

Contextual Factors and Prejudice at the Beginning of the Migrant Influx:

The Moroccan Case in Seville, Spain

Ricardo Iglesias-Pascual

Universidad Pablo de Olavide

Virginia Paloma and Manuel García-Ramírez

Universidad de Sevilla

Author Note

Ricardo Iglesias-Pascual, Department of Geography, History, and Philosophy, Universidad Pablo de Olavide; Virginia Paloma and Manuel García-Ramírez, Department of Social Psychology, Universidad de Sevilla.

This research project was funded by grants from the Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness of the Spanish Government (CSO2014-55780-C3-1-P; SEJ2006-14470) and from the Department of Migrant Policy of the Regional Government of Andalusia (2007/87).

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Ricardo Iglesias-Pascual, Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Edificio nº 2, Ctra. de Utrera, km. 1, 41013 Sevilla, Spain. E-mail: riglpas@upo.es

Abstract

Studies addressing contextual factors associated with anti-immigrant prejudice have focused on out-group size and rapid demographic changes in receiving locations. However, the territorial concentration and distribution of ethnic minorities at a local and intra-urban level has received little attention. We analyze the relationship between emerging territorial concentration points – alongside other contextual variables – by Moroccans and receiving society's growing prejudice towards them in a city experiencing the start of a migrant influx. We combine survey and census data from five Seville districts (southern Spain). Our results show how rapid changes in the general population's ethnic composition, coupled with Moroccan and economic migrants' territorial concentration, correlate strongly with negative attitudes towards Moroccans at this early stage. However, a weaker relationship between the immigrant percentage and degree of prejudice by the receiving group is observed. We also discuss guidelines for ensuring good, local diversity management to prevent socioterritorial fragmentation in multicultural cities.

Keywords: cultural diversity management; demographic change; immigrants; out-group size; prejudice; territorial concentration.

Contextual Factors and Prejudice at the Beginning of the Migrant Influx:**The Moroccan Case in Seville, Spain**

The arrival of immigrants to the world's wealthiest societies has brought about changes to their physiognomy, structure and dynamics, creating new cultural opportunities, socioeconomic benefits and demographic enrichment (Skeldon, 2013; United Nations, 2001). However, these changes often generate social uncertainty and feelings of insecurity, fear and rejection among part of the receiving population. The emergence of prejudice among the receiving population is a reaction that can be traced back to the formation of new ethnic groups, whether for reasons of resettlement or new migration flows (Gorodzeisky & Semyonov, 2015; Quillian, 2006; Sennett, 2011). The concept of anti-immigrant prejudice is understood as a reaction that the receiving society's majority dominant group has towards these newcomers, who are seen as a threat to the status quo and a danger to their privileged social position (Quillian, 1995; Valentine, 2010). These reactions manifest in various ways across different countries, ranging from an explicit and public protest action in the neighbourhood (Gruner, 2010; Iglesias-Pascual, 2016) to more subtle approaches such as having misgivings and only occasional contact with foreigners (Huijts, Kraaykamp, & Scheepers, 2014; Søholt & Lynnebakke, 2015). These negative attitudes make living together difficult and put social cohesion at risk in local contexts (Amin, 2002; Peterson, 2017; Putnam, 2007; Sturgis, Brunton-Smith, Kuha, & Jackson, 2014). Moreover, this perceived discrimination is among the main stressors in the lives of immigrants (Segal & Mayadas, 2005), which have a severe negative impact on their physical and mental health (Finch & Vega, 2003). Taking things further, anti-immigrant prejudice is also apparent in the difficulties that the out-group faces when accessing the labour market, who are pushed into living in impoverished and marginalized neighbourhoods (Portes &

Rumbaut, 2006; Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, & Szapocznik, 2010). In fact, anti-immigrant prejudice is considered a key determinant when it comes to understanding the dynamics of receiving contexts (Pettigrew, Wagner, & Christ, 2007). From this perspective, numerous studies emphasize the key role that contextual variables play in explaining prejudice (Valentine, 2010; Wilson, 2011; 2013), arguing for the need to explore in greater depth the relationship between the geographical context and the receiving population's social attitudes (Hjerm, 2009; Pottie-Sherman & Wilkes, 2017; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010).

Most studies that have turned their efforts to examining the relationship between anti-immigrant prejudice and contextual factors have observed the role played by out-group size (Hjerm, 2007, 2009; Quillian, 1995; McLaren, 2003) and ethnic composition changes in settlement locations (DeWaard, 2015; Newman & Velez, 2014). However, these studies have paid little attention to the spatial distribution and concentration patterns imposed by the receiving society in the early days of influx. Although it is widely acknowledged that these patterns are highly relevant to the level of cohesion and social integration in the city (Alba & Logan, 1993; Bolt & van Kempen, 2010; Massey, 1985; Massey & Denton, 1993; Wright & Ellis, 2000), there are few studies exploring a possible relationship between this territorial concentration and the anti-immigrant prejudices shown by the receiving society (e.g., Schlueter, 2012; Schlüter, Ullrich, Glenz, & Schmidt, 2017).

This study sheds light on the role played by the territorial distribution and concentration of immigrants, alongside other contextual variables (e.g., foreign population size, ethnic composition changes in geographical settlement areas), in the growing prejudice that the receiving population's dominant group shows towards Moroccans at a local level, for this purpose focusing on the city of Seville. The incipient

nature of the migration inflow into Seville over a relatively short space of time (2000 to 2008) — the latter being the year which saw the beginning of the largest wave of immigration to the city and when the data underpinning this study was collected — allows us to focus our research on the consequences that the start of the foreign influx has had on the receiving population's social attitudes.

First, we review the main contextual variables linked to the receiving society's reaction towards minority groups' presence in a given geographical setting. Second, we take a closer look at the scope of the study and show the methodological approach developed. After detailing the main results, we discuss these results and suggest guidelines for an appropriate treatment of ethnic diversity at a local level.

A Contextual Approach to Anti-immigrant Prejudice

Researchers analyzing the role of contextual variables in anti-immigrant prejudice agree that out-group size and demographic changes intensify the perceived threat among the receiving population, which ultimately feeds prejudice among them. In this study, we place emphasis on the territorial distribution and concentration of immigrants in host societies, as this approach brings to the forefront pending issues that reveal how contextual factors and receiving society's anti-immigrant prejudice are related.

