Socio-Spatial Segregation Factors in Isfahan

Mahmoud Ghalehnoee [1]

Associate Professor in Urban Design, Art University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

Sara Sabet

MA in Urban Design, Art University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

Extended Abstract

1. Introduction

All cities are more or less confronted to socio-spatial segregation. The aspects such as social, physical, economic, cultural, racial differences or combination of these factors could accelerate and increase the rate of various segregations. The spatial segregation acts as a problem in cities and exacerbates social gaps between people. The factors that cause segregation are in various forms: natural factors (such as rivers and valleys) and artificial (such as highways, railways, industrial and military zones). Sometimes these boundaries are conventional and perceptual. Another form of segregation is self-segregation that occurs in gated communities. The objective of this study is to determine the extent of segregation and to understand the locations of this segregation in 14 Districts of Isfahan. The Theory of Right to the City, from a philosophical perspective, describes the process of city fragmentation and the cause of the "problem of segregation". In formulating this theory, Henri Lefebvre first criticized post-World War II urban planning or urban reconstruction. He has introduced the goal of industrialization to achieve "urban society". He saw the consequence of industrialization without the prospect of urban society on issues such as the failure of the city as a whole and the "segregation" of various sectors, explaining the prospects for the creation of urban society (Lefebvre, 1980).

2. Background and Theoretical Framework

In related researches social exclusion has been investigated in three main categories; the first one insists on socio-cultural exclusion, economical-financial exclusion and political-juridical exclusion (Smets & Salman, 2008); the second one deals with "cultural exclusion" emphasizing on signs, meanings, language, religion, and nationality, economical exclusion emphasizing accessibility to employment and political exclusion dealing with participation and decision making (Madanipour, 2011); and finally the third one elaborates the socio-environmental realm, economical structure, and production and political order focusing top-down intervention of states and governments in distribution of urban space and resources (Afrough, 1997). Altinok and Cengiz (2008), K'Akumu and Olima (2007), Gascht and Gallo (2005) and Van Kempen (2005) are the most related researches from several countries.

3. Method

The quantitative study of segregation in particular uses the term "social exclusion". Social exclusion encompasses the various mechanisms and dimensions of poverty. Social exclusion avoids the full participation of people in society and implies processes and mechanisms of poverty. Having reviewed some experiences such as western European countries (Van Kempen, 2005), Africa (K'Akumu & Olima, 2007), France (Gascht & Gallo, 2005) and Turkey (Altinok & Çengiz, 2008), segregation has been measured by population index measured in sub-categories like economic, physical and cultural segregation. It has also been used in developed countries to measure segregation of immigrant populations. As used in the case of France, the Duncan formula is used

1. Corresponding Author- Email: m.ghalehnoee@aui.ac.ir

to measure segregation. Concerning the spatial segregation, research has focused on the settlement of demographic groups (residential areas, residential patterns, and official and informal settlements and residential areas). In the present study, a mixed method was used to measure the socio-spatial segregation and its indices were evaluated using information from the census of 2007 (literacy, occupation and migration) and 2012 (housing with residential unit skeleton and surface (m2) indexes). Housing was assessed as an alternative indicator of occupational groups for measuring economic segregation. The 2007 census data were used to assess economic segregation, and the literacy and immigration criteria were used to measure socioeconomic segregation. Demographic results of indices corresponding to each criterion were included in Duncan's formula. This formula is the most commonly used separation measurement formula to measure homogeneity.

4. Results and Discussion

The numbers obtained in each table were compared and the first 3 and the last 3 Districts for each table were identified. Based on the rankings in the table for each index, they were assigned from -3 to 3 points. Accordingly, Districts 5, 6 and 2 have the highest score (lowest exclusion). Districts 14, 13, and 11 have the lowest points in this regard (Figure 1). The maximum segregation rate according to the Duncan formula in Paris showed the rate of segregation equal to 0.233 in 1990 and 0.245 in 1999. The similar study in Tehran showed the average rate of 0.308 and the maximum rate of 0.458 in 2007 attributed to the Cadre groups of community. In this study in Isfahan the maximum rate of segregation was equal to 0.07 which show a more equilibrium in 14 Districts of the city according to segregation indicators.

5. Conclusion

Considering the historical background of segregation in Isfahan and also summarizing regional and local studies on the city, there were different types of socio-spatial segregation in Isfahan but its extent was not too high to harm significantly the integrity of the city. This segregation is more significant in Districts 5 and 6 of the city, where the meaningful differences have been observed with the adjacent districts. According to Duncan's formula and relying on the spatial placement of population groups by fourteen regions of the city, the most segregation belongs to the group of immigrants, illiterates and citizens of less than ten-year residents. The considerable presence of immigrants on the suburbs of the city and their absence in the central areas is considered the principal kind of segregation.

