
SOCIO-SPATIAL SEGREGATION AND HUMAN MOBILITY: A REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

A PREPRINT

 **Yuan Liao***


Department of Space, Earth and Environment
Chalmers University of Technology
Gothenburg, Sweden
yuan.liao@chalmers.se

 **Jorge Gil**

Department of Architecture and Civil Engineering
Chalmers University of Technology
Gothenburg, Sweden
jorge.gil@chalmers.se

 **Sonia Yeh**

Department of Space, Earth and Environment
Chalmers University of Technology
Gothenburg, Sweden
sonia.yeh@chalmers.se

 **Rafael H. M. Pereira**

Institute for Applied Economic Research (Ipea) - Brazil
Data Science Division, Brazil
rafael.pereira@ipea.gov.br

 **Laura Alessandretti**

Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science
Technical University of Denmark
Lyngby, Denmark
lauale@dtu.dk

March 14, 2024

ABSTRACT

Social segregation, the spatial and social separation between individuals from different backgrounds, can affect sustainable urban development and social cohesion. The literature has traditionally focused on residential segregation, examining how individuals' residential locations are distributed differently across neighborhoods based on income, ethnicity, and education. However, this approach overlooks the complexity of spatial segregation because daily activities often extend far beyond residential areas. Over the past one to two decades, emerging mobility data sources have enabled a new understanding of socio-spatial segregation by considering daily activities such as work, school, shopping, and leisure visits. From traditional surveys to GPS trajectories, diverse data sources reveal that day-to-day movements can impact segregation by reducing or amplifying segregation levels obtained when considering residential aspects alone. This literature review focuses on three critical questions: (a) to what extent do individual mobility patterns contribute to segregation? (b) Which factors explain the role played by mobility in segregation? and (c) What insights are gained by incorporating extensive mobility data into segregation research? Our literature review contributes to an improved understanding of socio-spatial segregation at the individual level and offers actionable insights into reducing segregation and addressing research gaps in the field.

Keywords Spatial segregation · Social integration · Individual mobility · Transport · Activity space · Urban space

*Corresponding author. Also affiliated with Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science, Technical University of Denmark, Lyngby, Denmark.

1 Introduction

Social segregation refers to the spatial and social separation between individuals from different socioeconomic backgrounds. Understanding segregation holds significant importance in our increasingly urbanized planet. Sustainable urban development fosters diverse populations and promotes social cohesion by facilitating access to vital resources, public services [Joelsson and Ekman Ladru, 2022], educational [Zhang et al., 2022a], and employment opportunities [Silm and Ahas, 2014a] to all socioeconomic groups. However, segregated cities can lead to differentiated access to such services and opportunities, perpetuating disparities in economic, social, and health outcomes [Li et al., 2022a, Hu et al., 2022, Xu, 2023]. Furthermore, high levels of segregation mean fewer opportunities for individuals from different socioeconomic backgrounds to come into contact with each other, resulting in limited opportunities for group interaction and exposure [Moro et al., 2021].

Quantitative studies on socio-spatial segregation focus on the geographic separation or clustering of social groups within physical spaces [Li et al., 2022a] and share a fundamental assumption that the co-presence of individuals serves as the precursor of social interaction [Rokem and Vaughan, 2018]. Traditionally, scholars have measured segregation from a static standpoint by looking exclusively at how individuals' residential locations are sorted into different neighborhoods based on income, race, and education [Kwan, 2013, Feitosa et al., 2007]. However, a large body of recent work shows that residential segregation alone cannot fully capture the complexity of spatial segregation in urban areas. Thus, understanding spatial segregation requires considering individual mobility patterns beyond residential spaces [Silm and Ahas, 2014a]. These include locations visited for work [Zhou et al., 2021], school, shopping, and leisure [Toger et al., 2023] both indoor and outdoor, as well as locations visited when en route, i.e., in the process of reaching these destinations.

Over the past one to two decades, many studies have advanced a dynamic understanding of segregation by incorporating activity spaces [Sampson and Levy, 2020, Candipan et al., 2021], considering the geography of individuals' daily activity and mobility patterns beyond their residential area, thus providing a more comprehensive understanding of socio-spatial segregation. This enhanced understanding largely stems from the widespread availability of extensive human mobility data, shedding light on how individuals allocate their time among various activity locations. The activity space approaches are driven by empirical mobility data from traditional data sources, such as travel surveys [Li and Wang, 2017], and emerging sources of big geolocation data covering large populations and geographical extent, e.g., GPS tracking devices [Roulston and Young, 2013], mobile phone data [Silm and Ahas, 2014a, Xu et al., 2019], or social media platforms [Wang et al., 2018, Candipan et al., 2021].

Despite increasing studies considering activities beyond residential areas, there is a lack of a comprehensive review of the empirical findings on how and why individual mobility shapes socio-spatial segregation in everyday life. The role of individual mobility in socio-spatial segregation remains partly unclear, given that the literature has shown contradictory findings: time spent outside the residence can reinforce or alleviate segregation [Kwan, 2013]. In exploring the role of individual mobility in socio-spatial segregation patterns based on the existing literature, we attempt to answer three questions:

- To what extent do individual mobility patterns contribute to segregation?
- Which factors explain the role played by mobility in segregation?
- What insights are gained by incorporating extensive mobility data into segregation research?

Answering these questions can contribute to providing actionable insights for reducing segregation and social inequalities.

In this paper, we review segregation research through the prism of individual mobility, drawing empirical evidence from the activity space perspective and built environment research, including transport and urban science. Based on the literature, we first define socio-spatial segregation and its quantification (Section 2). We then review studies based on activity space approaches, including evidence on the effect of mobility on segregation (Section 3) and the factors driving these effects (Section 4). In Section 5, we draw findings from the built environment research, including urban science and transport, to discuss critical factors explaining socio-spatial segregation experienced by varying socioeconomic groups. Finally, we synthesize these findings, highlight research gaps, and suggest directions for future research (Section 6).

2 Measuring spatial segregation

Socio-spatial segregation reflects the degree of physical separation among different groups. The process of estimating segregation requires first identifying individuals who are in the same location and subsequently assessing the mix of populations within each location using quantitative metrics [Yao et al., 2019, Li et al., 2022a, Müürisepp et al., 2022].

Figure 1 illustrates three primary approaches to measuring socio-spatial segregation. The first focuses on static information about individuals’ places of residence [Duncan and Duncan, 1955]. Analyses of social and demographic mix in residential areas to calculate residential segregation are by far the most common approach to study socio-spatial segregation [e.g., Andersson and BråmÅ, 2004].

Two other common approaches focus on mixing social groups in non-residential contexts. One approach focuses on analyzing the built environment and inferring the *potential* co-presence of different groups by looking at the spatial configuration of urban spaces, including transportation networks [e.g., Yunitsyna and Shtepani, 2023]. Another approach focuses on segregation from an activity space perspective [Müürisepp et al., 2022]. There has been a rapidly growing number of studies leveraging observed mobility patterns of individuals to quantify the levels of co-presence / spatial segregation empirically. The empirical mobility data in this literature varies, including “small” traditional travel surveys [Park and Kwan, 2018] and “big” mobile phone GPS records [Moro et al., 2021].




Figure 1: Conceptual framework of measuring spatial segregation. (1) Residential segregation. (2) Analysis of transport networks and urban spaces to evaluate the built environment’s potential in bringing people together. (3) Activity space approaches driven by empirical mobility data. This study includes (2-3) for the evidence synthesis.

This section first introduces the three main approaches to measuring socio-spatial segregation (Section 2.1), followed by a brief introduction of different metrics applied in each approach (Section 2.2).

2.1 Approaches and their spatiotemporal scale

In this section, we first discuss the residential approach. Then, we discuss the built environment approach. Finally, the activity space approach focuses on two aspects: “visiting segregation” and “experienced segregation.”

Socio-spatial segregation has long been investigated as a static area-based phenomenon, either in terms of *residential segregation* [Duncan and Duncan, 1955], or at other places such as workplaces and schools [Boterman and Musterd, 2016]. It focuses on interactions among individuals with different socioeconomic backgrounds in the area, often an administrative or statistical subdivision, of their home (or another key) location [e.g., Andersson et al., 2010].

Built environment analysis focuses on the transport networks and urban spaces, which can bring different populations together [Netto et al., 2015, Carpio-Pinedo, 2021]. Most of the studies using this approach quantify the opportunities for interaction between different socioeconomic groups through street network centrality analysis developed in the field of space syntax [Rokem and Vaughan, 2018, Carpio-Pinedo, 2021, Yunitsyna and Shtepani, 2023]. This type of analysis focuses on potential interactions in locations individuals can reach from home through walk, car, or transit networks [e.g., Rokem and Vaughan, 2018], which we can call *network segregation*. This perspective considers that individual mobility facilitates social encounters, but the analysis methods are not based on empirical mobility data.

Both residential and network segregation measures revolve around where people live and their surrounding built environment. The timescale for observed social segregation can span years, reflecting the long-term nature of residential mobility in contrast to daily mobility and stays at various activity locations, which often operate on a scale of minutes to hours.

Recent research underscores activity space approaches that conceptualize socio-spatial segregation dynamically, considering individuals’ travel behavior and daily visited locations. They are driven by empirical mobility data from traditional sources such as travel surveys [Ravalet, 2006, Wang et al., 2012, Le Roux et al., 2017, Park and Kwan, 2018, Landis, 2022, Lin and Ta, 2023] or emerging ones such as mobile phone GPS records and social media geolocation data [Östth et al., 2018, Wang et al., 2018, Candipan et al., 2021, Moro et al., 2021, Huang et al., 2022, Wu et al., 2023]. The commonly used mobility data from large populations include high-resolution location data from mobile

phone applications [Moro et al., 2021], telecommunications companies [Östh et al., 2018], and geotagged tweets [Netto et al., 2018, Wang et al., 2018, Candipan et al., 2021]. They can cover geolocations of millions of individuals over months and years, at the resolution of meters and seconds [Barbosa et al., 2018]. Although co-presence (being in the same place) does not always lead to social interactions, co-presence is a precursor to social interaction [Collins, 2004, Netto et al., 2015]. Utilizing large-scale digital data, it was shown that there is a significant correlation between spatial and social segregation [Blumenstock and Fratamico, 2013], demonstrating that human mobility data offers a realistic approximation of group interactions [Nilforoshan et al., 2023].

The activity space approach describes dynamic segregation building on big empirical mobility data and focusing on two aspects: urban spaces (*visiting segregation*) and individuals (*experienced segregation*). Some recent studies combine the two perspectives [Xu et al., 2019, Moro et al., 2021]. The stream on *visiting segregation* focuses on urban spaces. It seeks to understand how segregated a given location is, given how mixed its visitors are [Netto et al., 2015, Phillips et al., 2021]. These studies examine the composition of the visitors of urban spaces based on characteristics such as income, ethnicity, nativity, etc. [e.g., Netto et al., 2015, Moro et al., 2021]. In contrast, the stream on *experienced segregation* focuses on individuals. It captures how much a person is exposed to diverse individuals as they go about their daily lives [Wu et al., 2023]. In other words, it looks at the activity spaces of individuals, i.e., time spent in different locations at different times of the day. It considers the average segregation they experience across these activity visits [Zhang et al., 2019, Ta et al., 2021].

Due to data availability, the experienced segregation has been commonly approximated by measuring the stays at various places, excluding interactions happening while individuals are moving (e.g., on public transport) [e.g., Moro et al., 2021]. However, some studies particularly investigate en route segregation, pointing to equitable transport systems [Shen, 2019, Abbasi et al., 2021, Zhou et al., 2023].

In summary, there are different facets of measuring segregation (Table 1). The literature has witnessed a clear paradigm shift from a traditional static view toward a mobility perspective that is dynamic and data-driven [Li et al., 2022a]. Big geolocation data are widely used to better understand socio-spatial segregation in the urban landscape, focusing more on individuals [Müürisepp et al., 2022].

Table 1: Three approaches to socio-spatial segregation by their spatiotemporal scale of (potential) co-present individuals.

| Approach | Segregation type | Perspective | Subject | Time scale |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Residential Built Environment | Residential Network | Urban space | Residents | Static (year) |
| Activity space | Visiting Experienced | Urban space Individual | Visitors Travels and activities | Dynamic (minutes–hours) |

2.2 Segregation metrics

This section briefly overviews commonly used metrics in quantifying socio-spatial segregation. The aspects that are more widely considered to measure segregation include race/ethnicity [e.g., Vachuska, 2023], nativity [e.g., Bertoli et al., 2021], income [e.g., Moro et al., 2021], education [e.g., Zhang et al., 2022a], housing [e.g., Zhang et al., 2019], etc. They cover different aspects of the phenomenon: evenness, exposure, concentration, centralization, and clustering [Massey and Denton, 1988], where evenness and exposure remain the most widely used aspects [Silm and Ahas, 2014b].

In Table 2, we provide an overview of the most widely used segregation metrics, categorized into three types. The first class (Type 1) consists of traditional segregation metrics developed for residential segregation, which can integrate the co-presence outside homes in activity space approaches. The second class (Type 2) comprises metrics commonly seen in studies using activity space approaches. Socio-Spatial Isolation Indices, as one example in Type 2, Table 2, look at individual isolation at various locations [Athey et al., 2021], while the Extended Original Exposure Index and the Getis-Ord Local G-based Exposure Index incorporate the concept of activity space to assess exposure to different groups [Yao et al., 2019]. The third class (Type 3) considers network centrality metrics to quantify potential co-presence, e.g., the likelihood of different population groups occupying or traversing the same spaces within a spatial network [Legeby et al., 2015].

