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Four issues

1. Segregation research: a changing focus:
   – from classic description and index construction of segregation to analysis of inequality and concentrations;
   – from a focus on residential segregation to analysis in non-residential domains (work, leisure, public space related).

2. How can we understand the variation of inequalities?

3. What can we say about the effects or impacts of urban inequality?

4. What are the typical policy responses to urban inequality in European cities?
Social inequality in selected EU cities; segregation indexes as classic tools for describing urban inequality.
These overviews provide much information

- Low levels and lower in EU than in the US
- State dependent: higher in Belgium, low in Denmark and the Netherlands
- City dependent: high in Leeds, lower in Manchester
- Group dependent: higher levels in higher social classes; lower class in EU still in one system with middle class
Social Segregation Patterns

(problems with indicator selection, but still information rich)

Amsterdam as an example
Social Segregation Pattern in 1960
Social rank (pca on ‘classic’ indicators)
Social Segregation Pattern in 2007

m² Price for Housing

Price per m², 2007

- **Green**: Much less than average
- **Light Green**: Less than average
- **Orange**: More than average
- **Red**: Much more than average
- **White**: Not evaluated
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Social Segregation Pattern in 2012
test scores for entry in secondary education
Micro-level Social Segregation Pattern
2011 concentrations high (red) and low (blue) real estate values in housing

http://regiomonitor-uva.everimap.com/
Ethnic inequality: ‘classic’ segregation measures (D) and recent change (difference between years mentioned)

Sources: Arbaci (2007); Friedrichs (1998); Malheiro (2002a, b); Martori et al. (2005); Musterd (2005) (1996); Peach (1996); Stillwell & Phillips (2006)
Development of index of dissimilarity in several European cities
Again these overviews provide much information

- Varied levels, usually lower in EU than in the US
- State dependent: higher in UK and Belgium, lower in Germany and the Netherlands
- City dependent: higher in Leeds, lower in Birmingham
- Group dependent: higher levels for Bangladeshi, lower for Indian origin.
Changing Patterns of Segregation
Moroccan origin
1973
1981
1990
Moroccan 2011 (similar classification relative to average)
Type of index is relevant:

D dissimilarity upper half

xP*x isolation lower half

1994-2009
Micro-level Ethnic Segregation Pattern
2011 concentrations of Moroccan (2-4sd; >4sd)
Here too, a move away from classic measures of segregation to micro-level data used for constructing concentrations and for describing and analysing them
Amsterdam, Surinamese origin, 2009, n > 50, > 2sd

Concentrations:
Surinamese in 2009
Total in the city: 68761 (9.09%)
N Surinamese per area: >= 50
Perc. Surinamese in concentrations >= 17.83
110 concentrations with (total): 90087 inhabitants
30227 Surinamese (33.6%)
30227: 43.9% of all Surinamese
562.4 hectares
Amsterdam, Surinamese origin, 2009, n > 50, > 4sd

Concentrations:
Surinamese in 2009
Total in the city: 68761 (9.09%)
N Surinamese per area: >= 50
Perc. Surinamese in concentrations >=26.52
61 concentrations with (total):
67539 inhabitants
25427 Surinamese (37.6%)
25427: 36.9% of all Surinamese
419.4 hectares
Amsterdam, Surinamese origin, 2009, n > 50, > 50%

Concentrations:
Surinamese in 2009
Total in the city: 68761 (9.09%)
N Surinamese per area: >= 50
Perc. Surinamese in concentrations >=50%
5 concentrations with (total):
3245 inhabitants
1848 Surinamese (56.9%)
1848: 2.7 % of all Surinamese
27.9 hectares
Amsterdam, Surinamese origin, 2009, n > 50, > 60%

