**Ethnic Diversity and Social Cohesion: State-of-the-Art.** Recent waves of immigration have changed the demographic face of Western societies. According to official data from the European Commission, immigrants and their descendants now constitute between 20% - 30% of the population in countries such as France, Britain, and Germany (Eurostat 2015). Moreover, a substantial share of individuals with migration background hails from outside the European Union, a fact which speaks to the linguistic, political, and religious diversity of contemporary multiethnic communities. While it is widely acknowledged that immigration is vital to continued economic growth, job creation and innovation (Page 2008; Putnam 2007), these demographic shifts have also fueled public anxieties and academic debate across the social sciences about the potentially detrimental consequences of diversity for host societies.

One influential strand of scholarship has linked ethno-racial diversity to undesirable collec- tive outcomes such as low levels of trust, civic engagement, social capital and support for the welfare state (for recent reviews, see Dinesen and Sønderskov 2018; Schaeffer 2016; van der Meer and Tolsma 2014; Stichnoth and Van der Straeten 2013). In two seminal studies, Alesina and La Ferrara (2000, 2002) find that trust and community participation are lower in racially- heterogeneous communities in the United States. While these results were initially interpreted to reflect preferences against inter-racial contact, an even more alarming assessment was put forward by Putnam (2007, 137), who argued that racial diversity contributes to a general sense of anomie and social isolation: “trust (even of one’s own race) is lower, altruism and community cooperation rarer, friends fewer.” These provocative findings triggered a veritable cascade of studies examining the consequences of ethnic diversity across a large number of countries and employing a variety of data sources. To illustrate this breadth of this literature, a recent meta-analysis by Schaeffer (2016) counts over 170 articles testing the hypothesis that diversity erodes social cohesion.

This vast body of research is overwhelmingly characterized by two methodological choices. First, many studies employ participant samples comprised completely or predominantly of autochthonous (i.e. “native”) respondents (e.g. Tolsma and van der Meer 2017; Dinesen and Sønderskov 2015; Laurence and Bentley 2015; Levels et al. 2015; Gundelach and Traunmüller 2014; Dahlberg et al. 2012; Sturgis et al. 2011; Laurence 2009; Letki 2008). Secondly, existing work relies almost exclusively upon indices of heterogeneity to measure diversity. Although these indices ostensibly capture ethnic “fractionalization,” or the probability that two randomly chosen individuals from a given population will belong to different ethnic groups (Fearon 2003), in practice they are empirically indistinguishable from the overall percentage of foreigners living within a given area (Kustov and Pardelli 2018; Abascal and Baldassarri 2015; Koopmans and Schaeffer 2015; Schaeffer 2013).

These methodological choices have important implications for interpreting the accumulated evidence on the relationship between diversity and social cohesion. More specifically, by adopting heterogeneity indices and relying upon mostly native samples, scholars are in effect asking questions about natives’ reactions to the growing presence of immigrants (Schönwälder et al. 2016). Implicitly or explicitly, the focus of existing research largely revolves around whether natives are willing to extend trust and cooperation to individuals of migration background or, alternatively, whether diversity causes anomie and a general weakening of solidarity amongst the majority population.

In contrast, prevailing approaches offer only limited theoretical and empirical insight into how societies can “make diversity work” given rising levels of ethnic heterogeneity. The critical question here is not *whether* diversity erodes social cohesion for natives (on average), but rather *why do some diverse areas exhibit higher levels of trust and cooperation than others*? To date however, progress on this latter question has been hampered by insufficient attention to…[a bunch of issues, including]…the behavior of non-natives residing in multiethnic settings.

…[other issues described here]

**Minority contributions to social cohesion**. In principle, the aforementioned mechanisms [group threat and intergroup contact] are “color-blind:” that is, they are theorized to affect the behavior of all individuals regardless of ethnic background (Koopmans and Schaeffer 2016). In practice, however, these mechanisms have been invoked primarily to explain the reactions of the native majority to the growing presence of ethnic minorities (for similar critiques, see Schönwälder et al. 2016; Koopmans and Veit 2014b). In contrast, only a handful of studies have focused on minorities’ interactions with other residents in diverse environments (e.g. Winter and Zhang 2018; Schönwälder et al. 2016; Koopmans and Schaeffer 2016; Koopmans and Veit 2014b; Bakker and Dekker 2012; Bécares et al. 2011; Vervoort et al. 2010; Wimmer 2004). Addressing this oversight is important because a substantial share of interactions in multiethnic settings are likely to involve encounters initiated by minorities. Minorities’ social relations therefore constitute a potentially crucial piece to the puzzle of why social cohesion varies across diverse neighborhoods.

Two points here deserve particular consideration. First, the mechanisms mentioned above may not be “color-blind” to the extent that natives and minorities interact on unequal terms. More specifically, although numerous studies have amply documented the extent of native discrimination against immigrants (Auspurg et al. 2019; Zschirnt and Ruedin 2016), it seems unlikely that minorities will similarly discriminate against natives. For example, Winter and Zhang (2018) record the responses of natives and minorities to norm violations committed by individuals with and without migration background. They find an asymmetric pattern of social sanctioning whereby almost 20% of natives sanction minority norm breakers, whereas only 4% of minorities sanction natives. More broadly, such patterns may reflect prevailing social hierarchies between the native majority and members of subordinate groups (Sidanius and Pratto 1999; Hagendoorn 1995) which are often ignored in the diversity literature.

Secondly, the mechanisms described above are often constructed around a simple in-group / out-group paradigm demarcating the symbolic boundary separating natives and “foreigners.” However, this binary categorization scheme may not accurately capture the experience of mi- norities residing in diverse environments. Instead, the ethnic landscape facing minorities may well be more complex as individuals must often navigate relations with not one, but two sets of out-groups: namely, natives and minority non-coethnics (Bakker and Dekker 2012; Vervoort et al. 2010). As Abascal (2015) notes, this shift from a binary to a multi-group configuration opens up the possibility of cross-group alliances, thereby producing a qualitative change in so- cial relations. For instance, minorities may “band together” in reaction to collective experiences of discrimination or out of a shared sense of comfort in “otherness” (Schönwälder et al. 2016). Conversely, more-established immigrants may make common cause with natives in seeking to differentiate themselves from newer arrivals (Wimmer 2004).

Taken together, these considerations suggest that minorities and natives respond to diversity in qualitatively different ways. This recognition calls for systematic investigation into the full menu of social relations in multiethnic settings (illustrated in Fig. 2). Specifically, prevailing approaches to date have focused on natives’ relations with (i) minorities and (ii) fellow natives (Fig. 2a). In contrast, we know relatively little about interactions (iii) within minority groups, (iv) between minority groups, and (v) from minorities to natives (Fig. 2b). By taking account of these “missing links,” we can move beyond the traditional in-group / out-group paradigm privileged by majority-centered approaches and develop a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of social relations in diverse settings.
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