BEHOLD: A SLIDEDECK

A subtitle, wow

John McClane & Kier Eagan

Department of something



Darks (Standard for UCPH)

Medium

Light



CONTENTS

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Methods
- 3. Data
- 4. Results
- **5.** Conclusion
- **6.** Appendix



The music experience is cancelled.



... With a gradient background



- Motivation:
- Research Question:
- Methods:
- Results:
- Heterogeneity Analysis:
- Conclusion

Very cool, much wow:

$$\hat{\beta} = (X'X)^{-1}X'y$$

123

123¹

¹Cool!



Introduction



Theoretical Background:

• You can cite things too. Wow!! Schelling (1971) proposed that neighborhoods may "tip" when minority share reaches a threshold

insert image over here



Methods



Identification Challenge

$$V_{i,j,t} = f(Z_{i,t}, X_{j,t}, \xi_{j,t}) + \sum_{k} g(Z_{i,t}, Z_{k,t}, D_{i,k}) + \delta E[V_{i,j,t+1}] + \varepsilon_{i,j,t}$$

Where:

- $f(\cdot)$: Utility from neighborhood amenities
- $g(\cdot)$: Utility from characteristics of each neighbor k at distance $D_{i,k}$
- Z_i : Observable household attributes
- X_i : Observable neighborhood attributes
- ξ_i : Unobservable neighborhood attributes
- $\varepsilon_{i,j,t}$: Idiosyncratic preferences

Key identification challenges:

- Unobserved neighborhood amenities
- Dynamic preferences (expectations of future changes)
- Selection effecus (who moves where is not random)



theme-color-comp.get()

Nearest neighbor research design

Innovative approach from Bayer et al. (2022):

Compare households within the same neighborhood who receive different-type neighbors. Why does this work? Consider two households:

- Household a: New different-type e' neighbor among their nearest (rank 1-3) neighbors
- Household b: New different-type e' neighbor slightly further away (rank 4-6)

Difference in moving propensity:

$$\begin{split} Y_a(e',k_{\text{nearest}}) - Y_b(e',k_{\text{near}}) &= (\mathbb{P}[e',k_{\text{nearest}}]) - \mathbb{P}[e',k_{\text{near}}])) \\ + (\xi_a B(e',k_{\text{nearest}}) - \xi_b B(e',k_{\text{near}})) \\ + (\rho_a - \rho_b) + \left(\omega_j - \omega_j\right) \leftrightarrow \\ &= \mathbb{P}[e',k_{\text{nearest}}]^* + \rho_a - \rho_b \end{split}$$

- **1.** $\mathbb{P}[e', k_{\text{nearest}}]) \mathbb{P}[e', k_{\text{near}}]) > 0$
- 2. $\xi_a B(e', k_{\rm nearest}) \xi_b B(e', k_{\rm near}) \approx 0$: (almost) no difference in future neighborhood quality expectation
- 3. $Y_a(e', k_{\text{nearest}}) Y_b(e', k_{\text{near}}) \perp \rho_a \rho_b$: For existing households, location of new neighbors are not related to idiosyncratic factors ρ .



- Treatment group: Households with new different-type neighbors among their 3 nearest neighbors
- Control group: Households with new different-type neighbors "just down the road" (ranks 4-6)

$$Y_{i,j,t} = \beta_1 I[e', k = n_{\text{nearest}}] + \beta_2 I[e', k = n_{\text{near}}] + \beta_3 I[e', k = n_{\text{close}}] + \gamma Z_{i,j,t} + \omega_{j,t} + \varepsilon_{i,j,t}$$

Parameter of interest:

$$\beta_1 - \beta_2$$

This design addresses key identification challenges by comparing households experiencing same neighborhood conditions but different micro-geography of new neighbors.



DATA



RESULTS



Conclusion



- 1. Native Danish households increase moving propensity by 1.6% when receiving non-Western neighbors
- 2. Non-Western households show no significant response to new native neighbors
- **3.** Heterogeneity by SES: Low-SES native households responding to low-SES non-Western neighbors show strongest effects (2.8%)
- **5.** Magnitude in Denmark (1.6%) more modest than in U.S. context (4-6%)



- Do native households respond to new Western neighbors?
- How much are native households willing to pay in premium to live in a more homogenous neighborhood?
 - Variation?
- Those who show Schelling behavior, where do they move to?



Thank you for your attention!

Questions?



REFERENCES

Bayer, P. *et al.* (2022) "Distinguishing Causes of Neighborhood Racial Change: A Nearest Neighbor Design," *Social Science Research Network* [Preprint]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3386/w30487.

Schelling, T.C. (1971) "Dynamic models of segregation," Journal of mathematical sociology, 1(2), pp. 143–186.



APPENDIX