Concentrations:
Surinamese in 2009
Total in the city: 68761 (9.09%)
N Surinamese per area: >= 50
Perc. Surinamese in concentrations >=60%
2 concentrations with (total):
753 inhabitants
469 Surinamese (62.3%)
469: 0.7% of all Surinamese
6.1 hectares
Concentrations (4sd+) of ethnic categories in Amsterdam 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic category</th>
<th>Category’s city population</th>
<th>Percentage of category in city</th>
<th>Category’s concentration population</th>
<th>Total concentration population</th>
<th>Percentage of category in concentrations</th>
<th>Category’s concentration population relative to category’s city population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>39654</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>16102</td>
<td>68532</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>68099</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>32446</td>
<td>91235</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinamese</td>
<td>68761</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>23511</td>
<td>61710</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antillean</td>
<td>11559</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>16895</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concentrations (4sd+) of ethnic categories in Amsterdam 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic category</th>
<th>Category’s city population</th>
<th>Percentage of category in city</th>
<th>Category’s concentration population</th>
<th>Total concentration population</th>
<th>Percentage of category in concentrations</th>
<th>Category’s concentration population relative to category’s city population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>39654</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>16102</td>
<td>68532</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>68099</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>32446</td>
<td>91235</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinamese</td>
<td>68761</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>23511</td>
<td>61710</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antillean</td>
<td>11559</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>16895</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Share of four population categories in the city of Amsterdam, 2000-2011, based on country of origin (1st and 2nd generation) (column 3)
Concentrations (4sd+) of ethnic categories in Amsterdam 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic category</th>
<th>Category’s city population</th>
<th>Percentage of category in city</th>
<th>Category’s concentration population</th>
<th>Total concentration population</th>
<th>Percentage of category in concentrations</th>
<th>Category’s concentration population relative to category’s city population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>39654</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>16102</td>
<td>68532</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>68099</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>32446</td>
<td>91235</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinamese</td>
<td>68761</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>23511</td>
<td>61710</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antillean</td>
<td>11559</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>16895</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of each of the population categories relative to total population, in concentrations of these population categories (column 6) 2000-11
## Concentrations (4sd+) of ethnic categories in Amsterdam 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic category</th>
<th>Category’s city population</th>
<th>Percentage of category in city</th>
<th>Category’s concentration population</th>
<th>Total concentration population</th>
<th>Percentage of category in concentrations</th>
<th>Category’s concentration population relative to category’s city population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>39654</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>16102</td>
<td>68532</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>68099</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>32446</td>
<td>91235</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinamese</td>
<td>68761</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>23511</td>
<td>61710</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antillean</td>
<td>11559</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>16895</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of each of the population categories that lives in concentrations of these population categories (column 7) (2000-11)
How to understand urban inequalities?

**Structural**
- Globalisation
- Internationalisation
- Economic restructuring

{ produces inequality
  polarisation
  mismatch }

**Pathways**
- Path dependency (chain migration); urban structure ((un) fit for current urban economies; multi-layered or single-layered)

**Institutional**
- Welfare regime type and change

**Other**
- Behaviour, culture, tolerance, discrimination, political discourse, choice
Context: levels of social inequality, within and between states.

Gini-index 2008, black: sharp rise in past decade
Levels of social inequality, 2008
Polarisation or integrated social classes
share of total income per income decile, The Netherlands, 2010
Welfare states and levels of social inequality in European cities

Segregation index low

Source: Domburg 2005
Segregation and concentration receive much attention because of expected negative effects on participation.
Urban inequalities, effects on participation; theory

*Mechanisms*

- Socialisation, role models, peer groups
- Stigmatisation
- Social networks
- Opportunity for encountering ‘others’

*In Europe, hypotheses*

- Lower levels of segregation $\rightarrow$ small effects
- Perhaps even $\rightarrow$ positive effects
Effects of urban inequalities, methods

- Qualitative in-depth research
- Quantitative large datasets, longitudinal
- Both rich in terms of variables
- Detailed geo-coding available
- Quantitative research using techniques that make efforts dealing with selection effects
- Quantitative research enables detection of non-linearities, thresholds, etc.
Examples of results of some own (co-researched) large-scale longitudinal, individual level studies in Sweden and The Netherlands on the impact of neighbourhood composition (various sizes and compositions (ethnic, social, tenure)) on social outcomes (mostly income)
A selection of (mostly recent) neighbourhood effect studies (co) authored


Sweden

1. Concentrations of low income households have negative effects on individual’s social mobility.

2. Effects are generally stronger in metropolitan than in non-metropolitan areas and stronger for males than for females.

3. Own group ethnic concentrations can initially pay dividends for immigrants, but these benefits turn into disadvantages over time, after approx. two years.

4. The impact of other immigrants turned out positive only if unemployment levels are very low.
Sweden continued

5. For males who are not employed full time, or have a low income, middle income neighbours have a positive marginal impact (relative to either high- or low-income neighbours).