Out-group Size

Numerous research studies link a rise in the immigrant population to the growing prejudice on the part of the receiving society. These studies come under the theoretical approach 'group threat theory' (Blalock, 1967; Bobo, 1983). In this case, prejudice towards members outside of the host society (e.g., foreigners, immigrants, ethnic minorities) is explained by the social perception, be it real or imagined, of competition for economic resources and the threat to cultural identity. In general, these

studies show how anti-immigrant prejudice increases the larger the out-group size (Quillian, 1995; Semyonov et al., 2004), especially when this population is of non-Western origin (Schneider, 2008).

However, research studies grouped under the theoretical approach ‘contact theory’ play down this point of view. Their findings reveal that a stronger immigrant presence increases the chances of coming into contact with the local population, which in the long term would help reduce prejudice towards this immigrant population and likely improve coexistence (DeWaard, 2015; Hjerm, 2009; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Pettigrew, Wagner, & Christ, 2007). These studies show that aspects like greater contact with the out-group and an immigrant’s length of stay in the receiving society may reduce the occurrence of prejudice and help bring about more receptive attitudes towards immigrants (DeWaard, 2015). However, although fleeting encounters among diverse neighbours can contribute towards a greater sense of familiarity (Peterson, 2017; Wilson, 2017), evidently community spaces that encourage repeated encounters have the potential to create deeper and more meaningful interactions which lead to lasting relationships with ‘the other’ (Amin, 2002; Valentine, 2013). Based on this approach, closer contact of this kind should mitigate both the threat and anti-immigrant attitudes, whereas more superficial contact can have the opposite effect (Dixon, 2006; Valentine, 2008, 2010).

Thus, a wealth of academic literature reveals a positive relationship between out-group size and manifestations of prejudice (e.g., Blalock, 1957; Coenders, 2001; Gorodzeisky & Semyonov, 2015; Quillian, 1995, 1996; Scheepers, Gijsbert, & Coenders, 2002; Semyonov, Raijman, & Gorodzeisky, 2006), whereas other literature finds no such evidence (e.g., Coenders et al., 2005; Hjerm, 2007, 2009; McLaren, 2003; Semyonov et al., 2004) and even identifies a negative relationship (e.g., Lubbers,

Coenders, & Scheepers, 2006). This controversial discussion can be tackled if we take into account aspects such as the scale of the scope of study (van Heerden & Ruedin, 2017; Kaufmann & Harris, 2015; Pottie-Sherman & Wilkes, 2017; Rodon & Franco-Guillen, 2014); the opportunities that the receiving society offers for meaningful interethnic contact (Dinesen & Sønderskov, 2015); and other contextual variables to help interpret the results obtained.

Demographic Change to the Territory of Settlement

Other research has focused attention on the rapid change to the ethnic composition of the receiving society when it comes to explaining the occurrence of prejudice. The ‘salience of change hypothesis’ (Newman & Velez, 2014), based on Hopkins’ ‘defended neighbourhood hypothesis’ (2009, 2010), views drastic changes in the ethno-racial composition as being responsible for receiving society’s attitudes of rejection. The sudden changes in the ethnic composition stimulate the perception of sociocultural competition in a community, especially when the receiving society’s economic level is lower (Semyonov et al., 2006). In the same vein, authors including DeWaard (2015) consider the temporal dynamics of migration flow and greater spatial mobility more important than out-group size when it comes to explaining the formation of social attitudes. In situations marked by rapid demographic change, attitudes towards immigration that come into play on a social level are often characterized by the persistence of prejudice towards the immigrant individual (Rozin & Royzman, 2001).

Nevertheless, an emerging literature addresses the multiple methods that the receiving society uses in order to estimate demographic changes in out-group size within their neighbourhoods and local communities. Laméris, Kraaykamp, Ruiters, and Tolsma (2018) highlight how ethnic segregation, economic deprivation and crime prevalence in the neighbourhood and in surrounding neighbourhoods are attributed to a rise in out-

group size, shaping perceptions of threat and anti-immigrant prejudice. Moreover, all neighbourhoods within a municipality are interconnected and their residents move across and in-between urban spaces throughout their daily lives; the receiving population uses the information garnered from experience in attributing demographic changes to their neighbourhood (Wodtke, Harding, & Elwert, 2011).

Territorial Distribution and Concentration of the Immigrant Population

Using out-group size and demographic change as contextual predictors of anti-immigrant prejudice places the emphasis on migration flows rather than on the receiving population's reactions, who often force newcomers to settle in segregated and impoverished areas. This distribution is decided by the receiving society when migrants start to arrive according to the former's self-interests, the social position reserved for immigrants, and their inclination to consider different ethnic backgrounds as less trustworthy. To address this gap, we suggest that the key role most likely played by territorial distribution and concentration in explaining prejudice should figure among the most influential contextual variables.

Traditionally, the analysis of territorial distribution and concentration of immigrants has focused on describing the spatial patterns of residential segregation (e.g., Alba & Logan, 1993; Alba et al., 1999; Holloway, Wright, & Ellis, 2011; Johnston, Poulsen, & Forrest, 2009; Massey, 1985; Wright, Ellis, Holloway, & Wong, 2014). However, we maintain that the immigrants' patterns of residential and spatial behaviours are crucial for understanding how receiving society-led anti-immigrant prejudice evolves. This is based on previous studies that have shown how immigrant territorial concentration impacts on interaction among different ethnic groups at a local level (Iglesias-Pascual, 2017a; Smith, 2018); perceived competition for labour resources (Blalock, 1967); and the degree of social cohesion, collective efficacy, and a sense of

community among residents (Finney & Jivraj, 2013; Wright & Ellis, 2000; Wright et al., 2014). All of the above are relevant dimensions in anti-immigrant prejudice formation.

The present study aims to identify which contextual variables are predictive of the prejudice shown by native-born residents across five districts in Seville, the largest city in southern Spain. The decision to limit the research to the local context and to the intra-urban variation of immigrant population concentration in different districts is because these areas are where we observe more direct social interaction among the different ethnic groups. In addition, this is of particular interest when implementing management measures aimed at overturning prejudices (Nelson & Dunn, 2017).