Keywords: Socio-spatial Segregation, Urban Fragmentation, Right to the City, Urban Exclusion, Isfahan

References (In Persian)

1. Afrouq, E. (1998). فضا و نابرابری اجتماعی: مطالعه جدایی‌گزینی فضایی و تمرکز فقر در محله‌های مسکونی [space and social inequality] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Tarbiat-Modarres University, Tehran, Iran.

2. Amiri, S., & Khodaei, Z. (2012). حاشیه نشینی و اسکان غیررسمی: پیامدها و چالش ها [Marginalization and Informal Settlement: Implications and Challenges]. Tehran: Ghoghnous.

3. Bayat, A. (2013). سیاست های خیابانی، جنبش تهی‌دستان در ایران [Street politics: Poor people's movement in Iran] (S. A. Chashemi, Trans.). Tehran: Pardis Danesh.

4. Bell, S., & Rismanchian, O. (2011) شـناخت کاربردی روش چیدمان فضـا در درک پیکره بندی فضـایی شهرها [The application of space syntax in studying the structure of the cities]. *Journal of Honarhaye Ziba,* 2(43), 49-56.

5. Firouzabadi, A., & Sadeqi, A. (2014). طرد اجتماعی [Social exclusion]. Tehran: Sociologists.

6. Giddens, A. (2008). جامعه‌شناسی [Sociology] (H. Chavoshian, Trans.). Tehran: Ney.

7. Golkar, K. (2009). کند و کاوی در تعریف طراحی شهری [Exploring the definition of urban designing]. Tehran: Iran Center for Urban Studies and Research.

8. Hajireza Tehrani, A. (2011). تولید جنسـیتی فضـای عمومی؛ بررسی گفتمان تفکیک جنسیت در فضاهای عمومی شـهـر تهران [Gender generation of public spaces: A study of gender separation discourse in Tehran public spaces]. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Elm-o-Farhang, Tehran, Iran.

9. Harvey, D. (2013). حق به شهر [Right to the city] (Kh. Kalantari, Trans.). Tehran: Mehr-Vista.

10. Hillier, B. (2005). زبان مشـترک فضـا نظری به کارکرد اجتماعی، اقتصادی و زیست محیطی شهرها [The common language of space; A way of looking at the social, economic and environmental functioning of cities on a common basis]. Tehran: New Towns Development Company.

11. Lajevardi, H. (2006). نظریـه هـای زنـدگی روزمره [Theories of everyday life]. *Letter of social Sciences, 26*(84), 123-140.

12. Lefebvre, H. (2011). نظریه‌هایی درباره‌ی شـهر، شـهریت و برنامه‌ریزی [Theories about city, urban and planning] (K. Athari, Trans.). *Bon Journal, 84,* 20-23.

13. Lefebvre, H. (2012). علوم گسـیخته و واقعیت شـهری [Fragmented sciences and urban reality] (K. Athari, Trans.). *Bon Journal, 87,* 35-44.

14. Madanipour, A. (2003). تهران ظهور یک کلان شـهر [Tehran: The making of a metropolis] (H. Zarazvand, Tran.). Tehran: Urban Planning and Processing Association.

15. Meshkini, A., & Rahimi, H. (2011). جدایی‌گزینی فضـایی در مادرشـهرها: تحلیلی بر جغرافیای اجتماعی مادر شـهر تهران [Spatial segregation in metropolises: An analysis of the social geography of the Tehran Metropolis]. *The Journal of Spatial Planning, 15* (4), 87-107

16. Piran, P. (1988). آلونک نشـینی در تهران [Living in ghettos in Tehran]. *Political and Economic Information, 3*(20), 30-31.

17. Piran, P. (2002). تحلیل جامعه شـناختی از مسکن شهری در ایران: اسکان غیررسمی [Sociological analysis of urban housing in Iran: informal settlement]. *Iranian Sociology Institution, 1*(2), 27-48.

18. Piran, P. (2009). از اسـکان غیررسـمی تا اسـکان نایابی [From informal settlements to non-residential accommodation]. *Haftshahr Journal, 2*(29, 30) 14-29.

19. Piran, P. (2013). اسـطوره ها و واقعیت های فقر و اسکان غیررسـمی [The myths and realities of poverty and informal settlement]. *Mehrnameh, 23,* 178-186.