3 Individual segregation experiences

In this section, we critically assess the existing literature on how daily mobility influences individual segregation experiences, examining whether it mitigates or reinforces what is shown at the residential level (Sections 3.1, 3.2, and

Table 2: Selection of key segregation metrics. Type 1 = Classic, developed for quantifying residential segregation. Type 2 = Activity space, applied or developed in the context of activity space approaches, often along with a large amount of geolocation data on human mobility. Type 3 = Network analysis, applied in built environment research in approximating the potential co-presence of individuals.

| Type | Index/Model | Description |
|---------------------|---|---|
| 1 | Evenness or Dissimilarity | How evenly groups are distributed across a geographical space [Reardon and O’Sullivan, 2004]. |
| | Exposure Indices | Potential contact between groups [Silm and Ahas, 2014b]. |
| | Concentration Indices | The extent to which minority populations are situated in specific regions [Johnston et al., 2007]. |
| | Spatial Distribution Indices Spatial Clustering Indices | Broader spatial patterns [Demoraes et al., 2021]. The degree of clustering of high-density group areas, e.g., Moran’s I [O’Sullivan and Wong, 2007]. |
| 2 | Socio-Spatial Isolation Indices | Individual isolation within activity locations [Athey et al., 2021]. |
| | Social Interaction Potential | Metric of exposure based on time-geography for metropolitan scale [Farber et al., 2015]. |
| | i-STP index | Individual-level segregation index considering different times of the day [Park and Kwan, 2018]. |
| | Flow-based spatial interaction model | It can capture the impact of specified commuting routes on segregation experiences [Shen, 2019]. |
| | Segregation hotspots | Cluster multiscalar fingerprint to identify hotspots of segregation in urban spaces [Olteanu and Lamirel, 2020]. |
| | Segregated Mobility Index (SMI) | Racial segregation in how neighborhoods of varying racial compositions are connected [Candipan et al., 2021]. |
| | Income Unevenness | Quantifies income unevenness in US cities using population income quartiles [Moro et al., 2021]. |
| | Graph Embedding | Income segregation that combines residential and mobility perspectives [Zhang et al., 2021]. |
| 3 | Index of Concentration at the Extremes (ICE) | How population concentrates at certain groups in a given area [Iyer et al., 2023]. |
| | Spatial Segregation Index | This index integrates distance-decay functions to measure individual experienced segregation [Wu et al., 2023]. |
| | Integration Analysis/Closeness | Connectedness of each space highlighting areas likely to be frequented by diverse groups [Yunitsyna and Shtepani, 2023]. |
| | Choice Analysis/Betweenness | It quantifies a space’s role in facilitating encounters [Rokem and Vaughan, 2018]. |
| | Visibility Graph Analysis | Which spaces are visually connected, providing insight into interaction opportunities [Turner et al., 2001]. |
| | Angular Segment Analysis | Spaces accessible with fewer angular changes often being busier and thus prime for co-presence [Turner, 2001]. |
| | Combined integration and choice values | They identify the network’s most accessible areas [Rokem and Vaughan, 2018]. |
| Multi-accessibility | Simultaneous ease of access to a place by multiple transport modes [Carpio-Pinedo, 2021]. | |

3.3), followed by a discussion on the methodological limitations of the cited literature (Section 3.4). We also explore how mobility affects experienced segregation amid and after crises, e.g., hurricanes and the COVID-19 pandemic (Section 3.5).

An important question is whether experienced segregation is lower or higher than residential segregation. On the one hand, mobility could enable one to encounter diverse populations, especially beyond one’s residential neighborhood. Hence, mobility can reduce the experience of segregation at residence [Alfeo et al., 2019, Hedman et al., 2021]. On the other hand, mobility could strengthen segregation patterns depending on the nature of these encounters, the individuals’ openness to engagement, and the broader societal and systemic factors that influence social interactions and integration [Shdema et al., 2018]. Furthermore, mobility is often influenced by economic and social factors, which means that not everyone has the same ability to travel outside their residential area [Tiznado-Aitken et al., 2023]. The results revealed by the literature are contradictory, partly indicating that the potential of mobility to reduce segregation can vary widely among different individuals and groups.

3.1 Studies observing that mobility reinforces segregation

Using traditional data sources such as surveys and interviews, a small body of activity space literature concludes that mobility outside residential areas reinforces segregation. Aksyonov [2011] suggest that while residential spatial segregation in St. Petersburg, Russia, is relatively weak, segregation in personal activity spaces is much more prominent. Similarly, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the US, Gordon [2018] reports that racial segregation is pronounced, with distinct patterns of daily mobility among different racial groups. This notion of persistent segregation patterns is further supported by Le Roux et al. [2017], who found that the most segregated group during the night in Paris remained the most segregated during the day, indicating a strong correlation between night-time and day-time segregation. Consistent with these findings, studies on ethnic groups in urban China reveal that a residents' home neighborhood continues to be a strong predictor of segregation in their daily activity locations [Tan et al., 2017, 2019].

These findings are corroborated by studies informed by large-scale data [Roulston and Young, 2013, Hedman et al., 2021, Hilman et al., 2022]. GPS data from the Ivory Coast show that tribal affiliations significantly influence social connections within tribes, potentially reinforcing social segregation [Amini et al., 2014]. This tendency of individuals to associate with similar groups is echoed in the US, where geotagged tweets reveal that people frequently visit areas dominated by their racial group, thus mirroring macro-level racial segregation [Bora et al., 2014], despite the different racial groups traveling similar distances to these destinations [Wang et al., 2018]. A similar segregation pattern is observed in North Belfast, as daily movement patterns on tertiary streets show that individuals primarily travel within areas occupied by their community, actively avoiding areas associated with opposing communities [Davies et al., 2019]. This relationship between residential segregation and segregated mobility patterns is further underscored by Candipan et al. [2021], who identify black-white residential segregation as a critical determinant of segregated urban mobility. Complementing these findings, Zhang et al. [2022a] establish a significant and strong correlation ($r = 0.646$, $p < 0.001$) between residential segregation and activity space-based segregation concerning education in Beijing.

3.2 Studies finding that mobility reduces segregation

In contrast, several studies have found that accounting for daily mobility patterns significantly reduces individuals' levels of experienced segregation compared to approaches that measure segregation solely at residential locations. Wong and Shaw [2011] reveal that high levels of segregation in residential spaces might be moderated by lower levels of segregation at activity locations. In fact, activity places are substantially more heterogeneous regarding key social characteristics than residential neighborhoods [Jones and Pebley, 2014, Pinchak et al., 2021]. A lack of exposure to diversity (higher segregation) in the residential neighborhood may be compensated by greater workplace exposure or transport exposure [Boterman and Musterd, 2016, Wang and Li, 2016, Lin and Ta, 2023]. Therefore, studies have uncovered reduced segregation levels considering daytime activities [Le Roux et al., 2017, Li and Wang, 2017, Park and Kwan, 2018, Garlick et al., 2022, Fuentes et al., 2022].

Emerging data sources such as geotagged tweets and mobile phone data also reveal a similar reducing effect of mobility on segregation [Grujić et al., 2019, Athey et al., 2021, Moya-Gómez et al., 2021, Shin, 2021, Silm et al., 2021, Xian et al., 2022, Xu, 2022]. Research indicates that individuals from poor and black neighborhoods in the city are more mobile within the metro area than previously thought, often traveling outside their neighborhoods for work or other activities [Shelton et al., 2015]. This trend is also seen in Sweden's metropolitan areas, where daily mobility, especially among those who frequent central places, can lessen segregation levels [Östh et al., 2018]. However, this reduction in segregation is less noticeable in areas with low accessibility and mobility levels, typically located on the city outskirts [Östh et al., 2018]. In Seoul, South Korea, a significant decrease in daytime segregation of 20% was observed when compared to residential segregation levels [Hong, 2020], a trend similarly reflected in Turkey in the context of segregation between Syrian refugees and the native population [Bertoli et al., 2021].

3.3 Beyond the reinforcing-reducing dichotomy

Studies using both small and big data reveal that the impact of mobility on individual segregation experiences is not as simple as reinforcing or reducing segregation. The relationships between residential (home vicinity and sub-neighborhood), spatial or territorial (daily mobility), and social (interactive) segregation are found to be complex [Schnell and Haj-Yahya, 2014, Selim, 2015]. For instance, Goldhaber and Schnell [2007] found weak correlations among these segregation types, indicating that factors influencing each type of spatial segregation vary. It turns out that sharing residential neighborhoods does not necessarily translate into shared routines, particularly across different socioeconomic statuses [Browning et al., 2017]. Interestingly, Lin and Ta [2023] reveal that people with higher migrant exposure in their residential areas often experience lower migrant exposure in their activity locations, and vice versa, suggesting a negative correlation between residential and experienced segregation levels.

Whether mobility reduces or reinforces the total experienced segregation depends largely on individuals' lifestyle, i.e., which kind of locations they visit and when during the day [Zhang et al., 2023]. Using mobile phone data, Silm et al. [2018] find that places of daily activities outside home and work are less segregated, noting a surprising trend of higher workplace segregation than residential segregation, particularly in age groups 30 – 39 and above 60. However, Silm et al. [2021] observed higher segregation in residential areas than workplaces, with segregation levels during leisure activities fluctuating based on the specific activity. Zhang et al. [2022b] further contribute to this understanding by using location-based service data in Beijing, revealing more pronounced segregation at workplaces than residences and a general decrease in segregation outside these typical environments. Additionally, the city structure and distribution of amenities emerge as a critical factor for socioeconomic mixing, where diverse and unique amenities, particularly in city centers, tend to attract a mix of socioeconomic groups [Dannemann et al., 2018, Juhász et al., 2023]. A low segregation level is generally associated with being in the middle of the day, away from home, such as in places like workplaces, restaurants, commercial areas, and outdoor spaces, supported by extensive geolocation data on human mobility [Sampson and Levy, 2020, Abbasi et al., 2021, Athey et al., 2021, Qiao et al., 2021, Moro et al., 2021]. However, not everyone can equally access these places to fulfill their daily activity demand.

3.4 Limits of existing approaches

A limitation of the existing work is that spatial co-presence does not necessarily capture meaningful social interactions. Schnell and Haj-Yahya [2014] utilize GPS tracking and interviews to explore how daily commutes between segregated Arab towns and Jewish-Israeli spaces shape the socio-spatial experiences of Arab-Palestinian citizens in Israel, suggesting that while mobility influences aspects of segregation and integration, it cannot fully counteract societal structural stratification. Zhou and Cheng [2019] also note that physical proximity alone does not guarantee a social mix. Dorman et al. [2020] even find that economic and cultural factors influence co-presence, often leading to increased segregation, especially among wealthier and younger groups. In addition, there is no one-way relationship between residential and activity space-based segregation. Zhang et al. [2019] argue that segregation based on where people live influences where they conduct their daily activities. In turn, the differential usage of urban space - where certain groups are privileged to access specific locations and others are not - reinforces residential segregation in the long run.

The conclusions drawn from studies on social segregation, which utilize empirical mobility data, are influenced by the daily activity locations and to what extent co-presence in these locations approximates social interactions. However, methodological discrepancies across the reviewed studies may also contribute to the contradictory findings on whether mobility reinforces or diminishes segregation.

In particular, the contradictory findings may stem from the spatial resolution considered and how co-presence is computed. It was shown, for example, that two restaurants located next to each other can cater to distinct populations [Moro et al., 2021]. Hence, studies that consider interactions over relatively large areas [e.g., Silm and Ahas, 2014a] due to the low spatiotemporal resolution of the data, e.g., call detail records (CDR) or social media data, may hinder detailed segregation experiences in a specific location. GPS records, instead, capture visits with higher granularity and thus offer a more nuanced and accurate description of segregation. Moreover, focusing on the exposure level to an area's residential population [e.g., Wang et al., 2018] can result in different segregation levels than those considering the mixing of its visitors [e.g., Nilforoshan et al., 2023]. These methodological inconsistencies partly contribute to varying findings on mobility's role in segregation, as these approaches capture social mixing at different levels [Moro et al., 2021, Athey et al., 2021].

3.5 Amid and post-crisis segregation experiences

Socio-spatial segregation can change dramatically during and after crises. This section reviews the results in the area, focusing on COVID-19 and natural disasters.

Studies based on large populations' mobility data have shown that the COVID-19 pandemic amplified socio-spatial segregation. Results are similar across several Western countries and contexts. In the US, it was found that racial segregation shapes urban spatial patterns and behaviors during public health crises like the COVID-19 pandemic, as noted by [Hu et al., 2022]. This is echoed in Sweden, where the pandemic highlighted existing socio-economic and ethnic segregations, with low-income, multi-ethnic neighborhoods experiencing high mortality rates, as reported by Joelsson and Ekman Ladru [2022]. Investigating mobility inequality across U.S. cities, Marlow et al. [2021] found that factors like population size, public transportation usage, and neighborhood isolation intensify racial segregation, particularly during 2020. These findings align with Li et al. [2022b], who observed increased social segregation in the US during the pandemic, with mobile phone location data showing the most and least vulnerable census tracts, considering socioeconomic status, experienced the highest segregation. This trend is particularly stark for low-income and ethnic minority populations, who become more isolated from higher-income and white groups due to decreased

mobility, as highlighted by Lu and Giuliano [2023]. While Yabe et al. [2023] apply counterfactual analysis to show that, two years after the first COVID-19 wave, changes in experienced segregation were mainly due to lifestyle changes, i.e., less willingness to explore new places.

The literature highlights that changes in mobility patterns due to the COVID-19 pandemic, such as reduced public transport usage and increased reliance on cars, have deepened existing inequalities [Joelsson and Ekman Ladru, 2022, Shin, 2021]. This impact is particularly pronounced among young and vulnerable groups in socially disadvantaged neighborhoods, who often depend on public transport for their jobs with irregular hours [Joelsson and Ekman Ladru, 2022]. In Italy’s economically distressed regions, a slow U-shaped recovery was observed, with mobility levels still about 20% below pre-lockdown levels by late October 2020 [Bonaccorsi et al., 2021], and areas with lower income and higher income inequality were the most affected, indicating increased segregation. Similarly, in cities like New York, Los Angeles, and Sao Paulo, poor peripheries with high population density and limited access to individual transportation options faced heightened virus transmission risks [Sathler and Leiva, 2022].

Evacuations during and after disasters displace large populations, underscoring social inequalities and intensifying segregation. Analyzing large-scale mobility data from over 1.7 million mobile phone users and income census data, Yabe and Ukkusuri [2020] found that higher-income individuals in Florida, US, were more likely to evacuate disaster-affected areas and relocate to less damaged areas, both within and outside mandatory evacuation zones. This disparity in mobility resulted in prolonged spatial income segregation post-disaster, with higher-income individuals avoiding severely damaged areas while lower-income individuals remained, exacerbating segregation. Similar patterns were observed during Hurricane Harvey’s evacuation, where people from disadvantaged minority populations were notably less likely to evacuate than wealthier white residents despite similar evacuation distance [Deng et al., 2021].