Method

Study Context

Seville is the capital of Andalusia, the southernmost region of Spain and Europe which, together with Sicily and the Greek islands, constitutes Europe's southern border for seaborne migration. The foreign-born population in Andalusia represents 9.16%, with the Moroccan community being the largest immigrant population living in the region (OPAM, 2017). Moroccans usually move there to overcome the lack of employment opportunities and social inequalities in their home country. However, given the history between Spain and Morocco, the Andalusian population often labels these immigrants with the pejorative term 'los moros' [the Moors] (Flesler, 2008). Up against a Christian majority, this category refers to persons of mixed Arab and Berber descent who settled in the Iberian Peninsula during the Middle Ages and were later expelled following the Spanish Reconquest (García-Sánchez, 2014). This social imaginary contributes to the existence of a segmented labour market where Moroccans work in the most precarious positions in terms of harsh working conditions, instability

and low salaries (e.g., intensive agriculture, construction, domestic services). Such conditions usually see them living in segregated rural areas or marginalized urban neighbourhoods with limited access to community resources, resulting in poor health and well-being (Hernández-Plaza, García-Ramírez, Camacho, & Paloma, 2010). In response to this, Moroccan immigrants tend to draw strength from their religion, culture and traditions as well as from actively participating in community-based organizations that serve as settings of psycho-social protection, helping them to cope with the situations of injustice that prevail in challenging receiving contexts (Taurini, Paloma, García-Ramírez, Marzana, & Marta, 2017). In the case of Seville, attitudes towards the Moroccan population have never resulted in major racist incidents, partly thanks to the efforts of some community-based organizations operating in the city. In fact, there are several organizations made up of immigrants and local pro-immigrant people – for example, Fundación Sevilla Acoge, APDHA Sevilla, CODENAF – working together to create a convivial environment that empowers immigrants and reduces tensions between different ethnic groups, helping newcomers to meet initial requirements and developing reception awareness among local community members (Paloma, García-Ramírez, de la Mata, & Amal, 2010). However, a main point of contention, which also extends to other Spanish cities, has been the City Council's rejection (since 2004) of plans to build a mosque in the city (Astor, 2010; Castaño-Madroñal & Periañez-Bolaño, 2012). Moreover, Moroccan immigrants – much like many economic migrants – are met with an implicit reluctance to allow them access to rented housing and property-buying opportunities in some city neighbourhoods and districts (Iglesias-Pascual, in press).

Specifically, Seville was home to a foreign-born population of 1.5% in 2002, double the figure for two years prior, in 2000, and doubling the percentage figure again in 2005 (2.9%). There was a further substantial increase in 2008 when this figure

reached 4.2%, representing a foreign population increase of 67.3% on 2005. Despite this rapid growth over a short period of time, the figures for Seville can, in general terms, be considered moderate, especially when compared with major Spanish cities like Madrid, Barcelona, Valencia and Malaga (Iglesias-Pascual, 2017b). This limited foreign presence is most likely related to the city's low economic dynamism compared with other major Spanish cities, as a result of few jobs in the industrial sector and excessive labour dependence on the public administration (Ayuntamiento de Sevilla, 2015; Huete-García & Muñoz-Moreno, 2011). As an example of this low economic dynamism, Seville is home to seven of the fifteen poorest neighbourhoods in Spain (INE, 2017). These spaces of social vulnerability are concentrated in very specific points of the city which, to a large extent, correspond to immigrant-heavy districts.

In the specific case of the Moroccan population in Seville, it is important to highlight that this was the city's largest national community in the first decade of the twenty-first century. While in 2002 Moroccans represented 0.21% of the city's population, their presence almost doubled in 2005, reaching 0.43% of the city's population in 2008 and 10% of all foreigners. These data show the Moroccan population to be the main immigrant group in Seville, an aspect that was made particularly visible by the general public in the time period under study. In view of these data, 2008 represents the start of the largest arrival of immigrants to the city, and for this reason we considered it the best moment to undertake the aim of this study. Thus, we see Seville as an ideal setting in which to study how anti-immigrant prejudice begins to take shape with the start of foreign arrival at a local level.

Procedure

Given that the research takes in both social and territorial variables, the methodological approach encompasses a dual body of measures and analysis strategies which are described below.

Social attitudes of the receiving population.

First, we used the ArcGIS geographic information system to select the districts where we would conduct the survey. The indicators used for configuring the territorial units of analysis were: (a) number of Moroccan students enrolled at each of the non-higher education institutions; (b) number of non-governmental organizations dedicated to helping the immigrant population; (c) number of religious centres (i.e., mosques) registered in each district; (d) number of ethnic businesses run by and for Moroccan immigrants; (e) number of healthcare services per centre whose users are Moroccan immigrants; and (f) number of immigrants registered in the census for each Seville district. Based on this information, five districts in Seville were chosen, ensuring representativeness of diversity for the city's existing receiving settings. Specifically, two districts were selected that have the highest presence of economic and Moroccan migrants in the city (District 2 'Macarena' and District 4 'Cerro-Amate'); a further two districts where both groups are under-represented (District 5 'Sur' and District 6 'Triana'); and lastly District 10, La Palmera-Bellavista, with an overall low presence of economic migrants but the highest percentage of Moroccans in the city for 2008.

Second, we collected on average twenty-five questionnaires from the receiving population residents per district using a non-random sampling procedure. Participation was voluntary and participant anonymity was guaranteed. We used the direct mail technique. Each envelope contained a covering letter, the questionnaire to be filled in, a postage-paid envelope to return the questionnaire, and a ticket for a draw to win a trip to Paris. Given the low response rate (16%), this was complemented by face-to-face

interviews until reaching the required number. Two Spanish native-born survey takers took part in the process; they were previously trained by the research group to select participants of both genders and across different age groups in the districts' public spaces. They gave the self-administered questionnaire to the participants in order to collect their sociodemographic information (e.g., sex, age, level of education, employment status) and to complete the Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale developed by Pettigrew and Meertens (1995) and translated into Spanish by Rueda and Navas (1996). This questionnaire comprises 12 items with four response options (1=*strongly disagree* to 4=*strongly agree*), and reported an adequate level of reliability ($\alpha=0.83$). Some items include "Politicians care more about immigrants than they do the Spanish"; "If a daughter of mine had a child with a Moroccan, I would be very bothered if my grandchild physically resembled him"; "I would not mind it if my boss was a Moroccan immigrant"; and "Moroccans have jobs that the Spanish should have". We took into account an average score of between 1 and 4 points for our analyses. The total sample comprised 120 individuals aged between 18 and 83 years ($M=37.3$; $S=13.9$). Women accounted for 50.8% of the sample and 63.6% were in work at the time of survey. As for level of education, 1.7% of the sample had no education, 13.3% were educated to primary level, 30.8% to secondary level, and the remaining 54.2% had completed higher education studies.