20. Rahnama, M. R. (1998). جدایی‌گزینی فضـایی-مکانی شـهری [Urban spatial segregation]. *Journal of Language and Literature*, *31* (1-2), 200-218

21. Sen, A. K. (1999). توسـعه یعنی آزادی [Development as freedom] (M. S. Naeini, Trans.). Tehran: Jahad Daneshgahi.

22. Shokouei, H. (2012). جغرافیای اجتمـاعی شـهرهـا [Social geography of cities]. Tehran: Jahad Daneshgahi.

23. Weber, M. (2006). دین، قدرت، جامعه [Religion, power and society] (A. Tadayon, Trans.). Tehran: Hermes.

References (In English)

1. Bastia, B. L. (2010). *Right to the city workshop report*. The University of Manchester. Retrieved from http://www.sed.manchester.ac.uk

2. Bastia, T., Lombard, M., Jabeen, H., Sou, G., Banks, N., Moser, C., & Hebbert, M. (2010). *Right to the city workshop report*. Manchester: University of Manchester.

3. Brown, A. (2010). The 'right to the city': From Paris 1968 to Rio 2010. Paper presented at the *Ponencia Presentada en la 11th N-AERUS Conference*. Brussels, Belgium.

4. Cars, G., Madanipour, A., & Allen, J. (1998). *Social exclusion in European cities*. London: Routledge.

5. Cars, G., Madanipour, A., & Allen, J. (1998). *Social exclusion in European cities*. London: Routledge.

6. Gaschet, F., & Gallo, J. L. (2005). The spatial dimension of segregation-a case study in four French urban areas, 1990-1999. Paper presented at the *45th Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "Land Use and Water Management in a Sustainable Network Society"*. University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

7. Harvey, D. (2008). The right to the city. *New Left Review, 53*(8), 23- 40.

8. K'Akumu, O., & Olima, W. (2007). The dynamics and implications of residential segregation in Nairobi. *Habitat International, 31*(1), 87-99.

9. Harvey, D. (2017). "The right to the city": from New Left Review (2008). In *The Globalizing Cities Reader* (pp. 289-293). New York: Routledge.

10. K'akumu, O. A., & Olima, W. H. J. H. I. (2007). The dynamics and implications of residential segregation in Nairobi. *Habitat International, 31*(1), 87-99.

11. Kaminer, T., Sohn, H., & Robles-Duran, M. (2011). *Urban asymmetries: Studies and projects on neoliberal urbanization* Rotterdam: Nai010 Publishers.

12. Kempen, R. V. (2005) Segregation and housing conditions of immigrants in Western European cities. In Y. Kazepov (Ed.), *Cities of Europe: Changing contexts, local arrangements, and the challenge to urban cohesion* (pp.190-209). Oxford: Blackwell.

13. Lefebvre, H., & Kofman, E. (1995). *Henri Lefebvre writings on cities.* New York: Blackwell.

14. Lefebvre, H., & Nicholson-Smith, D. (1991). *The production of space* (Vol. 142). Oxford: Blackwell.

15. Lefebvre, H., Kofman, E., & Lebas, E. (1996). *Writings on cities* (Vol. 63). Oxford: Blackwell.

16. Lloyd, C., & Shuttleworth, I., & W. Wong, D. (2015). *Social-spatial segregation: Concepts, processes and outcomes*. Bristol: Policy Press.

17. Maffini, A., & Maraschin, C. (2018). *Urban Segregation and socio-spatial interactions: A configurational approach. Urban Science, 2*(3), 55-68.

18. Rashidzadeh, K. (2010). *Spatial justice for an open city*. Delft: Delft University of Technology.

19. Smets, P., & Salman, T. J. U. S. (2008). Countering urban segregation: Theoretical and policy innovations from around the globe. *Urban Studies, 45*(7), 1307-1332.

20. Sugranyes, A., & Mathivet, Ch. (2010). *Cities for all: Proposals and experiences towards the right to the city.* Santiago: Habitat International Coalition (HIC).

21. UN Habitat (2017). *New urban agenda*. Retrieved from http://habitat3.org/documents-and-archive/new-urban-agenda/

22. Van Gent, W. P. (2010). Housing context and social transformation strategies in neighbourhood regeneration in Western European cities. *Journal of Housing Policy, 10*(1), 63-87.

23. Verdugo, G. J. P. (2011). Public housing and residential segregation of immigrants in France, 1968-1999. *Population, 66*(1), 169-193.