In summary, crises tend to magnify existing segregation, mainly through individual mobility. Given the critical role of mobility in disaster evacuation and disease transmission, it is imperative to closely examine the mobility disparities across socioeconomic groups and formulate targeted policies to enhance social integration and mitigate the adverse effects of disasters.

4 Disparity in individual segregation experiences

Different social groups have different daily-life activity spaces, depending on age, race/ethnicity, and income level [Moro et al., 2021]. These differences can exacerbate socio-spatial segregation [Wang et al., 2012]. Here, we first present the effect of subjective factors such as homophily and lifestyle (Section 4.1). Then, we discuss the effect of other individual factors such as socioeconomic status (Section 4.2), ethnicity and nativity (Section 4.3), and other aspects (Section 4.4).

4.1 Homophily and lifestyle

Individual differences concerning lifestyle and choices of places to visit can lead to different experienced segregation levels.

On the one hand, several studies suggest that individuals are more likely to interact with others from similar socioeconomic backgrounds due to homophily [Xu et al., 2022]. For example, mobile activity tracking data also suggest that people from poor neighborhoods tend to participate in activities in other poor neighborhoods [Yip et al., 2016, Wu and Huang, 2022]. As observed in the US, African Americans [Gordon, 2018], Whites [Gordon, 2018], and Latinos tend to frequent areas predominantly occupied by their respective racial groups [Jones and Pebley, 2014]. Similarly, in Sweden, Hedman et al. [2021] find that individuals from areas with a higher proportion of non-Europeans generally stay within or move towards immigrant-dense areas. Social network data in Stockholm, Sweden, reveals the tendency of individuals to move through neighborhoods of similar income, education levels, and immigrant makeup, even when other factors, such as transit time and opportunities for interaction, are controlled [Heine et al., 2021]. In short, apart from geographically distant areas, people are less likely to travel between socioeconomically distant areas [Park et al., 2021, Chen et al., 2024].

On the other hand, studies based on GPS data have revealed that experienced segregation is partly influenced by individuals’ lifestyles, as captured by the kind of places that they visit in their daily life [Moro et al., 2021]. For example, a study found that lifestyles with more socializing, shopping weekends, and coffee shop visits are associated with higher social integration [Yang et al., 2023, Nilforoshan et al., 2023]. Instead, individuals visiting entertainment venues and restaurants may experience higher levels of segregation because those locations cater to specific income groups, and their cost or cultural context may exclude lower-income individuals [Moro et al., 2021].

4.2 Socioeconomic status

The wealthiest and the poorest groups demonstrate contrasting mobility behaviors and activity demand [Aksyonov, 2011, Farber et al., 2012, Östh et al., 2018], resulting in systematically different activity spaces [Wang et al., 2012]. Heringa et al. [2014] reveal that social status (in terms of education and income), as well as the opportunity to perform leisure activities, influences the extent of inter-ethnic contact more than neighborhood attributes. In turn, performing leisure activities is strongly influenced by economic factors, according to large-scale mobile phone data collected in Stockholm [Toger et al., 2023].

Table 3 summarizes the characteristics of individual mobility and activity spaces by income level observed in various studies. Data from developed countries shows that wealthier individuals use various types of urban areas [Wang et al., 2022] and travel longer distances [Xu et al., 2022]. A study suggests that the highest classes in society are more likely to form connections with all classes [Farber et al., 2012]. In contrast, the less wealthy experience limited activity spaces, leading to a more localized life. These may explain the higher segregation levels experienced by less wealthy populations [Wu and Huang, 2022]. In Hong Kong, the mobility gap between high- and low-income is widening between 2002 and 2011 [Tao et al., 2020a].

Table 3: Characteristics of individual mobility and activity space by income level and ethnicity/nativity observed in studies.

| Aspect | Group | Mobility patterns | Activity space |
|--------------------|--------------|--|---|
| Income | Wealthy | Longer trip distance [Xu et al., 2022, Farber et al., 2012] | Diverse and widely spread [Wang et al., 2022] Sports, leisure [Zambon et al., 2017], business [Wang et al., 2012, Heringa et al., 2014], shopping [Aksyonov, 2011] |
| | Less wealthy | Shorter trip distance [Wu and Huang, 2022] Less frequently travel outside city [Aksyonov, 2011] | Constrained and localized [Netto et al., 2015, Zhou et al., 2015] Convenience stores [Aksyonov, 2011] |
| Ethnicity/nativity | Majority | Longer commuting [Garlick et al., 2022] | Social, recreational, errand [Shirgaokar and Nobler, 2021] |
| | Minority | Shorter travel distance [Silm and Ahas, 2014a] | Exercise, education [Shirgaokar and Nobler, 2021] |

In some contexts, however, a different effect was observed, with the wealthy living relatively more segregated lives [Shelton et al., 2015, Xu et al., 2019]. Atkinson [2016] illustrate that the super-rich in London creates a “cloud space” or “flowing enclave,” engaging with the city’s diversity in a limited way. This phenomenon of social segregation among the upper classes is also observed in the Paris region, where Le Roux et al. [2017] note they remain the most segregated group both in residence and during daytime activities.

In developing countries, the less wealthy population does not always travel less or have more limited activity spaces than the rest. Using mobile phone data, Moya-Gómez et al. [2021] reveal that in Medellin, Colombia, the low-income population is more likely to leave their neighborhood during the day and travel longer distances to the most diverse destinations than the wealthy. Furthermore, the diversity of activities among the less wealthy is not necessarily inferior to that of the wealthy. For example, in Bangkok, Thailand, Wissink and Hazelzet [2016] find a contrasting pattern, where residents in informal settlements and lower-middle-income neighborhoods exhibit a more active social life than those in affluent areas.

Socioeconomic status often interacts with housing type, which affects individual mobility and segregation experiences. Li and Wang [2017] discovered a “reinforcing effect” of income and housing type, indicating that poor families in public housing face heightened isolation due to income and housing segregation. Zhang et al. [2019] complemented this by noting that individual activity spaces vary significantly among social groups by housing type, potentially intensifying segregation due to limited interaction opportunities. Extending this understanding, Demoraes et al. [2021] found that in Santiago de Chile, young working tenants with lower education and purchasing power and older working property owners experience longer commutes, highlighting a spatial displacement between their residential areas and activity locations, and the interdependence between housing type (or tenure) and residential location.

4.3 Ethnicity and nativity

Ethnic groups exhibit distinct segregation experiences [Bora et al., 2014, Raanan and Shoval, 2014]. These segregation experiences by ethnicity or nativity can be ascribed to their distinct mobility and activity space patterns (Table 3). For example, the study by Järv et al. [2015] suggests that ethnic differences in spatial behavior become more pronounced in leisure-related activities and other non-routine behaviors [Silm and Ahas, 2014a]. Ethnicity also affects transport choices. Living in co-ethnic neighborhoods increases the likelihood of inter-household carpooling for Asian and Hispanic groups, while this is not the case for African Americans [Shin, 2017].

Intersectionality has received attention in a few studies, as ethnicity or nativity often intertwines with factors like income and education. High-income natives [Boterman and Musterd, 2016] and low-income minorities [Tan et al., 2019] can experience higher segregation levels than the other populations. Most racial-ethnic groups' ethnicity/nativity segregation increases along with higher economic status [Wu et al., 2023]. However, Asian groups show the most diverse interactions, regardless of economic status, possibly because of their high presence in Downtown Commercial contexts, revealed by extensive geolocation data on human mobility [Salgado et al., 2021].

4.4 Other individual aspects

Besides socioeconomic status and ethnicity/nativity, other aspects, such as individual values, fears, trust, lifestyles, and social networks, affect individual segregation experiences.

Individuals with different values and preferences may experience different levels of segregation in their daily lives, driven by their distinct lifestyle choices. Järv et al. [2021] identify the subjective self-estimated social status as a critical factor affecting the extent of activity spaces and experiences of segregation, suggesting a complex relationship between socio-economic status, ethnicity, and segregation. People's inclination towards ascriptive (traditional roles) or achievable (personal accomplishments) status affects their spatial segregation [Goldhaber and Schnell, 2007]. Those focusing on achievable status are more likely to move beyond their ethnic enclaves, while ascriptive-oriented individuals stay within them. Moro et al. [2021] suggest that people who actively explore different places tend to be more economically integrated, experiencing less income segregation.

Security barriers and fear also affect the ability to move, interact, and use specific spaces, perpetuating the cycle of segregation [Selim, 2015]. GPS tracking shows that Catholic and Protestant students in Northern Ireland generally move within different areas, though they do share spaces, particularly in shopping and entertainment venues [Roulston and Young, 2013]. Complementing this, Dixon et al. [2020] suggest that religious segregation results not only from socioeconomic and institutional forces but also from individual mobility choices influenced by perceived intergroup threats and contact experiences. This perceived fear often restricts residents' willingness to travel, leading to geographical isolation and limited access to work, education, and other activities [Hernandez and Titheridge, 2016]. Furthermore, trust plays a crucial role in segregation experiences, with Browning et al. [2017] finding that high levels of neighborhood trust can mitigate the effects of socioeconomic inequality on spatial segregation in daily routines.

Besides cultural differences or socio-economic factors, social networks within ethnic groups strongly affect segregation patterns [Silm and Ahas, 2014a]. Segregation experiences can vary significantly between individuals; they show a strong correlation at a broader social level between social network segregation and spatial segregation [Xu et al., 2019].

4.5 Key takeaways

Activity space studies on segregation using mobility data often quantify the segregation levels experienced in daily lives and between different socioeconomic and demographic groups.

- Socioeconomic status
Variances in wealth lead to distinct mobility patterns. In developed countries, those with higher socioeconomic status often engage in more diverse activities, accessing various locations, which dilutes their experienced segregation levels. Conversely, lower-income individuals typically have more localized mobility, intensifying their experienced segregation levels. In developing countries, the opposite effect has been observed.
- Ethnicity and nativity
Different ethnic groups display unique mobility patterns, often gravitating towards or remaining within areas predominantly occupied by their communities. This tendency is influenced by various factors such as social comfort, security perceptions, and targeted policing practices.
- Lifestyle, homophily and other subjective factors

Individual perceptions of social status, personal values, and security concerns significantly influence lifestyles and mobility choices, thus affecting segregation experiences. People’s preferences, whether leaning towards traditional or achievement-oriented values, also shape their activity spaces.

5 Explaining segregation experiences

Using activity space approaches on empirical mobility data, studies have revealed persistent segregation in individuals’ daily mobility (Section 3), and how different populations experience various levels of segregation in their daily lives (Section 4).

In this section, we draw insights from the transport and urban science research literature to systematize key factors that help explain observed disparities in individual segregation experiences (Figure 2). Individuals’ experienced segregation is partly affected by their preferences on certain activities [Moro et al., 2021] and unequal access to diverse social settings [Netto et al., 2015], such as housing, transport access, etc. These unequal accesses result in different levels of mobility, translating into distinct movement networks in urban space, leading to different encounter opportunities. These daily experiences eventually create homophilic personal networks, therefore perpetuating segregated class networks. These elements are interlinked in shaping how individuals are exposed to different socioeconomic groups.

Covering various components of how spatial segregation is produced, we investigate four aspects of explaining individual segregation experiences in this section: housing regarding individuals’ residence and its environment (Section 5.1), urban sprawl characterizing the relative spatial relationship between residence and other activity locations (Section 5.2), transport access describing how easy one can reach various resources and opportunities (Section 5.3), and urban design characterizing the built environment of activity spaces (Section 5.4).




Figure 2: Conceptual framework explaining socio-spatial segregation.

5.1 Housing

Housing locations and types primarily affect individual mobility and segregation experiences (Table 4). Minorities often live in disadvantaged neighborhoods, which makes it hard to mix with the other groups [Tao et al., 2020b], with the built environment’s slow evolution locking urban communities into persistent settlement patterns and inequalities to resources [Patias et al., 2023].

5.2 Urban sprawl

Urban sprawl is the uncontrolled expansion of low-density urban areas into the surrounding rural land. Escalating segregation levels usually accompany such increasing size of cities [Monkkonen et al., 2018, Nilforoshan et al., 2023], observed in several countries, such as Brazil [Bittencourt et al., 2021], China [Zhao, 2013], Iran [Azhdari et al., 2018], and Chile [Figueroa et al., 2019]. Increasing urban compactness counteracts urban sprawl, significantly enhancing upward mobility through better job accessibility and indirectly mitigating poverty segregation [Ewing et al., 2016]. Conversely, urban sprawl contributes to disparities in public transportation and job opportunities [Bittencourt et al., 2021, Zhao, 2013], a decline in street network accessibility [Figueroa et al., 2019], and the isolation of peripheral areas [Azhdari et al., 2018, Figueroa et al., 2019]. These aspects intensify segregation through housing aspects discussed in Section 5.1.

Table 4: Housing effects on segregation experience.

| Aspect | Impact |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Rural vs. urban | Rural migrants experience higher nativity segregation in both residential and activity spaces than urban migrants [Lin and Ta, 2023, Shen and Luo, 2023]. |
| Land-use diversity | Areas with high land-use diversity shows less daytime segregation, despite high levels of nighttime segregation [Fuentes et al., 2022]. |
| High land values | Lead to segregation both day and night, attracting high-class residents and contributing to segregation [Fuentes et al., 2022]. |
| Disadvantaged neighborhoods | Face difficulties mixing with other groups due to persistent settlement patterns, with urban evolution fostering segregation into "ghettos" [Power, 2012]. |
| Peripheral and disconnected areas | Poorer populations residing in these areas face socio-economic disadvantages due to limited access to services and job opportunities [Kronenberger and De Saboya, 2017, Atuesta et al., 2018]. |

In explaining residential segregation, the concept of “spatial mismatch” was proposed in 1968, referring to the geographical separation between low-income communities, often inhabited by racial or ethnic minorities, and employment opportunities, typically located in areas located far from these communities [Kain, 1968]. Spatial mismatch creates a complex interplay between where people live and where they can work or access services. Minority groups tend to experience higher spatial mismatch levels than their white counterparts living in the same Metropolitan Statistical Areas in the US [Easley, 2018]. The commuting distance of workers with the lowest wages might be associated with a spatial mismatch between their residential locations and places of employment, leading to longer commuting times [Blázquez et al., 2010, Wang et al., 2022]. Although urban development in Chinese cities has not resulted in clear residential segregation akin to Western cities, the low-income population faces a trade-off between service accessibility and the floor area of their residences [Chen and Yeh, 2019]. In China, the availability of low-rent housing within urban villages, coupled with short commuting times, alleviates the spatial mismatch for disadvantaged groups in specific regions [Chen et al., 2021].