Contextual variables in the settlement location.

Below we describe the three contextual variables measured for the purpose of this study.

Out-group size. We measured this variable by using the percentages of the Moroccan population and economic migrants in general that reside in each chosen district. We considered it inappropriate to analyze prejudice towards Moroccans without

taking into account the rest of the immigrant population, especially those who came to Seville for economic reasons and who experience the most rejection from the receiving population. In this study, we consulted reports from the Spanish Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (Cea D'Ancona & Vallés, 2015) and identified economic migrants as coming from South America, Central America and the Caribbean, Africa, Asia, and those from Russia, Ukraine, Romania, Poland and Bulgaria.

Demographic change in settlement locations. We measured this variable by studying the growth across the city's districts between 2005 and 2008 (the three years leading up to the time of study) in relation to both the Moroccan population and economic migrants in general. We chose to measure demographic change as of 2005 because this was the year that saw the start of the migrant influx into Seville, which reached its peak in 2008.

Territorial distribution and concentration of the immigrant population. We used the Location Quotient (LQ; Brown & Chung, 2006) applied at the census-tract level to analyze the territorial concentration of the Moroccan population at an intra-urban level.

$$LQ = \frac{(X_i/T_i)}{(X/T)}$$

The LQ allows us to compare the percentage of foreign-born individuals of X nationality relative to the T population of a particular i section with the percentage that shares the same nationality across the city as a whole. This indicator makes it possible to assess the over-representation of the Moroccan population across the city's different census tracts, and has been used successfully in the study of several cities (Bayona & López-Gay, 2011; Iglesias-Pascual, 2017b; Wright, Ellis, & Parks, 2005). For interpreting this indicator, we considered five categories that correspond to different degrees of immigrant territorial representation (<0.85; 0.85-1.2; 1.2-2; 2-4; >4). In this

study, values higher than 2 were deemed indicative of locations with a significant over-representation of the Moroccan population (see Figure 1).

We took an exploratory approach to the data in this study by analyzing descriptive statistics and effect size indicators that allow us to empirically link the variables under consideration (Kelley & Preacher, 2012). In order to quantify the extent and strength of the established relationship between contextual variables and the degree of prejudice shown by the receiving population, we used both the Pearson correlation coefficient (r) and the estimated coefficient of determination (R^2) as effect size measures. To facilitate the interpretation of results, we chose to classify the obtained effect size values as ‘small’ ($R^2 \leq .25$), ‘moderate’ ($.25 < R^2 \leq .50$), and ‘large’ ($R^2 > .50$).

Results

The descriptive data for the variables considered in this study are shown in Table 1, and the effect size values that link the contextual variables with the prejudice shown by the receiving population are shown in Table 2. Thus, a salient finding is that the greater the growth of the Moroccan population and of economic migrants in terms of residence in the last three years, the greater the degree of prejudice shown by their local counterparts (‘large’ effect size, $R^2 = .66$ and $.52$, respectively). Furthermore, the presence of census tracts with high location quotient values, which reveal the areas with the highest concentration of Moroccans, is linked to a greater degree of prejudice among the receiving population for this district (‘moderate’ effect size, $R^2 = .26$). Lastly, the percentage of the Moroccan population and the immigrant population in general residing in the territorial area yields less explanatory capacity about the degree of prejudice shown by the receiving population (‘small’ effect size, $R^2 = .00$ and $.17$, respectively).

Discussion

Our results suggest that rapid immigrant population growth (Moroccans and economic migrants in general) as well as territorial concentration play a key role when it comes to understanding the prejudice exhibited by the receiving society's dominant group. However, the size of this population in certain geographical areas within the city seems to only be tenuously linked to the degree of prejudice shown by the resident receiving population in these areas.

The fact that the greatest impact on social attitudes towards the Moroccan population in Seville is associated with population increase in a short space of time, which encompasses Moroccans as well as other nationalities linked to economic migration, empirically supports the proposed approach from a 'salience of change' hypothesis perspective. Thus, the rapid growth in the foreign-born population within a short timeframe does not seem to be time enough for the new conditions surrounding inter-ethnic coexistence to become internalized, thereby impacting on emerging prejudices. Furthermore, the territorial concentration level for the immigrant population in very specific neighbourhoods appears to be linked to the degree of prejudice shown by the receiving society. This has already been shown at a municipal level in the south of Spain, where the concentration of a high percentage of immigrants in a particular territorial area encouraged prejudice and discriminatory conduct by the receiving population (Herranz de Rafael, 2008). Thus, these high concentrations are associated with a social discourse that labels these sectors as undesirable areas in which to live owing to the immigrant presence, a higher crime rate, and a greater perceived competition for social and economic resources (Iglesias-Pascual, 2016, 2017a; Semyonov, Rajzman, & Gorodzeisky, 2008). Because this study reveals immigrant territorial concentration to be a greater predictor of prejudice by the receiving society than the percentage or size of the immigrant population at a local level, we can consider

and apply this new indicator to those studies grouped under group threat theory. At the same time, our study, which emphasizes the importance of the relationship between territorial concentration and prejudice, points to a notable gap in the literature when analyzing the social effects of immigrant arrival and settlement patterns in the city, that is, it reaffirms the relationship between the geographic scale and social magnitude of the effects of migration (Smith, 2018). We can therefore draw the conclusion that the territorial concentration of the immigrant population and the salience of change hypothesis have an important role to play at the beginning of a migrant influx and, as such, are aspects worth taking into account in future studies to explain the emergence of anti-immigrant prejudice.

