared with that of model 2, and community-level variance of model 3 decreases from 0.0306 to 0.0177, indicating that adding the isolation index could explain 42.16% community differences of average psychological integration degree. It is proved that the isolation index is a valid variable to explain community differences with respect to average psychological integration degree.

**Table2 HLM of Psychological Integration between Migrants and Locals**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model1** | **Model2** | **Model3** | **Model4** |
| Fixed Effect | Coefficient | Coefficient | Coefficient | Coefficient |
|  | (S.E.) | (S.E.) | (S.E.) | (S.E.) |
| Level-1 Intercept G00 | 3.0368\*\*\* | 3.0370\*\*\* | 3.0892\*\*\* | 3.0416\*\*\* |
|  | (0.0435) | (0.0433) | (0.0435) | (0.0398) |
| Level-1 Individual |  |  |  |  |
| Registered Residential Place G10 |  | -0.3058\*\*\* | -0.3058\*\*\* | -0.3058\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.1097) | (0.1097) | (0.1097) |
| Gender G20 |  | 0.0756 | 0.0756 | 0.0756 |
|  |  | (0.0772) | (0.0772) | (0.0772) |
| Marital Status G30 |  | -0.0292 | -0.0292 | -0.0292 |
|  |  | (0.0913) | (0.0913) | (0.0913) |
| Education Degree G40 |  | -0.1538\*\*\* | -0.1538\*\*\* | -0.1538\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.0459) | (0.0459) | (0.0459) |
| Hukou G50 |  | 0.2520\*\* | 0.2520\*\* | 0.2520\*\* |
|  |  | (0.1236) | (0.1236) | (0.1236) |
| Home-ownership G60 |  | -0.0383 | -0.0383 | -0.0383 |
|  |  | (0.0685) | (0.0685) | (0.0685) |
| Working Status G70 |  | -0.1451\* | -0.1451\* | -0.1451\* |
|  |  | (0.0804) | (0.0804) | (0.0804) |
| Logarithm of Annual Income G80 |  | 0.0239 | 0.0239 | 0.0239 |
|  |  | (0.0310) | (0.0310) | (0.0310) |
| Level-2 Community |  |  |  |  |
| Isolation Index G01 |  |  | -0.0370\*\*\* |  |
|  |  |  | (0.0072) |  |
| Dissimilarity Index G02 |  |  |  | 0.0244\*\* |
|  |  |  |  | (0.0090) |
| Random Effect | Variance Component | Variance Component | Variance Component | Variance Component |
|  | (Chi-squre) | (Chi-squre) | (Chi-squre) | (Chi-squre) |
| Average Psychological Integration of Community U0 | 0.0289\*\* | 0.0306\*\*\* | 0.0177\* | 0.0210\*\* |
|  | (60.0349) | (62.9528) | (49.7187) | (52.5170) |
| Level-1 Random Effect R | 1.1458 | 1.0927 | 1.0941 | 1.0939 |
| df | 37 | 37 | 36 | 36 |
| Level-1 Reliability Estimate | 0.392 | 0.416 | 0.294 | 0.330 |

\* p＜0. 1，\*\*p＜0. 05，\*\*\*p＜0. 01

Similarly, another community-level variable--residential dissimilarity index is involved in Model 4. This model provides that the dissimilarity index is significantly and positively correlated with the degree of psychological integration, which means the average degree of community’s psychological integration also increases by 0.0244 points with one unit increase in residential dissimilarity index. Residential dissimilarity index ranges from -100 to 100, and the higher index is, the lower the proportion of new migrants in the community will be, and the more likely for it to be a local community. So, the result shows that the average psychological integration degree of local settlement is higher than that of migrants’ enclaves. Thus, hypothesis 3 has been proved. Compared with that of model2, the community-level variance of model 4 also decreases from 0.0306 to 0.0210, indicating that adding the residential dissimilarity index can explain 31.37% community differences of average psychological integration. It is illustrated that residential dissimilarity index is also a valid variable for explaining the community differences of average psychological integration degree.

1. **Interaction between Individual and Community Levels**

Based on model3 and model4, the community-level residential segregation indexes, isolation index and dissimilarity index are joined into the individual-level independent variables’ intercepts of model5 and model6 respectively. Specific models are as follows:

Level1: Y=B0 + B1\*Registered Residential Place + B2\*Education Degree + B3\*Hukou

+ B4\*Working Status + B5\*Logarithm of Annual Income + R

Level2: B0=G00+G01\*Residential Segregation Index+U0

B1=G10+G11\*Residential Segregation Index

…

B8=G80+G81\*Residential Segregation Index

Considering the limited sample size, all of the level-2 slopes are set for fixed effects, and there exists no random effect. It is for maintaining necessary statistically significant level. Other equations other than the level-2 intercept model determine the direction and strength of effects on the independent variables at level-1. The estimation of coefficients and statistical significance in the complete model is showed in Table 3, and all of the model results are estimations of some fixed parameters with robust standard errors.