5.3 Transport accessibility

This section first reviews evidence on how transport accessibility differs by income and ethnicity/nativity (Section 5.3.1) and brings attention to transport equity and how it affects socio-spatial segregation (Section 5.3.2).

Transport accessibility plays a crucial role in shaping experienced segregation patterns via mobility. Because spatial accessibility reflects how easy it is to reach locations and activities, it ultimately determines the range of places and social environments people can visit. Moreover, urban transport plays a crucial role in promoting social inclusion or deepening exclusion, as limited transportation opportunities are closely linked to an increased risk of social exclusion for various individuals or groups [Lucas et al., 2016, Luz and Portugal, 2022]. This relationship is further accentuated in a pre- and post-pandemic analysis by Gallego Méndez et al. [2023], which reveals growing disparities in transit access among socioeconomic groups. Given these challenges, to foster better social integration, Rokem and Vaughan [2019] argues for substantially reevaluating transport infrastructure accessibility, which is central to measuring the equity impacts of transport investments [Pereira et al., 2017].

5.3.1 Factors of income and ethnicity/nativity

Transport access disparity between low and high-income groups may explain their distinct mobility patterns, as reviewed in Section 4.2. High-income groups generally have better accessibility than the other groups [Jang and Yi, 2021, Arellana et al., 2021]. Material constraints among lower-income households limit where they go due to low affordability and poor accessibility [Logiodice et al., 2015, Hernandez and Titheridge, 2016, Martínez et al., 2018, Cortés, 2021], leading to socioeconomic segregation in their activity spaces [Hu et al., 2017, Peña et al., 2022, Cromley and Lin, 2023].

How transport access affects mobility also depends on ethnicity and nativity. Racial residential segregation is associated with lower equitable travel across neighborhoods [Haque, 2016] and fewer visits to common hubs Sampson and Levy [2020]. In the US, living in racially segregated metropolitan areas leads to longer travel times for Black individuals when compared to White individuals, particularly when driving [Landis, 2022]. Although homophily in activity spaces holds across races, for White residents, it is more a preference rather than accessibility Vachuska [2023]. While for Black and Hispanic residents, this is mainly due to lower accessibility of various transport modes.

Ethnicity and nativity often interact with socioeconomic status, resulting in different accessibility patterns [Xiao et al., 2021]. Rokem and Vaughan [2019] reveal two distinct migrant groups - economic migrants and refugees, where the

economic migrants have activity spaces closer to the city center, indicating better mobility opportunities, while refugees are found to be more spatially segregated.

The poor transport access where low-income and minority groups live tends to create a vicious circle of segregation and inequalities [Bittencourt et al., 2021]. Extended travel times and restricted access to resources expose the low-income to a greater risk of long-term unemployment [Korsu and Wenglenski, 2010], diminishing their opportunities for upward mobility. In Turkey, Syrian refugees struggle with the lack of language skills, which often limits their accessibility to various transportation methods and activities, further compounding their problems of poverty and social exclusion [Ozkazanc, 2021]. In contrast, efficient transportation networks can offset the adverse effects of segregation and narrow the income disparity between them and White populations [Galaskiewicz et al., 2021], and job accessibility is positively associated with earnings for the Black population living in the suburbs [Eom, 2022].

5.3.2 Transport equity

Transport access discrimination against certain social groups partly stems from planning stages being intentionally or unintentionally biased towards privileged groups and might perpetuate existing social segregation [Govender and Maharaj, 2012]. The study by Golub et al. [2013] highlights “environmental racism,” emphasizing how historical racial segregation in urban development has left a lasting imprint on the metropolitan area of Oakland, US, which continues to perpetuate discrimination due to race-neutral decisions that ignore this racialized legacy. Naranjo Gomez [2016] highlights that while expanding Spain’s road and high-speed rail network aims to enhance social cohesion, the plan could negatively impact socio-economic development for a quarter of the population, thus potentially hindering social cohesion. Road infrastructure enhancements in peri-urban communities often improve connectivity and attract middle-to-high-income individuals seeking enhanced services [Adugbila et al., 2023]. However, this influx often displaces low-income residents, pushing them into hinterlands and leading to fragmentation within these peri-urban areas.

Elevated highways and urban freeways deepen socio-spatial divisions by favoring affluent commuters and exposing marginalized groups to environmental risks and poor services [Graham, 2018, Mahajan, 2023]. However, even public transport infrastructure, primarily intended for promoting social integration, can have discriminatory consequences against disadvantaged groups. High-income neighborhoods seem to benefit more from public transport investments than low-income ones, reinforcing residential segregation [Heilmann, 2018, Pereira et al., 2019]. Higher-income homeowners can better take advantage of transit-induced price capitalization effects on their property values and upgrade to more affluent neighborhoods [Nilsson and Delmelle, 2020]. However, lower-income homeowners do not reciprocate this benefit.

5.4 Urban design

Socio-spatial segregation is influenced not only by current socioeconomic variables but also by historical patterns of urbanization and transformation [Zhou et al., 2015]. This section reviews how urban spaces affect individuals’ segregation experiences, where specific forms of urban areas are better than others in facilitating individual mobility and fostering social inclusion [Goldblatt and Omer, 2015], as illustrated in Table 5.

Architecture, urban design, and planning are vital in mitigating inequalities [Legeby and Feng, 2022]. Consequently, the built environment’s impact on segregation variation demands careful consideration. To effectively address segregation dynamics, it is essential to examine the co-presence of social groups in public spaces, utilizing urban form to foster positive change [Miranda, 2020].

As a crucial public space, urban parks enhance social integration by providing inclusive, shared spaces for interaction, cultural activities, and community engagement, strengthening communal bonds and cohesion Samson [2017]. Abdelmonem and McWhinney [2015] recommend that urban park design includes inclusive and accessible features, considers the socio-cultural dynamics of local communities [Xiao et al., 2019], offers neutral spaces that do not exacerbate territorial claims, and encourages shared activities to foster interaction among diverse community members. However, in some areas, the best parks and access to such parks are found in high-social-status areas, while those with low social status lack access to public green spaces [Van Nes and Aghabeik, 2015, Miller, 2019].

5.5 Facilitating mobility to promote integration

This section reviews practices and policies from various regions that affect socio-spatial segregation, focusing on housing, public transport, and urban design. Evidence in transport and urban science research highlights the essential role of mobility in promoting integration [Mooses et al., 2020]. Social integration benefits from a greater understanding

Table 5: Urban design effects on segregation experiences.

| Aspect | Impact |
|--|---|
| Hierarchical urban structures | Limit public space use and social inclusion, particularly affecting immigrants [Legeby and Marcus, 2011]. |
| Distribution of consumption spaces | Drives segregation in public space usage, indicating urban exclusion [Bolzoni, 2016]. |
| Streets with slower traffic and good environment | Enhance social integration and contribute to vibrant public life [Sauter and Huettenmoser, 2008]. |
| High spatial integration | Leads to enhanced access to services, reducing segregation [Van Nes and Aghabeik, 2015, Garnica-Monroy and Alvanides, 2019, Legeby and Feng, 2022]. |
| High pedestrian density, walkability, and bikability | Aligns with lower segregation through synergistic urban patterns with the surrounding cities [Alghatam, 2019, van den Berg et al., 2017, Mouratidis and Poortinga, 2020, Wang and Liu, 2022]. |
| Multi-scalar spatial configurations | Facilitates urban encounters and improves social integration [Şevik and Çalişkan, 2022]. |
| Mixed-use design and linear parks | Enhances activity interactions and socioeconomic integration [Gao and Lim, 2023]. |

of highly segregated communities, optimizing accessibility-based planning and policies to maintain community diversity [Huang et al., 2022, Camarero and Oliva, 2019].

Table 6-1 suggests that accounting for housing affordability and lack of transport access faced by minorities, housing policies could facilitate interactions across socioeconomic groups and promote social integration [Utzig, 2017].

Car-centric urban development is often associated with increased segregation [Sanchez et al., 2004]. These policies and specific land use practices have restricted transport access to essential opportunities like jobs, education, and healthcare due to direct and indirect effects, including inequitable costs and residential segregation [Sanchez et al., 2004, McDonagh, 2006]. Better public transportation may enhance exposure levels between population groups and reduce the overall levels of segregation experienced by individuals [Wong and Shaw, 2011, Kryvobokov and Bouzouina, 2014, Landis, 2022, Power, 2012, Utzig, 2017, Carpio-Pinedo, 2021, Athey et al., 2021, Huang et al., 2022]. This is also demonstrated in Table 6-2. Factors beyond public transport are worth investigating simultaneously [Arellana et al., 2021]. In transit-oriented development planning, we also need strategic methods to counter spatial inequality to fully unleash its potential in promoting both environmental and social sustainability in modern cities. In this process, Mueller et al. [2018] emphasize the integration of affordable housing preservation into city planning, particularly near transit corridors, and proposes a tool to assess, compare, and prioritize these corridors as potential sites for maintaining existing affordable rental housing.

More activities and interactions do not automatically lead to stronger communities [Mouratidis and Poortinga, 2020]. Targeted urban design initiatives in walkability, public space, and housing design can enhance urban vitality and social cohesion (Table 6-3). In implementing these urban design initiatives, Unceta et al. [2020] highlight the importance of considering local context and potential in space and society rather than solely relying on land regularization and imported solutions. One example is a measuring tool by Alipour and Galal Ahmed [2021] for assessing social sustainability indicators, covering factors like density, land use, mobility options, street layouts, etc., potentially revealing segregation.

5.6 Key takeaways

The studies within transport and urban science research provide detailed explanations for the observed mobility differences among various groups, shedding light on how these variations contribute to corresponding disparities in individual segregation experiences.

- Urban design and housing

The location and type of housing have profound impacts on individual mobility. Urban sprawl, a feature of many modern cities, often results in increased social segregation due to the geographic spread and the nature of residential development.

- Transport accessibility

Table 6: Policies and actions in housing, public transport, and urban design and their impact on segregation. 1 = Housing, 2 = Public transport, and 3 = Urban design.

| # | Policy/Action | Description | Segregation implications |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Urban village placement for rural migrant workers (China) | Good job accessibility for rural workers in urban villages. | Lowers workplace segregation [Zhu et al., 2017, Zhou et al., 2021]. |
| | Urban renewal (China) | Urban village demolition due to renewal policies. | Risks increasing segregation due to displacement [Zhu et al., 2022]. |
| | Housing Choice Voucher program (US) | Housing affordability programs. | Effectiveness limited by entrenched socio-demographic barriers [Garboden, 2021]. |
| 2 | Minibus taxi system (South Africa) | Integrated transport systems for diverse populations. | Could decrease segregation by serving actual transport needs [Nelson, 2023]. |
| | Public transport fare reform (Portugal) | Enhancing commuter accessibility. | May reduce social inequalities and segregation [Silver et al., 2023]. |
| | Bus and metro systems (Colombia) | Public transport accessible to the poor. | Reduces segregation by improving transport access for the poor [Valenzuela-Levi, 2023]. |
| | Light-rail transportation (US) | Light-rail construction in neighborhoods. | Gentrification risk with potential for demographic shifts [Hess, 2020]. |
| 3 | Bike share program (US) | Equitable bike station planning. | Equitable transport access can lower segregation [Bhuyan et al., 2019]. |
| | Cycle hire scheme (UK) | Wider distribution of city cycling schemes. | Enhanced inclusiveness and reduced income segregation [Lovelace et al., 2020]. |
| | Inclusive sidewalk design (Saudi Arabia) | Gender-responsive public space design. | Targets gender-based segregation reduction [Almahmood et al., 2018]. |
| | Urban transformation (Turkey) | Social inclusion efforts for refugees. | Fosters integration and combats segregation in mixed-use areas [Altaema and Hatipoğlu, 2023]. |
| | Carpooling (US) | Carpooling algorithms for diverse groups. | Encourages social integration via shared transport [Librino et al., 2020]. |

The availability and quality of transport options and proximity to activities crucially affect individual mobility patterns. Limited access to transportation and opportunities often results in social exclusion, further entrenching segregation experiences for certain groups.

6 Discussion

Our analysis of over 170 research works reveals that increased mobility enables individuals to interact with more diverse populations, particularly outside their residential neighborhoods, offering the potential to reduce the levels of segregation experienced by individuals and groups. However, the extent to which mobility reduces segregation depends on various factors. These include the nature of the encounters, the individuals' willingness to engage with others, and the broader societal and systemic influences at play. The effectiveness of mobility in lessening segregation varies significantly across different groups and individuals, mainly due to economic and social factors influencing their travel capacity. This interplay between residential segregation and mobility-related segregation patterns is intricate, as economic, cultural, physical, and spatial factors not only shape individual mobility but also, in turn, influence individual segregation experiences. Such complexity underscores the multifaceted nature of socio-spatial segregation and its challenges.

This section synthesizes the literature review to answer the research questions proposed in this study regarding the role of mobility in individual segregation experiences. Initially, we shift our focus from a static residential viewpoint to a dynamic activity-space paradigm, exploring what this perspective shift reveals (Section 6.1). We then examine the factors contributing to disparities in individual segregation experiences (Section 6.2). Subsequently, we evaluate the burgeoning literature utilizing emerging data sources, assessing its potential and challenges in understanding spatial segregation (Section 6.3). Finally, we pinpoint existing research gaps and propose corresponding future directions.

6.1 Mobility in shaping individual segregation experiences

This study investigated the literature using the activity space approach and empirical mobility data in quantifying socio-spatial segregation to examine whether individual mobility contributes lower to segregation levels than traditional residential segregation. The literature using either traditional or emerging data sources reveals no single answer.