However, the attitudes observed in sectors like District 6, where the small percentage of Moroccans renders their presence purely testimonial, cannot be explained by the demographic changes experienced or by territorial concentration, as would be the case of districts 2 and 4. That is to say, our study suggests that prejudice is diffused through other districts of the city, regardless of the district where anti-immigrant prejudice begins because of the contextual variables considered (i.e., the rapid growth in the foreign-born population and their concentration in space). This aspect, which has also been discussed in other research studies conducted at other geographic scales (Quillian, 1996; Riek, Mania, & Gaertner, 2006), can only be understood by taking into account the intersubjective social impact generated by the occurrence of high concentrations of Moroccans and other nationalities in specific areas of the city (Iglesias-Pascual, 2016; 2017a). As such, the uncertainty brought about by demographic change in certain geographical areas of the city determines feelings towards the Moroccan population, not only in specific places where this change occurs but also in other districts across the city. Thus, it is clear that immigrant territorial concentration,

albeit sporadic in the territory, creates a social imaginary reflected in the shaping of attitudes towards the Moroccan population characterized by increased prejudice, including those neighbourhoods where their presence is merely symbolic. Moreover, and as highlighted by Bader and Krysan (2015), the social intersubjectivity built around immigration and the territories where immigrants reside play an important role in understanding how processes of socioterritorial fragmentation are maintained. In other words, anti-immigrant prejudice is what drives places to be treated as undesirable and is crucial for understanding the territorial stigmatization of neighbourhoods where immigrants, due to their territorial concentration, reach greater social visibility (Iglesias-Pascual, 2017b; Wacquant, Slater, & Pereira, 2014).

Guidelines for Diversity Management

Based on these results and the link between the geographic scale and social effects of migration, it is possible to develop guidelines for good diversity management in the urban context to ensure social and residence-based equality in receiving locations for migration flow. First, measures need to be implemented that have an impact on dismantling the anti-immigrant prejudices becoming widespread in the city's social imaginary. Strategies that, following the guidelines of research coming under contact theory, promote daily and social contact at a neighbourhood level. From this perspective, there is a clear need for local environments that provide leisure areas enabling intercultural coexistence, such as public parks, playgrounds and family-friendly spaces for free-time activities (Schaeffer, 2013). Additionally, it is necessary to launch activities that promote awareness and establish continuous, meaningful, and deliberate intercultural exchanges within grassroots social organizations, and to develop an institutional message that promotes kindness and harmonious co-existence among cultures (García-Ramírez, de la Mata, Paloma, & Hernández-Plaza, 2011; Valentine,

2010). The target population is likely to be the one that shows the highest level of anti-immigrant prejudice (i.e., unemployed individuals, those with temporary or precarious contracts, a low level of education, and a conservative ideological stance; Martín-Artiles & Meardi, 2013). For this endeavour to succeed, the mass media needs to adopt a role of mutual understanding and responsibility when it comes to sharing information with the general public. Second, there is the need to implement public housing policy that plans for an even distribution of socially excluded ethnic minorities across the city's different districts, and a team that acts as a mediator in the property market, helping immigrants find housing in order to avoid concentrations of out-groups in particular areas of the city. Third, there is a demand for policies that address social equality, poverty reduction, and strengthening social protection services in the urban context. Community-based resources available in the city should be recognized as having professionals that not only possess the skills and knowledge to be effective in interacting with immigrants, but who also have the ability to bring about the necessary organizational changes that give this population access to quality community services (García-Ramírez, Hernández-Plaza, Albar, Luque-Ribelles, & Suarez-Balcazar, 2012). Lastly, and in a cross-sectional manner, intervention measures should not be restricted to districts with the highest share of immigrants (Iglesias-Pascual, 2017b). For these measures to be effective, interventions at a district level should alternate with municipal-wide ones. As we have seen, although social attitudes towards immigrant communities start out at a neighbourhood level, they end up spreading throughout the entire municipal territory, expressed as a widespread territorial stigma around the neighbourhoods where the immigrant population resides. Thus, the only way to mitigate this process of rejection and stop it from extending to other neighbourhoods, resulting in a property market blocked off to economic migrants, is to approach both levels at the

same time. Cutting off access to the housing market translates into higher immigration concentration in the medium term, which results in processes of territorial stigmatization and residential segregation for those neighbourhoods where, owing to low prices, an informal economy, the rental of rooms, and the poor state of properties, immigrants can gain access. These are all aspects that end up hampering the well-being of immigrants and social cohesion in the host society (Paloma, García-Ramírez, & Camacho, 2014).

Limitations and Future Directions

This study does have some limitations. First, its cross-sectional nature and the type of statistical analysis carried out prevent us from determining the direction of causality for the variables under study. Despite this, we have succeeded in identifying a bidirectional relationship, where the contextual variables have an impact on prejudice but where social attitudes expressed through the social imaginary also likely play a role in the territorial characterization of cities. Second, the study does not cover the reality of all the city's districts and is based on a small number of questionnaires. However, this research does represent an introduction to the effect and importance that contextual variables, specifically the rapid growth of the immigrant population and their territorial concentration, have on the emergence of anti-immigrant attitudes during the early stage of a migrant influx to a given location. Starting from this premise, it would be interesting to develop analyses that go beyond the simple use of quantitative indices of segregation and the spatial population distribution (e.g., Yao, Wong, Bailey, & Minton, 2018). An example would be a study that allows us to learn more about the relationship between the levels of residential segregation, neighbourhood stigma, and the host society's growing attitudes towards immigration by means of more advanced statistical analyses such as hierarchical linear modeling. Similarly, it would be interesting to

consider several other contextual variables, for example, the local economy, culture, the location's history, and local politics in order to understand how anti-immigrant prejudice takes shape. We also hope to use future studies to further explore the relationship between immigrant territorial concentration and the host society's attitudes at other territorial levels (municipal, regional and national), in other societies with a stronger tradition of receiving immigrants, and the possible variations in these attitudes towards different nationalities.

As has been suggested, the exponential influx of migrants to Seville over a short period of time has translated into a high territorial concentration of immigrants in certain districts across the city. Social attitudes expressed by the receiving population linked to these settling processes highlight the need to plan a diversity management policy in the urban context that covers both territorial and social variables, thus ensuring well-being and social cohesion in receiving societies.