Firstly, Model 5 is the complete model of isolation index that describes how the level-2 isolation index affects each independent variable and the intercept of level-1. The results show that the average degree of all individual psychology integration is 3.0892 points under the control of other factors. Level-2 isolation index and level-1 intercept (ie, the average degree of community psychological integration) are still significantly and negatively correlated to each other, which is consistent with the results of model 3. With one unit increases in isolation index, the average degree of community psychological integration decreases by 0.0369 points.

**Table3 Whole HLM of Psychological Integration between Migrants and Locals**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model5 (Isolation)** | | **Model6 (Dissimilarity)** | |
| Fixed Effect | Coefficient | (S.E.) | Coefficient | (S.E.) |
| **Level-1 Average Psychological Integration of Community Intercept：B0** | | | | |
| Level-2 Intercept, G00 | 3.0892\*\*\* | (0.0435) | 3.0416\*\*\* | (0.0398) |
| Residential Segregation Index, G01 | -0.0369\*\*\* | (0.0072) | 0.0244\*\* | (0.0090) |
| **Level-1 Registered Residential Place Slope, B1** | | | | |
| Level-2 Intercept, G10 | -0.2688\*\* | (0.1176) | -0.3276\*\*\* | (0.1110) |
| Residential Segregation Index, G11 | -0.0515\*\* | (0.0216) | 0.0367\*\* | (0.0150) |
| **Level-1 Gender Slope, B2** |  |  |  |  |
| Level-2 Intercept, G20 | 0.0092 | (0.0822) | 0.0681 | (0.0748) |
| Residential Segregation Index, G21 | 0.0437\*\*\* | (0.0160) | -0.0260\* | (0.0154) |
| **Level-1 Marital Status Slope, B3** |  |  |  |  |
| Level-2 Intercept, G30 | 0.0613 | (0.0931) | -0.0264 | (0.0856) |
| Residential Segregation Index, G31 | -0.0587\*\*\* | (0.0136) | 0.0408\*\*\* | (0.0116) |
| **Level-1Education Degree Slope, B4** | | | | |
| Level-2 Intercept, G40 | -0.1607\*\*\* | (0.0486) | -0.1570\*\*\* | (0.0451) |
| Residential Segregation Index, G41 | 0.0038 | (0.0136) | 0.0010 | (0.0119) |
| **Level-1 Hukou Slope, B5** |  |  |  |  |
| Level-2 Intercept, G50 | 0.2564\* | (0.1384) | 0.2573\*\* | (0.1266) |
| Residential Segregation Index, G51 | -0.0076 | (0.0415) | 0.0259 | (0.0304) |
| **Level-1 Home-ownership Slope, B6** | |  |  |  |
| Level-2 Intercept, G60 | -0.0363 | (0.0770) | -0.0529 | (0.0735) |
| Residential Segregation Index, G61 | -0.0154 | (0.0398) | 0.0059 | (0.0218) |
| **Level-1Working Status Slope, B7** | | | | |
| Level-2 Intercept, G70 | -0.1842\* | (0.0944) | -0.1367\* | (0.0817) |
| Residential Segregation Index, G71 | 0.0310\*\* | (0.0130) | -0.0187 | (0.0131) |
| **Level-1 Logarithm of Annual Income Slope, B8** | | | | |
| Level-2 Intercept, G80 | 0.0255 | (0.0312) | 0.0290 | (0.0299) |
| Residential Segregation Index, G81 | 0.0034 | (0.0154) | -0.0052 | (0.0087) |
| Random Effect | Variance Component | (Chi-square) | Variance Component | (Chi-square) |
| Average Psychological Integration of Community, U0 | 0.0180\* | (49.9681) | 0.0210\*\* | (52.5814) |
| Level-1 Random Effect, R | 1.0886 |  | 1.0925 |  |
| df | 36 | | 36 | |
| Level-1 Reliability Estimate | 0.298 | | 0.330 | |

\* p＜0. 1，\*\*p＜0. 05，\*\*\*p＜0. 01

Isolation index further reduces total negative slope by 0.0515 points, which is consistent with the total effect (G10) of registered residential place. This indicates that the new migrants’ degree of psychological integration is lower than that of local residents, and isolation index further strengthens the negative effects. When the sign of level-2 coefficients is same as that of corresponding level-1 coefficients, level-2 variables can enhance the associative strength of the level-1 coefficient. The enhanced direction is in accordance with the sign of level-2 intercept coefficient (Zhang Lei, 2003: 53). Living in the higher isolation index community further decreases the degree of new migrants’ psychological integration.

Secondly, model 6 is a complete model of residential dissimilarity index, and describes the effects of level-2 dissimilarity index on each independent variable and the intercept of level-1. The results show that the average degree of all individual psychology integration is 3.0416 points under the control of other factors. Level-2 dissimilarity index and level-1 intercept are still significantly and positively correlated to each other; with one unit increase in dissimilarity index, the average degree of community psychological integration increase 0.0244 points, which is consistent with the results of model4.