Several studies underscore the correlation between residential segregation and experienced segregation, drawing attention to the phenomenon of mobility homophily. These studies indicate that despite increased mobility, segregation patterns often persist or become more pronounced, with mobility sometimes restricted to within certain community bounds or along racial, ethnic, or tribal lines. Conversely, other research focuses on how mobility can mitigate segregation experiences, revealing disparities among different socioeconomic groups. They highlight instances where we see lower levels of segregation in activity spaces than the ones of residential segregation. This reduction is due to greater exposure to diverse racial-ethnic groups in nonresidential environments, workplaces, and other activity spaces.

Overall, the literature highlights the segregation-reducing effect of mobility compared to the other side of the coin, i.e., its segregation-reinforcing effect. However, these two aspects are not contradictory to each other. Some studies highlight both sides [e.g., Silm et al., 2018, Zhang et al., 2022b, Lin and Ta, 2023], drawing attention to the complexity of the relationship between residential and experienced segregation levels.

6.2 Mechanisms in segregation experiences

Synthesizing the findings from the literature in a broader context, we summarize the mechanisms of spatial segregation.

- **Economic and cultural influences**
Job opportunities, leisure options, and cultural preferences based on ethnicity, nativity, and income level significantly shape individual mobility and, consequently, segregation experiences.
- **Social networks and interactions**
The nature of social networks within ethnic communities, neighborhood trust levels, and preferences for social interaction contribute to forming segregation patterns. Mobility homophily, or the tendency to interact with similar socioeconomic groups, further reinforces these patterns.
- **Physical and spatial factors**
The design of urban spaces, including the layout of neighborhoods, proximity to amenities, and public transportation systems, influences how individuals experience segregation in their daily lives. Therefore, housing policies, urban planning decisions, and transport infrastructure can potentially mitigate or exacerbate segregation experiences. These elements determine where people can reside, work, and participate in daily activities, significantly influencing their segregation experiences.

6.3 Emerging data sources: nuanced understanding at scale

We have found over 70 reference studies using geolocation information from emerging data sources such as GPS tracking devices, mobile phone GPS, Call Detail Records, and geotagged tweets to quantify socio-spatial segregation. Studies using emerging data sources, compared to those relying on traditional data, provide evidence based on actual behavioral data on mobility rather than stated preferences and offer broader spatial and population coverage with high spatiotemporal granularity [Nilforoshan et al., 2023]. These emerging-data studies typically quantify multi-dimensional aspects of socio-spatial segregation, simultaneously examining race/ethnicity, nativity, income, and other factors [e.g., Heine et al., 2021]. In contrast, traditional data-driven studies often focus on a single aspect of segregation, e.g., housing [Wang et al., 2012], linking it to other relevant and readily available explanatory variables in the applied data. With data from a wide range of users, these sources offer diverse demographic insights, capturing the experiences and behaviors of different social groups and revealing interacting effects between various dimensions, e.g., income and nativity [Gao et al., 2021].

Emerging data sources often provide large-scale insights into segregation levels while preserving nuanced understandings to zoom in at the block level [Moro et al., 2021, Nilforoshan et al., 2023]. Most studies examining the entire country [Vachuska, 2023] or major metropolitan areas [Moro et al., 2021, Wu and Huang, 2022, Huang et al., 2022] use data collected from the US. Leveraging these widely available data sources allows for a detailed examination of various points of interest [Moro et al., 2021] and regions, uncovering segregation patterns at the block level [Wu and Huang, 2022]. They also enable near real-time analysis with high temporal granularity, providing insights into dynamic segregation patterns and trends as they change over different times of the day [Shen and Luo, 2023] and seasons of the year [Mooses et al., 2016].

The abundance and intricacy of big data have spurred the development of innovative analytical methods and tools in spatial segregation research. For example, the theory of mobility homophily, confirmed across multiple regions [Xu et al., 2019, Heine et al., 2021, Huang et al., 2022], extends its relevance beyond residential segregation to include daily segregation experiences. Leveraging emerging data sources allows for integrating extensive mobility geolocation data with social network data, unveiling patterns previously unobservable at such refined scales [Xu et al., 2019, Silm et al., 2021]. Building on this, Moro et al. [2021] have developed a social exploration and preferential return model using vast human mobility geolocation data, effectively capturing the dual aspects of economic integration: social and place explorations. By harnessing extensive mobility data from large populations, it becomes feasible to construct a large-scale mobility network [Nilforoshan et al., 2023] and employ network analysis tools, like community detection, to uncover insights into segregation patterns at a national level [Huang et al., 2022].

6.3.1 Challenges

Emerging data sources, such as mobile phone applications and GPS-enabled services, face two significant challenges: population bias and uneven sampling of locations. Population bias arises because the user demographics behind this big geodata, including age, gender, and ethnicity, often do not accurately represent the broader population. Therefore, appropriately weighting individual devices in spatial segregation analysis is crucial to prevent inaccurate results [Wang et al., 2018]. Saxon [2021] show that spatial models using mobile phone GPS data have systematic bias, notably towards overestimating the park access of minority populations, which results in understating inequity.

An uneven sampling of locations brings two types of biases in the collected geolocation data on human mobility. Firstly, self-reported geolocations such as geotagged tweets have selective biases, overly representing leisure and non-routine activities [Liao et al., 2019]. Secondly, passively collected geodata from call detail records or GPS-enabled phone applications are contingent on user interactions with mobile phones, resulting in data sparsity and biases, particularly towards activities in the afternoon and nighttime [Liao, 2021]. These factors significantly influence the analysis of segregation experiences, considering the recorded activity spaces visited instead of the full range.

Analyzing socio-spatial segregation with anonymized mobile phone data necessitates implementing home detection methods to infer the sociodemographic attributes of the device users. Traced by human circadian rhythms, temporal rules are commonly used to infer individuals' home and work locations from mobile phone data [e.g., Gao et al., 2021]. There is a notable lack of validation against ground truth data, mainly due to privacy concerns and the anonymization of big geolocation data [Verma et al., 2024]. However, accurately identifying home and work locations remains crucial for understanding daily mobility patterns and capturing individual segregation experiences. More work is needed to examine and enhance the validity of these methods for practical applications in socio-spatial segregation research [Pappalardo et al., 2021].

Another limitation is regarding the collection and analysis of demographic and household data. The inability to directly ascertain gender, age, or family composition, alongside reliance on residential location to infer income, restricts our understanding of socio-economic diversity. Additionally, the focus on individual mobile devices, without access to household-level information, limits insights into how household structure affects mobility and segregation patterns, highlighting a significant gap in analyzing collective household dynamics.

6.4 Future research directions

Numerous studies employing activity space approaches quantify spatial segregation, utilizing both small and large data sets. These approaches are predominantly descriptive, focusing on defining and measuring social segregation through human mobility data. Their principal contribution lies in transcending traditional residential perspectives. With over a decade since this paradigm shift in socio-spatial segregation research, moving from a static residential viewpoint to a dynamic, mobility-based one, the field is now poised to advance beyond mere descriptive analysis. There is a pressing need to delve deeper into explaining observed social segregation phenomena within various spatiotemporal contexts.

As highlighted in this review (Section 5), numerous transport and urban science studies have provided insights into socio-spatial segregation in diverse spatial contexts over time. However, these studies often treat socio-spatial segregation primarily as a static residential phenomenon, seldom considering how individuals experience it daily. For instance, the concept of spatial mismatch is typically employed to explain residential segregation, and in transport equity evaluations, accessibility is primarily calculated based on residential locations. Despite these efforts, the direct contributions of these factors to individuals' daily segregation experiences remain somewhat ambiguous.

Looking ahead, we advocate for three critical research directions that emphasize the need for a cross-disciplinary approach at the intersection of urban social science and transportation. These include exploring how people experience social segregation daily and devising region-specific explanations. First, we suggest that activity space approaches fueled by big geodata should be integrated with additional data sources that quantify transport systems and urban

spaces. This integration would enable a more comprehensive analysis of the relationships among housing, transport access, urban design, and individual segregation experiences [Zhang et al., 2022a, Vachuska, 2023, Nilforoshan et al., 2023], thereby maximizing the potential of big data’s scale effect. Second, studies employing urban space analysis to foster spatial integration should incorporate empirical insights into people’s mobility behaviors. As empirical mobility data reveals, the urban design challenge for promoting social inclusion may reside in bridging the gap between intended and observed social mixing between different populations. Third, one shall explore the causal relationships between land use, transportation infrastructure, and experienced segregation. Investigating how variations in land use patterns and accessibility levels influence human mobility could yield valuable insights into the effectiveness of policy interventions that foster social mixing. This approach could help identify strategies for mitigating segregation and enhancing community cohesion through urban planning and policy design.

Acknowledgements

We thank E. Moro for providing insightful comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript. This research is funded by the Swedish Research Council (Project Number 2022-06215).

During the preparation of this work the authors used GPT-4 and Jenni.ai in order to improve the language use. After using this tool/service, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the preprint.

A Literature selection methods

This literature review is centered around three pivotal concepts: segregation, activity space, and the role of the built environment in facilitating mobility. The included studies were extracted from the Scopus database on Oct 18, 2023, covering the original research in English published as journal or conference articles. Table A.1 shows the search keywords and search query, which are designed to identify the role of mobility in shaping individual segregation experiences quantified using activity space approaches and gain relevant insights in the field of built environment, including transport and urban science research.

Table A.1: Keywords for literature search.

| Theme | Keywords |
|-----------------------|---|
| (1) Segregation | segregation, spatial integration, social integration, socio-spatial integration, social cohesion |
| (2) Activity space | spatial mobility, human mobility, daily mobility, personal mobility, individual mobility, spatio-temporal mobility, spatiotemporal mobility, socio-spatial mobility, sociospatial mobility, urban mobility, spatial movement, activity space, action space, spatial network, spatial behavior, spatio-temporal behavior, spatiotemporal behavior, use of space, lifeworld, person-based, individual-based |
| (3) Encounter | social mix, encountering, encounter, encounter network, social ties, third places, cross-cultural encounters, shared experiences, connectivity, co-presence, co-existence, co-presenting |
| (4) Built environment | mobility, access inequality, accessibility, access, social and spatial inequality, transport-related social exclusion, urban sprawl, transport modes, modal split, transit deserts, transport justice, active transportation, transit-oriented development, multi-modality, travel behavior, transport affordability, traffic congestion, public transport subsidies |
| Search query | Titles, abstract, and keywords include (1 AND 2) OR (1 AND 3) OR (1 AND 4) |

Our study focuses on research that employs empirical data to quantify socio-spatial segregation from an activity space viewpoint. This approach addresses our first research question regarding the influence of mobility on individual segregation experiences, encompassing Themes 1 & 2, which are detailed in Sections 3 and 4. We categorize the studies into two groups: those relying on traditional data sources like travel surveys, census, and register data and those employing emerging data sources, including GPS trackers and mobile phone data. Additionally, we examine studies that estimate potential interactions facilitated by the built environment alongside insights from transport and urban science regarding housing, transport accessibility, and urban design. These studies, which align with Themes 1 & 3 and Themes 1 & 4, are explored in Section 5. They contribute to our second research question, aiming to elucidate segregation experiences and propose potential solutions to socio-spatial segregation.

Figure A.1 summarizes the included original studies. Figures A.1a-b show the studies cited under Sections 3-4 on empirical findings of individual segregation experiences using activity space approaches. Figures A.1c-d illustrate those references under Section 6 on explaining segregation from a built environment perspective.




Figure A.1: Referenced papers from activity space and built environment perspectives. These statistics only include original studies published in journals or conference proceedings, excluding reviews, opinions, and other articles cited in this study. (a) Number of activity space papers by studied country, year, and data source (Themes 1 & 2.) (b) Number of transport and urban science papers by studied country and year (Themes 1 & 3 and Themes 1 & 4.)

References

- Tanja Joelsson and Danielle Ekman Ladru. Cracks in the well-plastered façade of the nordic model: reflections on inequalities in housing and mobility in (post-) coronavirus pandemic sweden. *Children's Geographies*, 20(4): 478–486, 2022.
- Yanji Zhang, Liang Cai, Guangwen Song, Lin Liu, and Chunwu Zhu. From residential neighborhood to activity space: The effects of educational segregation on crime and their moderation by social context. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 112(8):2393–2412, 2022a.
- Siiri Silm and Rein Ahas. Ethnic differences in activity spaces: A study of out-of-home nonemployment activities with mobile phone data. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 104(3):542–559, 2014a.
- Qing-Quan Li, Yang Yue, Qi-Li Gao, Chen Zhong, and Joana Barros. Towards a new paradigm for segregation measurement in an age of big data. *Urban Informatics*, 1(1):5, 2022a.
- Songhua Hu, Chenfeng Xiong, Hannah Younes, Mofeng Yang, Aref Darzi, and Zhiyu Catherine Jin. Examining spatiotemporal evolution of racial/ethnic disparities in human mobility and covid-19 health outcomes: Evidence from the contiguous united states. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 76:103506, 2022.
- Alice Z Xu. Segregation and the spatial externalities of inequality: A theory of interdependence and public goods in cities. *American Political Science Review*, pages 1–18, 2023.
- Esteban Moro, Dan Calacci, Xiaowen Dong, and Alex Pentland. Mobility patterns are associated with experienced income segregation in large us cities. *Nature communications*, 12(1):4633, 2021.
- Jonathan Rokem and Laura Vaughan. Segregation, mobility and encounters in jerusalem: The role of public transport infrastructure in connecting the ‘divided city’. *Urban Studies*, 55(15):3454–3473, 2018.
- Mei-Po Kwan. Beyond space (as we knew it): Toward temporally integrated geographies of segregation, health, and accessibility: Space–time integration in geography and giscience. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 103(5):1078–1086, 2013.
- Flávia F Feitosa, Gilberto Camara, Antônio Miguel Vieira Monteiro, Thomas Koschitzki, and Marcelino PS Silva. Global and local spatial indices of urban segregation. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*, 21(3):299–323, 2007.
- Xingang Zhou, Zifeng Chen, Anthony GO Yeh, and Yang Yue. Workplace segregation of rural migrants in urban china: A case study of shenzhen using cellphone big data. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, 48(1):25–42, 2021.