References

- Alba, R.D. & Logan, J. R. (1993). Minority proximity to whites in suburbs: An individual level analysis of segregation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98, 1388-1427.
- Alba, R. D., Logan, J. R., Stults, B. J., Marzan, G., & Zhang, W. Q. (1999). Immigrant groups in the suburbs: A reexamination of suburbanization and spatial assimilation. *American Sociological Review*, 64, 446-460.
- Amin, A. (2002). Ethnicity and the multicultural city: Living with diversity. *Environment and Planning A*, 34, 959–980.
- Astor, A. (2010). Mezquita no: The origins of mosque opposition in Spain. *GRITIM-UPF Working Paper Series*, 3.
- Ayuntamiento de Sevilla (2015). *Anuario Estadístico de la Ciudad de Sevilla*. Sevilla: The author.
- Bader, M. & Krysan, M. (2015). Community attraction and avoidance in Chicago: What's race got to do with it? *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 660 (1), 261-281.
- Bayona, J. & López-Gay, A. (2011). Concentración, segregación y movilidad residencial de los extranjeros en Barcelona. *Documents d'Anàlisi Geogràfica*, 57(3), 381-412.
- Blalock, H. M. (1957). Percent non-White and discrimination in the South. *American Sociological Review*, 22, 667–82.
- Blalock, H. M. (1967). *Toward a Theory of Minority-Group Relations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Bobo, L. (1983). White's opposition to busing: Symbolic racism or realistic group conflict? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(6),196-1210.

- Bolt, G. & Van Kempen, R. (2010). Ethnic segregation and residential mobility: Relocations of minority ethnic groups in the Netherlands. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(2), 333-354. doi: 10.1080/1369183090338745.1
- Brown, L. & Chung, S.Y. (2006). Spatial segregation, segregation indexes and the geographical perspective. *Population, Space and Place*, 12, 125-143.
- Castaño-Madroñal, A. & Periañez-Bolaño, I. (2012). Digital press discourses and representations on immigration, islam and immigrant students in Andalusia. Coimbra, Portugal: *TOLERACE Project Working Papers*. Retrieved from https://www.ces.uc.pt/ces/proyectos/tolerace/media/WP5/WorkingPapers%205_Spain-Andalusia.pdf
- Cea D'Ancona, M. A., & Vallés, M. S. (2015). *Evolución del racismo y la xenofobia y otras formas conexas de intolerancia en España [Informe Encuesta 2014]*. Madrid: OBERAXE, Ministerio de Trabajo e Inmigración.
- Coenders, M. (2001). *Nationalistic attitudes and ethnic exclusionism in a comparative perspective: An empirical study of attitudes toward the country and ethnic immigrants in 22 countries*. Nijmegen: Radboud University Nijmegen.
- Coenders, M., Lubbers, M., & Scheepers, P. (Eds.) (2005). *Majority populations' attitudes towards migrants and minorities*. Vienna: European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia.
- DeWaard, J. (2015). Beyond group-threat: Temporal dynamics of international migration and linkages to anti-foreigner sentiment. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41(7), 1041-1067.
- Dinesen, P.T, & Sønderskov, K.M. (2015). Ethnic diversity and social trust: Evidence from the micro-context. *American Sociological Review*, 80(3), 550-573.

- Dixon, J. C. (2006). The ties that bind and those that don't: Towards reconciling group threat and contact theories of prejudice. *Social Forces*, 84, 2179–204.
- Finch, B.K., & Vega, W.A. (2003). Acculturation stress, social support, and self-rated health among Latinos in California. *Journal of Immigrant Health*, 5(3), 109-117.
- Finney, N., & Jivraj, S. (2013). Ethnic group population change and neighbourhood belonging. *Urban Studies*, 50(16), 3323–3341.
- Flesler, D. (2008). *The return of the Moor: Spanish responses to contemporary Moroccan immigration*. West Lafayette: IN: Purdue University Press.
- García-Ramírez, M., de la Mata, M. L., Paloma, V., & Hernández-Plaza, S. (2011). A liberation psychology approach to acculturative integration of migrant populations. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 47, 86-97.
- García-Ramírez, M., Hernández-Plaza, S., Albar, M. J., Luque-Ribelles, V., & Suarez-Balcazar, Y. (2012). Building healthcare stakeholder coalitions: A community psychology approach to user involvement for migrant populations. In D.Ingleby,A. Chiarenza, W. Devillé, and I. Kotsioni (Eds.), *Inequalities in health care for migrants and ethnic minorities* (pp. 188-204). Belgium: Garant.
- García-Sánchez, I.M. (2014). *Language and Muslim immigrant childhoods: The politics of belonging*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Gorodzeisky, A. & Semyonov, M. (2015). Not only competitive threat but also racial prejudice: Sources of anti-immigrant attitudes in European societies. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 28, (3/1),331–354.
- Gruner, S. (2010). The others don't want... small-scale segregation: Hegemonic public discourses and racial boundaries in German neighbourhoods. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(2), 275–292.

- Hernández-Plaza, S., García-Ramírez, M., Camacho, C., & Paloma, V. (2010). New settlement and wellbeing in oppressive contexts: A liberation psychology approach. In S.C. Carr (Ed.), *The psychology of Global Mobility* (pp. 235-256). New York: Springer.
- Herranz de Rafael, G. (2008). Xenofobia: Un estudio comparativo en barrios y municipios almerienses. *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 121, 107-132.
- Hjerm, M. (2007). Do numbers really count? Group threat theory revisited. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33, 1253–1276.
- Hjerm, M. (2009). Anti-immigrant attitudes and cross-municipal variation in the proportion of immigrants. *Acta Sociologica*, 52(1), 47-62.
- Holloway, S., Wright, R., & Ellis, M. (2011). The racially fragmented city? Neighborhood racial segregation and diversity jointly considered. *The Professional Geographer*, 64, 63–82.
- Hopkins, D. J. (2009). The diversity discount: When increasing ethnic and racial diversity prevents tax increases. *Journal of Politics*, 71(1), 160–77.
- Hopkins, D. J. (2010). Politicized places: Explaining where and when immigrants provoke local opposition. *American Political Science Review*, 104(1), 40–60.
- Huete-García, M.A., & Muñoz-Moreno, R. (2011). Modelos de barrio y lógicas de localización de la población inmigrante: El caso de la ciudad de Sevilla. *Scripta Nova*, XV, 372.
- Huijts, T., Kraaykamp, G., & Scheepers, P. (2014). Ethnic diversity and informal intra- and interethnic contacts with neighbours in the Netherlands. *Acta Sociologica*, 57(1), 41–57.