6. Increases in middle-income neighbours will have a negative effect on high-income males if they substitute for high-income neighbours.

7. Smallest scale areas (10,000 m²) have strongest effects.

8. Recent, and continued cumulative exposure yields stronger associations than lagged, temporary ones.

9. There is distinct time decay (but some persistence) in the potential effects after exposure ceases.
10. Higher median neighbourhood income is positively related to individual income prospects.

11. Income mix in the neighbourhood likely has a small positive effect.

12. A high share of rented dwellings relates to higher income gain than a high share of owner-occupied dwellings (possibly because the rented sector functions as a springboard rather than a trap).
Typical policy responses to urban inequalities in European cities

- Fear for lack of integration and assumed relation with spatial inequalities
- Call for forced interventions to obtain reduction of segregation
- Policies aimed at creating balanced communities and social mix
- Instruments: urban restructuring and mixed tenure, mixed qualities and mixed house prices, gentrification
Theoretical considerations; Empirical findings

Macro and managerial; social mix policy …

1. prevents the development of uncontrollable neighbourhoods and rising segregation

2. is a ‘conspiracy against the poor’: it produces gentrification, favours the affluent and displaces the poor
“[i]t is ironic that a process that results in segregation and polarization – gentrification – is being promoted via social mix policies as the ‘positive’ solution to segregation…the rhetoric of social mixing tends to conceal the inequalities of fortune and economic circumstance that are produced through the process of gentrification”
Theoretical considerations; Empirical findings

Macro and managerial; social mix policy …

1. prevents the development of uncontrollable neighbourhoods and rising segregation
2. is a ‘conspiracy against the poor’: it produces gentrification, favours the affluent and displaces the poor
3. helps to improve local conditions and service levels
4. creates negative spill-over effects (displacement)
5. reduces stigmatisation through social mix
6. increases stigmatisation through selection of areas
7. reduces the accumulation of neighbourhood problems
8. improves neighbourhood liveability
Theoretical considerations; Empirical findings

*Micro and individual; social mix policy …*

1. helps the poor to realize social mobility through socialisation, role models, peers, and ‘better’ social networks through weak ties

2. stimulates economic, social and cultural participation and integration

3. destroys individual’s local social networks; spatial proximity is no guarantee for social integration

4. frustrates individual’s behaviour – especially of those who can afford – to sort into relatively homogeneous neighbourhoods

5. neglects metropolitan and state level impacts on social compositions
Comments on predominant policy interventions

- Social mix may indeed help social prospects
- Social mix may be good for some, but harming others.
- Segregation and ‘social mix’ are often weakly defined, if at all, and mostly used as metaphores, which blurs discussions.
- Fear often drives policies, which is a bad thing.
- Social mix does not work when micro-level social distances and social inequality are too large.
- Social mix may create injustice effects (due to reduction of affordable housing).
Conclusions and discussion

• Differences between cities relate to urban histories, welfare regimes, and opportunities to adapt to structural economic transformation and globalisation.
• These differences produce different levels of social/ethnic (spatial) inequality.
• Which results in governmental intervention, strongest in universal welfare states
• Caution is required:
  – Interventions are good for some but bad for others
  – Don’t pathologise the poor or social housing; Lupton and Tunstall (2008, p. 114):

  “[i]t is a short step from there to the assumption that the solution is to reduce the proportion of poor people, rather than to address structural inequalities or inject additional resources to provide the services that people need”
Conclusions and discussion

...Continued

• Caution is required:
  – Interventions are good for some but bad for others
  – Don’t pathologise the poor or social housing
  – Spatial sorting is a strong process, difficult to engineer
  – Interventions may add to stigma
  – Interventions may produce negative externalities (demolition, spillovers and fear)

• Moderate segregation associates with universal welfare states; however, almost all of these states appear to be heading towards more neo-liberal models

• Consider the potential of structural and institutional factors and interventions at various scales aimed at services delivery (schools) and enhanced individual labour market participation and social mobility
Conclusions and discussion

...Continued

- Avoid cynical attitudes and neglect of potential impact of concentrated poverty; this may produce more segregation and marginalisation of the poor
- Recognise the complexity and reciprocal relations and (social) ties between people, place, space and scale
- Address more comprehensive measures of individual and neighbourhood well-being
- Avoid classifying poor neighbourhoods as a problem and middle-class as a solution