- Marina Toger, Umut Türk, John Östh, Karima Kourtit, and Peter Nijkamp. Inequality in leisure mobility: An analysis of activity space segregation spectra in the stockholm conurbation. *Journal of transport geography*, 111:103638, 2023.
- Robert J Sampson and Brian L Levy. Beyond residential segregation: Mobility-based connectedness and rates of violence in large cities. *Race and social problems*, 12(1):77–86, 2020.
- Jennifer Candipan, Nolan Edward Phillips, Robert J Sampson, and Mario Small. From residence to movement: The nature of racial segregation in everyday urban mobility. *Urban Studies*, 58(15):3095–3117, 2021.
- Fei Li and Donggen Wang. Measuring urban segregation based on individuals’ daily activity patterns: A multidimensional approach. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 49(2):467–486, 2017.
- Stephen Roulston and Orna Young. Gps tracking of some northern ireland students—patterns of shared and separated space: divided we stand? *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*, 22(3):241–258, 2013.
- Yang Xu, Alexander Belyi, Paolo Santi, and Carlo Ratti. Quantifying segregation in an integrated urban physical-social space. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 16(160):20190536, 2019.
- Qi Wang, Nolan Edward Phillips, Mario L Small, and Robert J Sampson. Urban mobility and neighborhood isolation in america’s 50 largest cities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(30):7735–7740, 2018.
- Jing Yao, David WS Wong, Nick Bailey, and Jonathan Minton. Spatial segregation measures: A methodological review. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, 110(3):235–250, 2019.
- Kerli Müürisepp, Olle Järv, Tiit Tammaru, and Tuuli Toivonen. Activity spaces and big data sources in segregation research: A methodological review. *Frontiers in Sustainable Cities*, 4:861640, 2022.
- Otis Dudley Duncan and Beverly Duncan. A methodological analysis of segregation indexes. *American sociological review*, 20(2):210–217, 1955.
- Roger Andersson and Åsa BråmÅ. Selective migration in swedish distressed neighbourhoods: can area-based urban policies counteract segregation processes? *Housing studies*, 19(4):517–539, 2004.
- Anna Yunitsyna and Ernest Shtepani. Investigating the socio-spatial relations of the built environment using the space syntax analysis—a case study of tirana city. *Cities*, 133:104147, 2023.
- Yoo Min Park and Mei-Po Kwan. Beyond residential segregation: A spatiotemporal approach to examining multi-contextual segregation. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 71:98–108, 2018.
- Willem R Boterman and Sako Musterd. Cocooning urban life: Exposure to diversity in neighbourhoods, workplaces and transport. *Cities*, 59:139–147, 2016.
- Roger Andersson, Åsa BråmÅ, and Emma Holmqvist. Counteracting segregation: Swedish policies and experiences. *Housing studies*, 25(2):237–256, 2010.
- Vinicius M Netto, Maíra Pinheiro Soares, and Roberto Paschoalino. Segregated networks in the city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39(6):1084–1102, 2015.
- Jose Carpio-Pinedo. Multimodal transport and potential encounters with social difference: A novel approach based on network analysis. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 43(1):93–116, 2021.
- E Ravalet. Segregation and daily mobility, an international comparison. *WIT Transactions on the Built Environment*, 89, 2006.
- Donggen Wang, Fei Li, and Yanwei Chai. Activity spaces and sociospatial segregation in beijing. *Urban Geography*, 33(2):256–277, 2012.
- Guillaume Le Roux, Julie Vallée, and Hadrien Commenges. Social segregation around the clock in the paris region (france). *Journal of Transport Geography*, 59:134–145, 2017.
- John D Landis. Minority travel disparities and residential segregation: Evidence from the 2017 national household travel survey. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 112:103455, 2022.
- Shuting Lin and Na Ta. Does social exposure influence locals’ and migrants’ city attachment? comparing residential areas and activity spaces. *Population, Space and Place*, 29(3):e2643, 2023.
- John Östh, Ian Shuttleworth, and Thomas Niedomysl. Spatial and temporal patterns of economic segregation in sweden’s metropolitan areas: A mobility approach. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 50(4): 809–825, 2018.
- Xiao Huang, Yuhui Zhao, Siqin Wang, Xiao Li, Di Yang, Yu Feng, Yang Xu, Liao Zhu, and Biyu Chen. Unfolding community homophily in us metropolitans via human mobility. *Cities*, 129:103929, 2022.

- Meiliu Wu, Xinyi Liu, Yuehan Qin, and Qunying Huang. Revealing racial-ethnic segregation with individual experienced segregation indices based on social media data: A case study in los angeles-long beach-anaheim. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 104:102008, 2023.
- Vinicius M Netto, João Vitor Meirelles, Maíra Pinheiro, and Henrique Lorea. A temporal geography of encounters. *CyberGeo: European Journal of Geography*, 2018.
- Hugo Barbosa, Marc Barthelemy, Gourab Ghoshal, Charlotte R James, Maxime Lenormand, Thomas Louail, Ronaldo Menezes, José J Ramasco, Filippo Simini, and Marcello Tomasini. Human mobility: Models and applications. *Physics Reports*, 734:1–74, 2018.
- Randall Collins. *Interaction ritual chains*. Princeton university press, 2004.
- Joshua Blumenstock and Lauren Fratamico. Social and spatial ethnic segregation: A framework for analyzing segregation with large-scale spatial network data. In *Proceedings of the 4th Annual Symposium on Computing for Development*, pages 1–10, 2013.
- Hamed Nilforoshan, Wenli Looi, Emma Pierson, Blanca Villanueva, Nic Fishman, Yiling Chen, John Sholar, Beth Redbird, David Grusky, and Jure Leskovec. Human mobility networks reveal increased segregation in large cities. *Nature*, pages 1–7, 2023.
- Nolan E Phillips, Brian L Levy, Robert J Sampson, Mario L Small, and Ryan Q Wang. The social integration of american cities: Network measures of connectedness based on everyday mobility across neighborhoods. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 50(3):1110–1149, 2021.
- Xue Zhang, Jue Wang, Mei-Po Kwan, and Yanwei Chai. Reside nearby, behave apart? activity-space-based segregation among residents of various types of housing in beijing, china. *Cities*, 88:166–180, 2019.
- Na Ta, Mei-Po Kwan, Shuting Lin, and Qiuyu Zhu. The activity space-based segregation of migrants in suburban shanghai. *Applied Geography*, 133:102499, 2021.
- Yao Shen. Segregation through space: A scope of the flow-based spatial interaction model. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 76:10–23, 2019.
- Sorath Abbasi, Joonho Ko, and Jaehong Min. Measuring destination-based segregation through mobility patterns: Application of transport card data. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 92:103025, 2021.
- Yirong Zhou, Ran Wei, Xiaoyue Cathy Liu, Danielle Wallace, and Tony Grubestic. Delineating race-specific driving patterns for identifying racial segregation. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 119:103769, 2023.
- Karl Vachuska. Racial segregation in everyday mobility patterns: Disentangling the effect of travel time. *Socius*, 9: 23780231231169261, 2023.
- Simone Bertoli, Caglar Ozden, and Michael Packard. Segregation and internal mobility of syrian refugees in turkey: Evidence from mobile phone data. *Journal of Development Economics*, 152:102704, 2021.
- Douglas S Massey and Nancy A Denton. The dimensions of residential segregation. *Social forces*, 67(2):281–315, 1988.
- Siiri Silm and Rein Ahas. The temporal variation of ethnic segregation in a city: Evidence from a mobile phone use dataset. *Social Science Research*, 47:30–43, 2014b.
- Susan Athey, Billy Ferguson, Matthew Gentzkow, and Tobias Schmidt. Estimating experienced racial segregation in us cities using large-scale gps data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(46):e2026160118, 2021.
- Ann Legeby, Meta Berghauser Pont, and Lars Marcus. Streets for co-presence?: Mapping potentials. In *The 10th International Space Syntax Symposium (SSS10), London, 13-17 July 2015*, pages 108–1. Space Syntax Laboratory, The Bartlett School of Architecture, University . . . , 2015.
- Sean F Reardon and David O’Sullivan. Measures of spatial segregation. *Sociological methodology*, 34(1):121–162, 2004.
- Ron Johnston, Michael Poulsen, and James Forrest. Ethnic and racial segregation in us metropolitan areas, 1980-2000: The dimensions of segregation revisited. *Urban Affairs Review*, 42(4):479–504, 2007.
- Florent Demoraes, Marc Souris, and Yasna Contreras Gatica. Live nearby, be different, work apart? some learnings from action spaces discrepancies in santiago de chile. *Geographical Analysis*, 53(2):329–354, 2021.
- David O’Sullivan and David WS Wong. A surface-based approach to measuring spatial segregation. *Geographical analysis*, 39(2):147–168, 2007.
- Steven Farber, Morton O’Kelly, Harvey J Miller, and Tijs Neutens. Measuring segregation using patterns of daily travel behavior: A social interaction based model of exposure. *Journal of transport geography*, 49:26–38, 2015.

- Madalina Olteanu and Jean-Charles Lamirel. When clustering the multiscale fingerprint of the city reveals its segregation patterns. In *Advances in Self-Organizing Maps, Learning Vector Quantization, Clustering and Data Visualization: Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop, WSOM+ 2019, Barcelona, Spain, June 26-28, 2019*, pages 140–149. Springer, 2020.
- Tong Zhang, Xiaoqi Duan, David WS Wong, and Yashan Lu. Discovering income-economic segregation patterns: A residential-mobility embedding approach. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 90:101709, 2021.
- Nandini Iyer, Ronaldo Menezes, and Hugo Barbosa. Mobility and transit segregation in urban spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07086*, 2023.
- Alasdair Turner, Maria Doxa, David O’sullivan, and Alan Penn. From isovists to visibility graphs: a methodology for the analysis of architectural space. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 28(1):103–121, 2001.
- Alasdair Turner. Angular analysis. In *Proceedings of the 3rd international symposium on space syntax*, volume 30, pages 30–11. Georgia Institute of Technology Atlanta, GA, 2001.
- Antonio Luca Alfeo, Mario GCA Cimino, Bruno Lepri, Alexander Sandy Pentland, and Gigliola Vaglini. Assessing refugees’ integration via spatio-temporal similarities of mobility and calling behaviors. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, 6(4):726–738, 2019.
- Lina Hedman, Kati Kadarik, Roger Andersson, and John Östh. Daily mobility patterns: Reducing or reproducing inequalities and segregation? *Social Inclusion*, 9(2):208–221, 2021.
- Ilan Shdema, Nasreen Haj-Yahya, and Izhak Schnell. The social space of arab residents of mixed israeli cities. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 100(4):359–376, 2018.
- Ignacio Tiznado-Aitken, Giovanni Vecchio, Luis A Guzman, Julián Arellana, Mateus Humberto, Eduardo Vasconcellos, and Juan Carlos Muñoz. Unequal periurban mobility: Travel patterns, modal choices and urban core dependence in latin america. *Habitat International*, 133:102752, 2023.
- KE Aksyonov. Social segregation of personal activity spaces in a posttransformation metropolis (case study of st. petersburg). *Regional Research of Russia*, 1:52–61, 2011.
- Daanika Gordon. Daily mobility in the black-white segregated city: Linking material realities and repertoires of meaning. *Sociological Perspectives*, 61(4):661–680, 2018.
- Yiming Tan, Mei-Po Kwan, and Yanwei Chai. Examining the impacts of ethnicity on space-time behavior: Evidence from the city of xining, china. *Cities*, 64:26–36, 2017.
- Yiming Tan, Yanwei Chai, and Zifeng Chen. Social-contextual exposure of ethnic groups in urban china: from residential place to activity space. *Population, Space and Place*, 25(7):e2248, 2019.
- Rafiazka Millanida Hilman, Gerardo Iñiguez, and Márton Karsai. Socioeconomic biases in urban mixing patterns of us metropolitan areas. *EPJ data science*, 11(1):32, 2022.
- Alexander Amini, Kevin Kung, Chaogui Kang, Stanislav Sobolevsky, and Carlo Ratti. The impact of social segregation on human mobility in developing and industrialized regions. *EPJ Data Science*, 3(1):1–20, 2014.
- Nibir Bora, Yu-Han Chang, and Rajiv Maheswaran. Mobility patterns and user dynamics in racially segregated geographies of us cities. In *Social Computing, Behavioral-Cultural Modeling and Prediction: 7th International Conference, SBP 2014, Washington, DC, USA, April 1-4, 2014. Proceedings 7*, pages 11–18. Springer, 2014.
- Gemma Davies, John Dixon, Colin G Tredoux, J Duncan Whyatt, Jonny J Huck, Brendan Sturgeon, Bree T Hocking, Neil Jarman, and Dominic Bryan. Networks of (dis) connection: mobility practices, tertiary streets, and sectarian divisions in north belfast. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 109(6):1729–1747, 2019.
- David WS Wong and Shih-Lung Shaw. Measuring segregation: An activity space approach. *Journal of geographical systems*, 13:127–145, 2011.
- Malia Jones and Anne R Pebley. Redefining neighborhoods using common destinations: Social characteristics of activity spaces and home census tracts compared. *Demography*, 51(3):727–752, 2014.
- Nicolo P Pinchak, Christopher R Browning, Catherine A Calder, and Bethany Boettner. Activity locations, residential segregation and the significance of residential neighbourhood boundary perceptions. *Urban Studies*, 58(13):2758–2781, 2021.
- Donggen Wang and Fei Li. Daily activity space and exposure: A comparative study of hong kong’s public and private housing residents’ segregation in daily life. *Cities*, 59:148–155, 2016.
- Sarah Garlick, Gemma Catney, Frances Darlington-Pollock, and Christopher D Lloyd. Is there greater ethnic mixing in residential or workplace spaces? *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, pages 1–21, 2022.