- Iglesias-Pascual, R. (2016). Espacio inducido y territorialización del discurso. Determinando el impacto socio-territorial del imaginario social sobre la inmigración en el Área Metropolitana de Sevilla. *Documents d'Anàlisi Geogràfica*, 62(2), 299-325.
- Iglesias-Pascual, R. (2017a). Generadores y transversalidad del discurso sobre inmigración en el ámbito metropolitano de Sevilla. *EURE - Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Urbano Regionales*, 43(129), 93-114.
- Iglesias-Pascual, R. (2017b). Subjetividad socioespacial y gestión de la diversidad en las principales ciudades españolas: Lo que los índices de segregación no pueden reflejar. *Boletín de la Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles*, 75, 247-270.
- Iglesias-Pascual, R. (in press). Social discourse, housing search and residential segregation in Seville during earlier stages of economic migrant influx. *Housing Studies*.
- INE (2017). *Indicadores Urban Audit para ciudades*. Madrid: Instituto Nacional de Estadística. Retrieved from <http://www.ine.es/jaxiT3/Tabla.htm?t=10849>
- Johnston, R.J., Poulsen, M., & Forrest, J. (2009). Measuring ethnic residential segregation: Putting some more geography in. *Urban Geography*, 30(1), 91-109.
- Kaufmann, E.P. & Harris, G. (2015). White flight or positive contact? Local diversity and attitudes to immigration in Britain. *Comparative Political Studies*, 48(12), 563-1590.
- Kelley, K. & Preacher, K. J. (2012). On effect size. *Psychological Methods*, 17(2), 137-152.
- Laméris, J., Kraaykamp, G., Ruiter, S., & Tolsma, J. (2018). Size is in the eye of the beholder: How differences between neighbourhoods and individuals explain

- variation in estimation of ethnic our-group size in the neighbourhood. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 63, 80-94.
- Lubbers, M., Coenders, M., Scheepers, P. (2006). Objections to asylum seeker centers: Individual and contextual determinants of resistance to small and large centres in the Netherlands. *European Sociological Review*, 22,243–257.
- Nelson, J. & Dunn, K. (2016). Neoliberal anti-racism responding to ‘everywhere but different’ racism. *Progress in Human Geography*, 41(1), 26-43.
- Massey, D. S. (1985). Ethnic and residential segregation: A theoretical and empirical review. *Sociology and Social Research*, 69, 315-350.
- Massey, D.S., & Denton, N.A. (1993). *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Martín-Artiles, A. & Meardi, G. (2013). Actitudes hacia la inmigración y compromiso igualitario en Europa. *Política y Sociedad*, 50(2),629-656.
- McLaren, L. M. (2003). Anti-immigrant prejudice in Europe: Contact, threat perception, and preferences for the exclusion of immigrants. *Social Forces*, 81, 909–36.
- Newman, B.J., & Velez, Y. (2014). Group size versus change? Assessing Americans’ perception of local immigration. *Political Research Quarterly*, 67(2),293–303.
- OPAM (2017). *Boletín n° 27*. Sevilla: Observatorio Permanente Andaluz de las Migraciones, Junta de Andalucía.
- Paloma, V., García-Ramírez, M., de la Mata, M., & Amal (2010). Acculturative integration, self and citizenship construction: The experience of Amal-Andaluza, a grassroots organization of Moroccan women in Andalucía. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 34, 101-113.

- Paloma, V., García-Ramírez, M., & Camacho, C. (2014). Well-being and social justice among Moroccan migrants in southern Spain. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 54*(1/2), 1-11.
- Peterson, M. (2017). Living with difference in hyper-diverse areas: How important are encounters in semi-public spaces? *Social & Cultural Geography, 18*(8), 1067-1085. doi: 10.1080/14649365.2016.1210667
- Pettigrew, T. & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in Western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 25*, 57-75.
- Pettigrew, T. & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 751-783.
- Pettigrew, T., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2007). Who opposes immigration? Comparing German with North American findings. *Du Bois Review, 4*(1), 19-39.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R.G. (2006). *Immigrant America: A portrait. Third edition. Revised, Expanded, and Updated.* University of California Press.
- Pottie-Sherman, Y. & Wilkes, R. (2017). Does size really matter? On the relationship between immigrant group size and anti-immigrant prejudice. *International Migration Review, 51*, 218–250.
- Putnam, R. D. (2007). E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture. *Scandinavian Political Studies, 30*(2), 137-174.
- Quillian, L. (1995). Prejudice as a response to perceived group threat: Population composition and anti-immigrant and racial prejudice in Europe. *American Sociological Review, 60*, 586-611.
- Quillian, L. (1996). Group threat and regional change in attitudes toward African Americans. *American Journal of Sociology, 102*, 816–860.

- Quillian, L. (2006). New approaches to understanding racial prejudice and discrimination. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 32, 299-328.
- Riek, B.M., Mania, E. W., & Gaertner, S. M. (2006). Intergroup threat and outgroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 336–353.
- Rueda, J. F. & Navas, M. S. (1996). Hacia una evaluación de las nuevas formas del prejuicio racial: Las actitudes sutiles del racismo. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 11(2), 11-149.
- Rodon, T. & Franco-Guillén, N. (2014). Contact with immigrants in times of crisis: An exploration of the Catalan case. *Ethnicities*, 14(5),650-675.
- Rozin, P. & Royzman, E. B. (2001). Negativity bias, negativity dominance, and contagion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5(4), 296–320.
- Schaeffer, M. (2013). Inter-ethnic neighbourhood acquaintances of migrants and natives in Germany: On the brokering roles of inter-ethnic partners and children. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39(8),1219-1240.
- Scheepers, P., Gijsbert, M., & Coenders, M. (2002). Ethnic exclusionism in European countries. *European Sociological Review*, 18(1),1-18.
- Schlueter, E. (2012). The inter-ethnic friendships of immigrants with host-society members: Revisiting the role of ethnic residential segregation. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38(1), 77-91.
- Schlueter, E. & Scheepers, P. (2010). The relationship between outgroup size and anti-outgroup attitudes: A theoretical synthesis and empirical test of group threat and intergroup contact theory. *Social Science Research*, 39(2), 285-295.
- Schlüter, E., Ullrich, J., Glenz, A. & Schmidt, P. (2017). From segregation to intergroup contact and back: Using experiments and simulation to understand the

