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Introduction

This course will present the different possible forms of “urban mosaic” and the different methodological approaches.

It will be an introduction to a discussion about segregation and integration processes, starting again from the observations from Chicago School (« Les relations humaines peuvent toujours être analysées, certes avec plus ou moins d’exactitude, en termes de distance », Robert Ezra Park) and then taking examples in France and North America.

I. City as a living body

The growth of the city: urban ecology’s program intends to describe and understand social and cultural change occurring during the process of huge growth, Chicago being a living “social laboratory” for methodological and conceptual experimentations. (Ezra Park)

Social life in big cities is a mix of “struggle for life” and of cooperation and links of different types between its inhabitants.

Aggregation, desegregation and segregation are active processes running all the time and producing socio spatial differentiation.
Now clear of questionable analogies with vegetal or animal world (‘natural predispositions’ of certain groups), urban ecology still proposes useful perspectives for cities as material and human environment.

_Urban space as a milieu_

Social morphology is the result of crystallisation of social relations, the physical substrates of social life. These structures are rather stable. They are less reflects than expression (E. Durkheim)

Consequently, these morphological structures have a specific action on urban population. They are quite constraining and compelling. This is obvious for physical elements (roads, buildings, monuments): they often survive to the conditions in which they have emerged.

Social groups, but also images and memories, are linked with specific urban location: they contribute to define a “milieu”, characterised by a certain combination of material and human presence by time. Neighbourhoods can be considered as “milieus”

_Urban space as a stake_

Different types of agents are competing in the city: households, enterprises, age groups…

The objects of competition are mainly

- Land control
- Access to services, facilities and goods
- Symbolic appropriation
- Political domination

Competitions take place into markets or networks. These networks and markets can be virtual (recommendation and cooptation networks) or material (housing market; education market; leisure market) etc.

II. Differentiation, divisions, distances

The scale of local urban space is relevant for the study of these different processes: built environment, social morphology, socio spatial change processes, individual and collective logics of action: all these related factors can be taken in consideration.

Time and space scales can be reduced or augmented according to the research question. They can be also compared (internal or external comparisons)
Residential location is often the criterion chosen to study socio-spatial differentiation. One look at the distribution of households belonging to the same social group, generally socio-professional in European cities, and “ethnic” in North American cities. As a consequence, figures of social groups' repartition are proposed.

The 3 more frequent models are:

- **circular** (Burgess, 1925). Households are distributed in the urban space according to their social position, their lifestyle, and the duration of their stay (Chicago). The circular model can be also centrifugal, the poor being pushed out of the more bourgeois centre.

- **axial**. Households are distributed independently from the distance to the centre. (east/west, M. Pinçon et M. Pinçon-Charlot, 2004, Paris)

- **nuclear**: households belonging to the same social group are concentrated in nuclear. The more homogeneous, in European cities, are those constituted by high bourgeoisie and dominant classes. Conversely, poor neighbourhoods can be found in a larger scale, well-being area. “quartiers d’exil” (Lapeyronie Didier et Dubet François, *Les quartiers d’exil*, Seuil, 1992)
Schéma 2. Les aires urbaines
These three figures are not exclusive one from each other. More often cities offer a combination.

They have only a descriptive value, not an explicative one. In order to reach comprehension of the observations, one must look at neighbourhoods’ formation historical processes, and at households’ residential mobility, in brief, one must look at migration processes.

They can change by time: These three figures are not exclusive one from each other. More often cities offer a combination.

They can change by time: gentrification is going on in North American cities centre.

*Neighbourhoods’ typologies*
Socio professional definition of households is not the only possible criterion for
neighbourhoods’ classification: most recent researches try to combine several variables.
Reviewing Urban ecology concepts (social integration, mobility, transitory processes etc.) and
models (concentric zonal hypothesis), several statistical researches try to describe the social
structure of urban space

As an example: M. Marpsat and M. Mansuit define 25 types, regrouped into 10 categories
(“Les quartiers des grandes villes: contrastes sociaux en milieu urbain”, *Economie et
Statistique n°245, juillet-août 1991*)

- First step: all neighbourhoods of all French cities more than 150 000 inhabitants have
  been classified according to the “households configuration”, i.e. crossing between
  socio professional category of the head of household and structure of household
  (single, couples with or without children etc.). (N.B. Neighbourhood definition,
  INSEE, part of a municipality)

  The 10 categories:
  1. central neighbourhoods of employers and inactive
  2. commercial neighbourhoods of the centre
  3. “les beaux quartiers”
  4. intermediary profession and young people neighbourhoods
  5. mix neighbourhoods
  6. recent industrial suburbs
  7. ancient industrial suburbs
  8. Young working class people neighbourhoods
  9. popular centre
  10 Belsunce (a-typical)

- Second step: all neighbourhoods (defined as explained) are again selected through
  other variables such as nationality, housing status, city, and “housing configuration”.