- Luis Fuentes, Ricardo Truffello, and Mónica Flores. Impact of land use diversity on daytime social segregation patterns in Santiago de Chile. *Buildings*, 12(2):149, 2022.
- Nastasija Grujić, Sanja Brdar, Olivera Novović, Miro Govedarica, and Vladimir Crnojević. Evidence of urban segregation from mobile phone data: A case study of Novi Sad. In *2019 27th Telecommunications Forum (TELFOR)*, pages 1–4. IEEE, 2019.
- Borja Moya-Gómez, Marcin Stepniak, Juan Carlos García-Palomares, Enrique Frías-Martínez, and Javier Gutiérrez. Exploring night and day socio-spatial segregation based on mobile phone data: The case of Medellín (Colombia). *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 89:101675, 2021.
- Eun Jin Shin. Spatial segregation of Chinese immigrants in Seoul, South Korea, during the COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence from population data derived from mobile phone signals. *The Social Science Journal*, pages 1–22, 2021.
- Siiri Silm, Veronika Mooses, Anniki Puura, Anu Masso, Ago Tominga, and Erki Saluveer. The relationship between ethno-linguistic composition of social networks and activity space: A study using mobile phone data. *Social Inclusion*, 9(2):192–207, 2021.
- Shi Xian, Zhixin Qi, and Ngai-ming Yip. Beyond home neighborhood: Mobility, activity and temporal variation of socio-spatial segregation. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 99:103304, 2022.
- Wenfei Xu. The contingency of neighbourhood diversity: Variation of social context using mobile phone application data. *Urban Studies*, 59(4):851–869, 2022.
- Taylor Shelton, Ate Poorthuis, and Matthew Zook. Social media and the city: Rethinking urban socio-spatial inequality using user-generated geographic information. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 142:198–211, 2015.
- Seong-Yun Hong. Open-source tools for the measurement of socio-spatial segregation in activity spaces. *Transactions in GIS*, 24(5):1248–1263, 2020.
- Izhak Schnell and Nasreen Haj-Yahya. Arab integration in Jewish-Israeli social space: Does commuting make a difference? *Urban Geography*, 35(7):1084–1104, 2014.
- Gehan Selim. The landscape of differences: Contact and segregation in the everyday encounters. *Cities*, 46:16–25, 2015.
- Ravit Goldhaber and Izhak Schnell. A model of multidimensional segregation in the Arab ghetto in Tel Aviv-Jaffa. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, 98(5):603–620, 2007.
- Christopher R Browning, Catherine A Calder, Lauren J Krivo, Anna L Smith, and Bethany Boettner. Socioeconomic segregation of activity spaces in urban neighborhoods: Does shared residence mean shared routines? *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 3(2):210–231, 2017.
- Yongjun Zhang, Siwei Cheng, Zhi Li, and Wenhao Jiang. Human mobility patterns are associated with experienced partisan segregation in US metropolitan areas. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1):9768, 2023.
- Siiri Silm, Rein Ahas, and Veronika Mooses. Are younger age groups less segregated? Measuring ethnic segregation in activity spaces using mobile phone data. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44(11):1797–1817, 2018. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2017.1400425.
- Yanji Zhang, Jiejing Wang, and Changcheng Kan. Temporal variation in activity-space-based segregation: A case study of Beijing using location-based service data. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 98:103239, 2022b.
- Teodoro Dannemann, Boris Sotomayor-Gómez, and Horacio Samaniego. The time geography of segregation during working hours. *Royal Society open science*, 5(10):180749, 2018.
- Sándor Juhász, Gergő Pintér, Ádám J Kovács, Endre Borza, Gergely Mónus, László Lőrincz, and Balázs Lengyel. Amenity complexity and urban locations of socio-economic mixing. *EPJ Data Science*, 12(1):34, 2023.
- Mengling Qiao, Yandong Wang, Shanmei Wu, Xiaokang Fu, Yanyan Gu, and Mingxuan Dou. A realistic and multilevel measurement of citywide spatial patterns of economic segregation based on human activities. *Cities*, 110:103067, 2021.
- Xiang Zhou and Yuning Cheng. Between state and family: Discussion on the segregation and integration of the daily living space within Shanghai historic lane neighborhood. *Home Cultures*, 16(3):163–190, 2019.
- Michael Dorman, Tal Svoray, and Itai Kloog. How does socio-economic and demographic dissimilarity determine physical and virtual segregation? *Journal of Spatial Information Science*, (21):177–202, 2020.
- Thomas Marlow, Kinga Makovi, and Bruno Abrahao. Neighborhood isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sociological Science*, 8:170–190, 2021.

- Xiao Li, Xiao Huang, Dongying Li, and Yang Xu. Aggravated social segregation during the covid-19 pandemic: Evidence from crowdsourced mobility data in twelve most populated us metropolitan areas. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 81:103869, 2022b.
- Youngeng Lu and Genevieve Giuliano. Where do people meet? time-series clustering for social interaction levels in daily-life spaces during the covid-19 pandemic. *Cities*, 137:104298, 2023.
- Takahiro Yabe, Bernardo García Bulle Bueno, Xiaowen Dong, Alex Pentland, and Esteban Moro. Behavioral changes during the covid-19 pandemic decreased income diversity of urban encounters. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):2310, 2023.
- Giovanni Bonaccorsi, Francesco Pierri, Francesco Scotti, Andrea Flori, Francesco Manaresi, Stefano Ceri, and Fabio Pammolli. Socioeconomic differences and persistent segregation of italian territories during covid-19 pandemic. *Scientific reports*, 11(1):21174, 2021.
- Douglas Sathler and Guilherme Leiva. The city matters: urbanization, regional analysis and urban segregation in times of the covid-19 pandemic. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos de População*, 39:e0205, 2022.
- Takahiro Yabe and Satish V Ukkusuri. Effects of income inequality on evacuation, reentry and segregation after disasters. *Transportation research part D: transport and environment*, 82:102260, 2020.
- Hengfang Deng, Daniel P Aldrich, Michael M Danziger, Jianxi Gao, Nolan E Phillips, Sean P Cornelius, and Qi Ryan Wang. High-resolution human mobility data reveal race and wealth disparities in disaster evacuation patterns. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 8(1):1–8, 2021.
- Yang Xu, Paolo Santi, and Carlo Ratti. Beyond distance decay: Discover homophily in spatially embedded social networks. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 112(2):505–521, 2022.
- Ngai Ming Yip, Ray Forrest, and Shi Xian. Exploring segregation and mobilities: Application of an activity tracking app on mobile phone. *Cities*, 59:156–163, 2016.
- Meiliu Wu and Qunying Huang. Human movement patterns of different racial-ethnic and economic groups in us top 50 populated cities: What can social media tell us about isolation? *Annals of GIS*, 28(2):161–183, 2022.
- Cate Heine, Cristina Marquez, Paolo Santi, Marcus Sundberg, Miriam Nordfors, and Carlo Ratti. Analysis of mobility homophily in stockholm based on social network data. *PloS one*, 16(3):e0247996, 2021.
- Souneil Park, Taylor M Oshan, Abdallah El Ali, and Alessandro Finamore. Are we breaking bubbles as we move? using a large sample to explore the relationship between urban mobility and segregation. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 86:101585, 2021.
- Fei Chen, Suhong Zhou, Junwen Lu, and Zhong Zheng. A behavioral explanation of the activity-space segregation: Individuals' preference of choosing an activity destination. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, page 23998083241229110, 2024.
- Yanni Yang, Alex Pentland, and Esteban Moro. Identifying latent activity behaviors and lifestyles using mobility data to describe urban dynamics. *EPJ Data Science*, 12(1):15, 2023.
- Steven Farber, Antonio Pérez, and Catherine Morency. Activity spaces and the measurement of clustering and exposure: A case study of linguistic groups in montreal. *Environment and Planning A*, 44(2):315–332, 2012.
- Aafke Heringa, Gideon Bolt, Martin Dijst, and Ronald Van Kempen. Individual activity patterns and the meaning of residential environments for inter-ethnic contact. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, 105(1):64–78, 2014.
- Hui Wang, Mei-Po Kwan, Mingxing Hu, Junheng Qi, Jiemin Zheng, and Bin Han. Time allocation and the activity-space-based segregation of different income groups: A case study of nanjing. *Land*, 11(10):1717, 2022.
- Sui Tao, Sylvia Y He, Mei-Po Kwan, and Shuli Luo. Does low income translate into lower mobility? an investigation of activity space in hong kong between 2002 and 2011. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 82:102583, 2020a.
- Ilaria Zambon, Pere Serra, David Sauri, Margherita Carlucci, and Luca Salvati. Beyond the 'mediterranean city': Socioeconomic disparities and urban sprawl in three southern european cities. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 99(3):319–337, 2017.
- Suhong Zhou, Lifang Deng, Mei-Po Kwan, and Ruogu Yan. Social and spatial differentiation of high and low income groups' out-of-home activities in guangzhou, china. *Cities*, 45:81–90, 2015.
- Manish Shirgaokar and Erin Nobler. Differences in daily trips between immigrants and us-born individuals: Implications for social integration. *Transport policy*, 105:103–114, 2021.
- Rowland Atkinson. Limited exposure: Social concealment, mobility and engagement with public space by the super-rich in london. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 48(7):1302–1317, 2016.

- Bart Wissink and Arjan Hazelzet. Bangkok living: Encountering others in a gated urban field. *Cities*, 59:164–172, 2016.
- Malka Greenberg Raanan and Noam Shoval. Mental maps compared to actual spatial behavior using gps data: A new method for investigating segregation in cities. *Cities*, 36:28–40, 2014.
- Olle Järv, Kerli Müürisepp, Rein Ahas, Ben Derudder, and Frank Witlox. Ethnic differences in activity spaces as a characteristic of segregation: A study based on mobile phone usage in tallinn, estonia. *Urban Studies*, 52(14): 2680–2698, 2015.
- Eun Jin Shin. Ethnic neighborhoods, social networks, and inter-household carpooling: A comparison across ethnic minority groups. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 59:14–26, 2017.
- Ariel Salgado, Weixin Li, Fahad Alhasoun, Inés Caridi, and Marta Gonzalez. Street context of various demographic groups in their daily mobility. *Applied Network Science*, 6(1):1–14, 2021.
- Olle Järv, Anu Masso, Siiri Silm, and Rein Ahas. The link between ethnic segregation and socio-economic status: An activity space approach. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, 112(3):319–335, 2021.
- John Dixon, Colin Tredoux, Gemma Davies, Jonny Huck, Bree Hocking, Brendan Sturgeon, Duncan Whyatt, Neil Jarman, and Dominic Bryan. Parallel lives: Intergroup contact, threat, and the segregation of everyday activity spaces. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 118(3):457, 2020.
- Daniel Oviedo Hernandez and Helena Titheridge. Mobilities of the periphery: Informality, access and social exclusion in the urban fringe in colombia. *Journal of transport geography*, 55:152–164, 2016.
- Sui Tao, Sylvia Y He, and Shuli Luo. The influence of job accessibility on local residential segregation of ethnic minorities: A study of hong kong. *Population, Space and Place*, 26(8):e2353, 2020b.
- Nikos Patias, Francisco Rowe, and Dani Arribas-Bel. Local urban attributes defining ethnically segregated areas across english cities: A multilevel approach. *Cities*, 132:103967, 2023.
- Yue Shen and Xueyao Luo. Linking spatial and temporal contexts to multi-contextual segregation by hukou status in urban china. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 107:103540, 2023.
- Anne Power. Social inequality, disadvantaged neighbourhoods and transport deprivation: an assessment of the historical influence of housing policies. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 21:39–48, 2012.
- Bruna Da Cunha Kronenberger and Renato Tibiriçá De Saboya. A configurational study of sociospatial segregation in the metropolitan region of Florianópolis, Brazil. In *Proceedings 11th International Space Syntax Symposium*, volume 11, pages 75–1, 2017.
- Laura H Atuesta, J Eduardo Ibarra-Olivo, Nancy Lozano-Gracia, and Uwe Deichmann. Access to employment and property values in Mexico. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 70:142–154, 2018.
- Paavo Monkkonen, Andre Comandon, Jorge Alberto Montejano Escamilla, and Erick Guerra. Urban sprawl and the growing geographic scale of segregation in Mexico, 1990–2010. *Habitat International*, 73:89–95, 2018.
- Taina A Bittencourt, Mariana Giannotti, and Eduardo Marques. Cumulative (and self-reinforcing) spatial inequalities: Interactions between accessibility and segregation in four Brazilian metropolises. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, 48(7):1989–2005, 2021.
- Pengjun Zhao. The impact of urban sprawl on social segregation in Beijing and a limited role for spatial planning. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, 104(5):571–587, 2013.
- Abolghasem Azhdari, Mohammad Ali Sasani, and Ali Soltani. Exploring the relationship between spatial driving forces of urban expansion and socioeconomic segregation: The case of Shiraz. *Habitat International*, 81:33–44, 2018.
- Cristhian Figueroa, Margarita Greene, and Rodrigo Mora. Urban structure and the layout of social segregation. In *12th International Space Syntax Symposium, SSS 2019*, 2019. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85083951364&partnerID=40&md5=923976dd7c66c98cde0aa1997cf7c53c>.
- Reid Ewing, Shima Hamidi, James B Grace, and Yehua Dennis Wei. Does urban sprawl hold down upward mobility? *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 148:80–88, 2016.
- John F Kain. Housing segregation, negro employment, and metropolitan decentralization. *The quarterly journal of economics*, 82(2):175–197, 1968.
- Janeria Easley. Spatial mismatch beyond black and white: Levels and determinants of job access among Asian and Hispanic subpopulations. *Urban Studies*, 55(8):1800–1820, 2018.
- Maite Blázquez, Carlos Llano, and Julian Moral. Commuting times: Is there any penalty for immigrants? *Urban Studies*, 47(8):1663–1686, 2010.