Dissimilarity index increase total negative slope by 0.0367 points, which is inconsistent with the total effect (G10) of registered residential place. We can find that the new migrants’ degree of psychological integration is lower than that of local residents, and dissimilarity index relieves the negative effects. When the sign of level-2 coefficients is different from that of corresponding level-1 coefficients, level-2 variables weaken the associative strength of the level-1 coefficient, and the influence direction is opposite to the sign of level-2 intercept coefficient (Zhang Lei, 2003: 53). Living in the higher dissimilarity index community, which means the locals’ settlement, can relieve the new migrants’ low degree of psychological integration.

For the psychological integration, there exist some interactions between the individual level and the community level. However, only the registered residential place is significant at two levels, which means the differences between migrants and locals are significant. Meanwhile, the impact of residential segregation on individual level is significant. Similarly, residential segregation also significantly affects gender and marital status, but they are not significant at individual level. In contrast, residential segregation has no significant impact on education degree, *hukou* type, working status, and income. Hence, hypothesis 4 is only partially verified. Compared with that of local residents, new migrants’ degree of psychological integration is lower, tending to agree with "the migrants are always excluded from locals". Meanwhile, isolation index strengthens the effect while dissimilarity index weakens it.

In short, basing on above data analysis, this paper has built a hierarchical linear model to prove that new migrants’ and local residents’ degrees of psychological integration in Shanghai are influenced by both individual characteristics and the community variables. For the analysis of social integration, residential segregation is an important factor not to be ignored. However, due to the nested structure of data, it is difficult to analyze both levels, and the hierarchical linear model provides a way to solve this problem.

**CONLUSIONS & DISCUSSIONS**

As the "internal migrants" phenomenon has highlighted, more and more attention has been paid to the issue of social integration from the academic circle. This paper attempts to add community-level variables, breaks the situation that previous researches of social integration in China are limited to analyzing individual characteristics. The models in this paper take both the individual level and the community level into account so as to explore the combined effect of two levels. Through using hierarchical linear model analysis, this paper finally comes to the following conclusions:

Firstly, on the individual level, different from the previous researches about how the new migrants integrate into host society, this study includes both migrants and locals, and explores the differences of psychological integration between them. The results show that the new migrants’ degree of psychological integration is significantly lower than that of local residents’. In other words, new migrants tend to agree with "the migrants are always excluded from locals”, but local residents’ views are on the contrary. It is noted that the new migrants feel the sense of exclusion from the local residents after arriving at Shanghai. Nevertheless, local residents are not aware of this problem, and do not think they are excluding the new migrants. Therefore, no matter whether the local residents do anything to exclude new migrants or not, the new migrants still do feel exclusion from local residents.

Secondly, on the community level, the "residential segregation" is the focus of this study, measured by the "isolation index" and "residential dissimilarity index", which are common to measure residential segregation but have different meanings and points of emphasis. Isolation index represents the isolation level of new migrants in Shanghai: the higher the isolation index of the community is, the lower the average degree of psychological integration is found. Residential dissimilarity index represents the settlement status of the local residents and new migrants: the higher the dissimilarity index of the community is, the lower the proportion of new migrants is found, and the more likely for it to be a locals’ settlement. From this study, we find that the community is more inclined to be a locals’ settlement, and a higher average degree of psychological integration is showed.

Thirdly, on the interactions between individual level and community level, we have taken the residential segregation into each individual-level variable and intercept, and analyzed the interactions of two levels. The results show that there only exists interaction between residential segregation and individual-level registered residential place, which shows whether the respondents are local residents or new migrants. The isolation index strengthens the negative effects of new migrants’ psychological integration while dissimilarity index weakens the negative effects. In other words, living in a high isolation level community will further reduce the degree of psychological integration, while living in a locals’ settlement community will improve its level of psychological integration. Therefore, mix residential pattern of new migrants and local residents boosts the level of psychological integration.

In summary, this paper is about psychological integration and residential segregation, and has proved that psychological integration is influenced by the combined impact of individual level and community level according to empirical data analysis. Results show that residential segregation plays an important role of psychological integration analysis, and cannot be overlooked in social integration researches. Considering the limitations of the data, however, this paper cannot involve more influence factors of social integration, which may affect the validity of the model. In the process of this study, we found that some problems can be further explored: firstly, the concept of social integration is complex and multidimensional, but this article only analyzes the level of psychological integration because of the limited data. In the next step, we can take extra dimensional factors of social integration into account. Secondly, we have tested the effectiveness of community-level variables for analyzing social integration. GIS analysis can intuitively reflect the residential status, but cannot connect the individual feeling and residential status, and the hierarchical linear model makes this link possible. In the next step, more community-level variables should be added into the model, such as the location of community and housing prices. Finally, this paper has tried to consider both local residents and new migrants. Further analysis could focus on different attitudes, including new migrants’ integration attitudes and local residents’ acceptable attitudes, to obtain more accurate results.
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