- bidirectional link. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2284.
- Schneider, S.L. (2008). Anti-immigrant attitudes in Europe. *European Sociological Review*, 24(1), 53-67.
- Segal, U., & Mayadas, N. (2005). Assessment of issues facing immigrant and refugee families. *Child Welfare*, 84, 563–583.
- Semyonov, M., Raijman, R., Yom-Tov, A., & Schmidt, P. (2004). Population size, perceived threat and exclusion: A multiple indicator analysis of attitudes toward foreigners in Germany. *Social Science Research*, 33, 681–701.
- Semyonov, M., Raijman, R., & Gorodzeisky, A. (2006). The rise of anti-foreigner sentiment in European societies, 1988–2000. *American Sociological Review*, 71, 426–449.
- Semyonov, M., Raijman, R., & Gorodzeisky, A. (2008). Foreigners' impact on European societies. Public views and perceptions in a cross-national comparative perspective. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 49, 5–29. doi: 10.1177/0020715207088585
- Sennett, R. (2011). *The foreigner*. London: Notting Hill editions.
- Smith, D. P. (2018). Population geography II: The r/age of migration. *Progress in Human Geography*, 1-10. doi: 10.1177/0309132518760098
- Søholt, S. & Lynnebakke, B. (2015). Do immigrants' preferences for neighbourhood qualities contribute to segregation? The case of Oslo. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41(14), 2314-2335.
- Sturgis P., Brunton-Smith, I., Kuha, J., & Jackson, J. (2014). Ethnic diversity, segregation and the social cohesion of neighbourhoods in London. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37(8), 1-21.

- Schwartz, S. J., Unger, J. B., Zamboanga, B. L., & Szapocznik, J. (2010). Rethinking the concept of acculturation: Implications for theory and research. *American Psychologist, 65*(4), 237-251.
- Skeldon, R. (2013). Global migration: Demographic aspects and its relevance for development. New York: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Population Division. *Technical Paper, 6*. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/publications/technicalpapers/docs/EGM.Skeldon_17.12.2013.pdf
- Taurini, E., Paloma, V., García-Ramírez, M., Marzana, D., & Marta, E. (2017). Effects of the community engagement of migrants on their well-being: The case of Moroccan leaders in southern Spain. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community, 45* (1), 32-43.
- United Nations (2001). *Replacement migration: Is it a solution to declining and ageing populations?* New York: Population Division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs at the United Nations Secretariat.
- Valentine, G. (2008). Living with difference: Reflections on geographies of encounter. *Progress in Human Geography, 32*, 323–338.
- Valentine, G. (2010). Prejudice: Rethinking geographies of oppression. *Social & Cultural Geography, 11*(6), 519-537. doi: 10.1080/14649365.2010.497849
- Valentine, G. (2013). Living with difference: Proximity and encounter in urban life. *Geography, 98*, 4–9.
- Van Heerden, S., & Ruedin, D. (2017). How attitudes towards immigrants are shaped by residential context: The role of ethnic diversity dynamics and immigrant visibility. *Urban Studies*. doi: 10.1177/00420980 17732692.

- Wacquant L., Slater, T., & Pereira, V. B. (2014). Territorial stigmatization in action. *Environment and Planning A*, 46(6), 1270-1280.
- Wilson H.F. (2011). Passing propinquities in the multicultural city: The everyday encounters of bus passengering. *Environment and Planning A*, 43(3), 634-649.
- Wilson H.F. (2013). Learning to think differently: Diversity training and the ‘good encounter’. *Geoforum*, 45,73–82.
- Wilson H.F. (2017). On geography and encounter: Bodies, borders, and difference. *Progress in Human Geography*, 41(4), 451–471.
- Wodtke, G., Harding, D.J., & Elwert, F. (2011). Neighborhood effects in temporal perspective. *American Sociological Review*, 76(5), 713-736.
- Wright, R. & Ellis, M. (2000). Race, region and the territorial politics of immigration in the US. *Population, Space and Place*, 6, 197–211.
- Wright, R., Ellis, M., & Parks, V. (2005). Replacing whiteness in spatial assimilation research. *City and Community*, 4(2), 111–35.
- Wright, R., Ellis, M., Holloway, S., & Wong, S. (2014). Patterns of racial diversity and segregation in the United States: 1990–2010. *The Professional Geographer*, 66(2), 173-182.
- Yao, J., Wong, D. W., Bailey, N., & Minton, J. (2018). Spatial segregation measures: A methodological review. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*. doi:10.1111/tesg.12305

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Variables Included in the Study (n=120)

	District 10	District 5	District 6	District 2	District 4
Degree of prejudice (1-4)	1.84 (<i>S</i> =.58)	1.93 (<i>S</i> =.61)	2.10 (<i>S</i> =.55)	2.11 (<i>S</i> =.60)	2.44 (<i>S</i> =.57)
% Moroccan immigrants (0-100)	0.92	0.42	0.23	0.78	0.81
% Economic migrants (0-100)	3.05	2.48	3.07	7.60	4.82
Growth of Moroccan immigrants 2005-2008 (0-100)	-0.06	0.13	0.06	0.01	0.25
Growth of economic migrants 2005-2008 (0-100)	0.57	1.22	0.97	2.55	2.3
% Census tracts with high LQ (>2) (0-100)	17	15	0	35	35

Note. Compiled by authors based on data from their own survey and the Continuous Register 2005 and 2008 provided by the Spanish Statistical Office (INE). LQ: Location quotient. The names of the variables are followed by the range of possible values in brackets.

Table 2

Effect Size Values between Contextual Variables and Prejudice against Moroccan Immigrants in Five Districts of Seville, Spain

	Degree of prejudice
% Moroccan immigrants	$r=.07$ ($R^2=.00$)
% Economic migrants	$r=.41$ ($R^2=.17$)
Growth of Moroccan immigrants 2005-2008	$r=.81$ ($R^2=.66$)
Growth of economic migrants 2005-2008	$r=.72$ ($R^2=.52$)
% Census tracts with high LQ (>2)	$r=.51$ ($R^2=.26$)

Note. LQ: Location quotient; r: Pearson r; R^2 : Coefficient of determination.

Figure 1. Location quotient of the Moroccan population located in the city of Seville, Spain, for 2008. Compiled by authors based on data from the Spanish Statistical Office (INE).