- Zifeng Chen and Anthony Gar-On Yeh. Accessibility inequality and income disparity in urban china: a case study of guangzhou. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 109(1):121–141, 2019.
- Chen Chen, Lin Cheng, Chunliang Xiu, and Jiuquan Li. Spatial mismatch or not? evidence from public janitors in xi'an, china. *Chinese Geographical Science*, 31:376–386, 2021.
- Karen Lucas, Giulio Mattioli, Ersilia Verlinghieri, and Alvaro Guzman. Transport poverty and its adverse social consequences. In *Proceedings of the institution of civil engineers-transport*, volume 169, pages 353–365. Thomas Telford Ltd, 2016.
- Gregorio Luz and Licinio Portugal. Understanding transport-related social exclusion through the lens of capabilities approach. *Transport Reviews*, 42(4):503–525, 2022.
- Jorge Gallego Méndez, Lina M García-Moreno, Jackeline Murillo-Hoyos, and Ciro Jaramillo Molina. Social inequality in popular neighborhoods: A pre-and post-pandemic perspective from joint accessibility. *Sustainability*, 15(13):10587, 2023.
- Jonathan Rokem and Laura Vaughan. Geographies of ethnic segregation in stockholm: The role of mobility and co-presence in shaping the 'diverse' city. *Urban Studies*, 56(12):2426–2446, 2019.
- Rafael HM Pereira, Tim Schwanen, and David Banister. Distributive justice and equity in transportation. *Transport reviews*, 37(2):170–191, 2017.
- Seongman Jang and Changhyo Yi. Imbalance between local commuting accessibility and residential locations of households by income class in the seoul metropolitan area. *Cities*, 109:103011, 2021.
- Julian Arellana, Daniel Oviedo, Luis A Guzman, and Vilma Alvarez. Urban transport planning and access inequalities: A tale of two colombian cities. *Research in Transportation Business & Management*, 40:100554, 2021.
- Pedro Logiodice, Renato Arbex, Diego Bogado Tomasiello, and Mariana A Giannotti. Spatial visualization of job inaccessibility to identify transport related social exclusion. In *GeolInfo*, pages 105–118, 2015.
- Cristhian Figueroa Martínez, Frances Hodgson, Caroline Mullen, and Paul Timms. Creating inequality in accessibility: The relationships between public transport and social housing policy in deprived areas of santiago de chile. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 67:102–109, 2018.
- Yasna Cortés. Spatial accessibility to local public services in an unequal place: An analysis from patterns of residential segregation in the metropolitan area of santiago, chile. *Sustainability*, 13(2):442, 2021.
- Yujie Hu, Fahui Wang, and Chester G Wilmot. Commuting variability by wage groups in baton rouge, 1990–2010. *Papers in Applied Geography*, 3(1):14–29, 2017.
- Javier Peña, Julian Arellana, and Luis A Guzman. Which dots to connect? employment centers and commuting inequalities in bogotá. *Journal of Transport and Land Use*, 15(1):17–34, 2022.
- Gordon Cromley and Jie Lin. Examining the interplay between racial segregation patterns and access to hospital care. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, 50(1):117–129, 2023.
- Ismail Haque. Discriminated urban spaces: A study of spatial segregation in urban west bengal. *Economic and Political Weekly*, pages 41–50, 2016.
- Weiye Xiao, Yehua Dennis Wei, and Han Li. Spatial inequality of job accessibility in shanghai: A geographical skills mismatch perspective. *Habitat international*, 115:102401, 2021.
- Emre Korsu and Sandrine Wenglenki. Job accessibility, residential segregation and risk of long-term unemployment in the paris region. *Urban Studies*, 47(11):2279–2324, 2010.
- Seher Ozkazanc. Transportation experiences of syrian refugees under the clampdown of poverty, social exclusion and spatial segregation. *Cities*, 112:103117, 2021.
- Joseph Galaskiewicz, Kathryn Freeman Anderson, and Kendra Thompson-Dyck. Minority-white income inequality across metropolitan areas: The role of racial/ethnic residential segregation and transportation networks. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 43(1):16–39, 2021.
- Hyunjoo Eom. Does job accessibility matter in the suburbs? black suburbia, job accessibility, and employment outcomes. *Land*, 11(11):1952, 2022.
- Sives Govender and Brij Maharaj. Segregation, buffer zones and transport routes: The saga of the second access road to chatsworth. *The Oriental Anthropologist*, 12(2):379–399, 2012.
- Aaron Golub, Richard A Marcantonio, and Thomas W Sanchez. Race, space, and struggles for mobility: Transportation impacts on african americans in oakland and the east bay. *Urban Geography*, 34(5):699–728, 2013.

- Jose Manuel Naranjo Gomez. Impacts on the social cohesion of mainland Spain's future motorway and high-speed rail networks. *Sustainability*, 8(7):624, 2016.
- Emmanuel Junior Adugbila, Javier A Martinez, and Karin Pfeffer. Road infrastructure expansion and socio-spatial fragmentation in the peri-urban zone in Accra, Ghana. *Cities*, 133:104154, 2023.
- Stephen Graham. Elite avenues: flyovers, freeways and the politics of urban mobility. *City*, 22(4):527–550, 2018.
- Avichal Mahajan. Highways and segregation. *Journal of Urban Economics*, page 103574, 2023.
- Kilian Heilmann. Transit access and neighborhood segregation. Evidence from the Dallas light rail system. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 73:237–250, 2018.
- Rafael HM Pereira, David Banister, Tim Schwanen, and Nate Wessel. Distributional effects of transport policies on inequalities in access to opportunities in Rio de Janeiro. *Journal of Transport and Land Use*, 12(1):741–764, 2019.
- Isabelle Nilsson and Elizabeth C Delmelle. Impact of new rail transit stations on neighborhood destination choices and income segregation. *Cities*, 102:102737, 2020.
- Ran Goldblatt and Itzhak Omer. The relationship between spatial configuration and Arab minority residential patterns in Israeli mixed cities. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, 106(3):321–338, 2015.
- Ann Legeby and Chen Feng. Towards just cities: An architectural approach to mapping unequal living conditions. In *13th International Space Syntax Symposium, SSS 2022, Bergen, Norway, Jun 20 2022-Jun 24 2022*. Western Norway University of Applied Sciences (HVL), 2022.
- Arianna Salazar Miranda. The shape of segregation: The role of urban form in immigrant assimilation. *Cities*, 106:102852, 2020.
- Ann Legeby and Lars Marcus. Does the urban structure of Swedish cities inhibit the sharing of public space? *Built Environment*, 37(2):155–169, 2011.
- Magda Bolzoni. Spaces of distinction, spaces of segregation. Nightlife and consumption in a central neighbourhood of Turin. *Méditerranée. Revue géographique des pays méditerranéens/Journal of Mediterranean geography*, (127):59–68, 2016.
- Daniel Sauter and Marco Huettenmoser. Liveable streets and social inclusion. *Urban Design International*, 13(2):67–79, 2008.
- A Van Nes and L Aghabeik. Ethnic groups and spatial behaviour in Rotterdam's neighbourhoods. In *SSS10: Proceedings of the 10th International Space Syntax Symposium, London, UK, 13-17 July 2015*, pages 102.1–102.17. Space Syntax Laboratory, The Bartlett School of Architecture, UCL, 2015.
- Ruben Garnica-Monroy and Seraphim Alvanides. Spatial segregation and urban form in Mexican cities. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, 46(7):1347–1361, 2019.
- W Alghatam. The generic patterns of urban village space: the ugly side of integration and the power of choice movement. In *12th International Space Syntax Symposium, SSS 2019*, 2019.
- Pauline van den Berg, Fariya Sharmeen, and Minou Weijjs-Perrée. On the subjective quality of social interactions: Influence of neighborhood walkability, social cohesion and mobility choices. *Transportation research part A: policy and practice*, 106:309–319, 2017.
- Kostas Mouratidis and Wouter Poortinga. Built environment, urban vitality and social cohesion: Do vibrant neighborhoods foster strong communities? *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 204:103951, 2020.
- Xiaomeng Wang and Zhilin Liu. Neighborhood environments and inclusive cities: An empirical study of local residents' attitudes toward migrant social integration in Beijing, China. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 226:104495, 2022.
- Ebru Şevik and Olgu Çalişkan. Coexistence in space: Stimulating encounter in the socially fragmented open urban fabrics. *Built Environment*, 48(3):364–392, 2022.
- Tongchaoran Gao and Samson Lim. Socio-spatial integration in innovation districts: Singapore's mixed-use experiment. *Cities*, 140:104405, 2023.
- Navya P. Samson. The socio-spatial relations of the accessibility of parks in Chicago. In *Proceedings - 11th International Space Syntax Symposium, SSS 2017*, pages 108.1–108.14, 2017. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85031100525&partnerID=40&md5=7bc2cf1f9af412a9f28434ec88343ad7>.
- Mohamed Gamal Abdelmonem and Rachel McWhinney. In search of common grounds: Stitching the divided landscape of urban parks in Belfast. *Cities*, 44:40–49, 2015.
- Yang Xiao, De Wang, and Jia Fang. Exploring the disparities in park access through mobile phone data: Evidence from Shanghai, China. *Landscape and urban planning*, 181:80–91, 2019.

- Shaleen Miller. Park access and equity in a segregated, southern us city: A case study of tallahassee, fl. *Environmental Justice*, 12(3):85–91, 2019.
- Veronika Mooses, Siiri Silm, Tiit Tammaru, and Erki Saluveer. An ethno-linguistic dimension in transnational activity space measured with mobile phone data. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 7(1):1–13, 2020.
- Luis Camarero and Jesús Oliva. Thinking in rural gap: mobility and social inequalities. *Palgrave Communications*, 5(1), 2019.
- Lukas Utzig. Urban integration of refugee homes: Spatial potential for integrative social processes. In *Proceedings - 11th International Space Syntax Symposium, SSS 2017*, pages 156.1–156.14, 2017.
- Pengyu Zhu, Songnian Zhao, Liping Wang, and Salem Al Yammahi. Residential segregation and commuting patterns of migrant workers in china. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 52:586–599, 2017.
- Pengyu Zhu, Songnian Zhao, and Yanpeng Jiang. Residential segregation, built environment and commuting outcomes: experience from contemporary china. *Transport Policy*, 116:269–277, 2022.
- Philip ME Garboden. You can't get there from here: Mobility networks and the housing choice voucher program. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, page 0739456X211051774, 2021.
- Ruth Joan Nelson. The spatial and social logic of the minibus taxi network: how access may support social inclusion in cape town, south africa. *Applied Mobilities*, 8(1):1–25, 2023.
- Kelli Silver, André Lopes, David Vale, and Nuno Marques da Costa. The inequality effects of public transport fare: The case of lisbon's fare reform. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 112:103685, 2023.
- Nicolás Valenzuela-Levi. Income inequality and rule-systems within public transport: A study of medellín (colombia) and santiago (chile). *Journal of Transport Geography*, 112:103700, 2023.
- Chris L Hess. Light-rail investment in seattle: Gentrification pressures and trends in neighborhood ethnracial composition. *Urban Affairs Review*, 56(1):154–187, 2020.
- Istiaq A Bhuyan, Celeste Chavis, Amirreza Nickkar, and Philip Barnes. Gis-based equity gap analysis: Case study of baltimore bike share program. *Urban Science*, 3(2):42, 2019.
- Robin Lovelace, Roger Beecham, Eva Heinen, Eugeni Vidal Tortosa, Yuanxuan Yang, Chris Slade, and Antonia Roberts. Is the london cycle hire scheme becoming more inclusive? an evaluation of the shifting spatial distribution of uptake based on 70 million trips. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 140:1–15, 2020.
- Mohammed Almahmood, Oliver Schulze, Trine Agervig Carstensen, and Gertrud Jørgensen. The sidewalk as a contested space: Women's negotiation of socio-spatial processes of exclusion in public urban space in saudi arabia; the case of al tahlia street. *Planning Practice & Research*, 33(2):186–210, 2018.
- Mariam Altaema and Hatice Kalfaoğlu Hatipoğlu. The urban socio-environmental impact of a mixed-use street in fostering refugee integration in the host society. *Journal of Asian Architecture and Building Engineering*, pages 1–13, 2023.
- Federico Librino, M Elena Renda, Paolo Santi, Francesca Martelli, Giovanni Resta, Fabio Duarte, Carlo Ratti, and Jinhua Zhao. Home-work carpooling for social mixing. *Transportation*, 47:2671–2701, 2020.
- Thomas W Sanchez, Rich Stolz, and Jacinta S Ma. Inequitable effects of transportation policies on minorities. *Transportation research record*, 1885(1):104–110, 2004.
- John McDonagh. Transport policy instruments and transport-related social exclusion in rural republic of ireland. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 14(5):355–366, 2006.
- Marko Kryvobokov and Louafi Bouzouina. Willingness to pay for accessibility under the conditions of residential segregation. *International Journal of Strategic Property Management*, 18(2):101–115, 2014.
- Elizabeth J Mueller, Thomas W Hilde, and Marla J Torrado. Methods for countering spatial inequality: Incorporating strategic opportunities for housing preservation into transit-oriented development planning. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 177:317–327, 2018.
- Pablo Muñoz Unceta, Birgit Hausleitner, and Marcin Dąbrowski. Socio-spatial segregation and the spatial structure of 'ordinary' activities in the global south. *Urban Planning*, 5(3):303–318, 2020.
- SM Hossein Alipour and Khaled Galal Ahmed. Assessing the effect of urban form on social sustainability: A proposed 'integrated measuring tools method' for urban neighborhoods in dubai. *City, Territory and Architecture*, 8:1–21, 2021.
- Qi-Li Gao, Yang Yue, Wei Tu, Jinzhou Cao, and Qing-Quan Li. Segregation or integration? exploring activity disparities between migrants and settled urban residents using human mobility data. *Transactions in GIS*, 25(6):2791–2820, 2021.

- Veronika Mooses, Siiri Silm, and Rein Ahas. Ethnic segregation during public and national holidays: A study using mobile phone data. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 98(3):205–219, 2016.
- James Saxon. Empirical measures of park use in american cities, and the demographic biases of spatial models. *Geographical Analysis*, 53(4):665–685, 2021.
- Yuan Liao, Sonia Yeh, and Gustavo S Jeuken. From individual to collective behaviours: exploring population heterogeneity of human mobility based on social media data. *EPJ Data Science*, 8(1):1–22, 2019.
- Yuan Liao. *Understanding Mobility and Transport Modal Disparities Using Emerging Data Sources: Modelling Potentials and Limitations*. Chalmers Tekniska Hogskola (Sweden), 2021.
- Rajat Verma, Shagun Mittal, Zengxiang Lei, Xiaowei Chen, and Satish V Ukkusuri. Comparison of home detection algorithms using smartphone gps data. *EPJ Data Science*, 13(1):6, 2024.
- Luca Pappalardo, Leo Ferres, Manuel Sacasa, Ciro Cattuto, and Loreto Bravo. Evaluation of home detection algorithms on mobile phone data using individual-level ground truth. *EPJ data science*, 10(1):29, 2021.