- This statistical method leads the following result: 3 main criterion of differentiation
  appear:

  Socio-economical status (cake)
  Household structure (onion)
  Nationality=non native (nuclear)
Such approach, geographical and statistical, allows to define cities according to the specific combination of different types of neighbourhoods (homogeneity vs. Heterogeneity) – almost all types being present in each, but not with the same frequency.

Northern cities (Lens, Valenciennes, Dunkerque…) are mainly linked with “ancient industrial suburbs”; Bordeaux with “commercial neighbourhoods”;

Marseille is a real mosaic – all types represented in the centre;

Lyon presents all types but bourgeois suburban residential areas are very developed.
Toulouse and Rennes have a strong presence of type 4…

Demographical processes (mainly migrations) seems to enlarge the difference between neighbourhoods
The scale of the observation is a big concern; borders effects are not easily integrated in the model
The social effects of such configuration are not accessible

*Neighbourhoods’ qualities*

Neighbourhoods are also subject of contradictory discussion. A range of recent researches have put the emphasis on the importance of the neighbourhoods (villages in the city), while others talk about the end of the city as a territory (global cities, virtual cities).

This is actually an old debate. In the 1950 already, some sociologists argue that industrialisation has produced differentiation of interests and at the same time capacity for residents to liberate from local dependency. Others continue to find neighbourhoods vital in at least two directions: maintaining and developing social links, acting collectively.

- Certain typologies represent an effort towards finding correlations between social, economical and demographical characteristics of the population, on one hand, and some “qualities” of the neighbourhood as a “primary group” or even as a political actor on the other hand.

See Donald I. Warren proposition for instance (*The Sociological Quarterly* 19 (Spring 1978): the dimensions employed to construct neighbourhoods variations are the following: 1/ the extent of individual identification with the local area 2/ the degree of social exchange between neighbours, 3/ the extend to which the area is explicitly linked to the larger community. The result is a typology in 6 (ideally 8 but 2 never appear) types combining the 3 elements (+ or -): integral; parochial; diffuse; stepping-stone; transitory; anomic. Results put the emphasis on race (black or white) as a main factor.
Neighbourhood is a contradictory object. It is at the same time vague and very common and present in social sciences as in political discourses. “La persistance des débats autour de la nation de quartier se trouve en grande partie liée aux usages qu’en fait le pouvoir politique”, J.Y. Authier, M. H. Bacquê, F. Guérin-Pace”, 2006

III. The construction of segregation issues

« Urban segregation »: the term itself usually refers to huge forms of social division of space. But using that term is also an interpretation of explicative principles and social signification of the observations
Segregation: the term refers to an intentional action of separation (a group from another). In our societies dominated by an egalitarian ideology, segregation has also a pejorative meaning: it implicitly sends back to the opposite – an ideal (norm) where equality would be realized by a perfect mixed or random distribution of people (Grafmeyer, 1994)
Mixing population is considered as a positive answer to strong social division of space

Segregation versus social mix: an interpretation of social division of space
Concentration of dominated social groups have always preoccupied governments and authorities
It is also a big concern in urban studies
How to measure concentration? Segregation? Social mix?
Concentration measures focus on “ethnicity” and socio professional position/income. These categories can be questioned.

● Exercise: Write a list of words – or shorts stories associated with:
Concentration/Segregation/Social mix/

Case study 1 : A French approach of the « ghetto », E. Maurin, 2004
“Séparatisme social”… Statement: figure 1: “ghettoisation par le haut” : neighbourhoods without non native and without poor households are over represented.

E. Maurin wants to demonstrate that French urban space is segregated. This is of very heavy consequences on social cohesion, because it reinforces inequality of chances.

The cause of this segregation is the dominant groups « struggle for power ». Dominant groups want to keep their privilege so that they are able to assure their social reproduction.

Residential location is very important in this combat, also because it has a great importance on children’s future, because of the unequal quality of schools, the quality of schools being linked tightly to the… socio economic characteristics of the residents.

In order to tackle this process, E. Maurin proposes to invest more public money on individual educational support.
Case study 2. A north American approach of socio spatial differentiation


US public housing has pushed out its poor and working-class families to make way for new developments favouring professional wage-earners. But this attempt to revitalise inner cities has huge social costs.

Segregation is a process which is more deeply linked to political choices and weakness of welfare.

Segregation issues
1. Territorial: the location of different groups defined according to their social position or their origin. Problematic association of disadvantaged people and dilapidated or poorly equipped areas (socio-spatial inequality). In that case different statistical tools are required (dissimilarity index)
2. Political: unequal chance to access symbolic and material goods usually offered by the city (inequality of condition). In that case indicators have to be constructed. They usually start from school score, quality and quantity of equipments and utilities. They can also consider more symbolic capacities as public participation to political life, reputation and image etc.

Processes leading to concentration and to segregation have been broadly studied. While concentration can be actively and consciously looked for, segregation results from a process of exclusion. One can argue that the two processes are linked: distinction logics among group 1 lead to differentiation from group 2, possibly to exclusion of group 2.

There are contradictory debates about production of exclusion. There is currently a debate about the level of competition between groups (residential choices, educational strategies).

Sociology helps to formulate correctly the terms of the question.