



## Christopher D. Lloyd, Ian G. Shuttleworth, and David W. Wong (eds), Social-spatial segregation. Concepts, processes and outcomes

Giovanni Picker

To cite this article: Giovanni Picker (2016) Christopher D. Lloyd, Ian G. Shuttleworth, and David W. Wong (eds), Social-spatial segregation. Concepts, processes and outcomes, Urban Research & Practice, 9:2, 226-228, DOI: [10.1080/17535069.2016.1190511](https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2016.1190511)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2016.1190511>



Published online: 13 Jun 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 21



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

are shaped by hard angle between plan for integration and municipality's regulatory power. These challenges are particularly formed in an atmosphere of rising migrant and poverty levels in addition to inequalities in accessing urban services. As such, authors argue that local rescaling in Cape Town, specifically after 2006, is at large governed by white interest groups, in other words by white capitalism which creates contradictions at the vertical and horizontal public governance. Here, urban service providing and finance is largely differentiated based on informal and formal settlements.

Géraldine Pflieger's piece on Santiago de Chile stresses on the strong state power in the urban sector, gradually established since 1965, by the military coup d'état of Pinochet. The author periodizes the gradual institutionalization of 'state as developer' (219) scheme that set growth coalition between the state and the construction industry. Like the other authors in the volume, Pflieger examines urban infrastructure investments and access in connection to housing crisis, stemming from the ban on illegal settlements. Thus, she concludes that the strong state implements strict regulation over basic urban services while privatizing such services. On the other hand, new urban developments take on paying the costs of developing infrastructure. Within this context, municipalities are reduced to the role of state subcontractors – somewhat not included in the overall decision-making and policy processes. Despite strong state control over social movements, rising discontent since 2010, with regard to urban transportation – the most inefficient sector reveals growing social inequalities and fragmentation.

All of the articles in the volume concentrate on the relationship between construction boom and urban infrastructure investments in correlation with how 'city industries' bring about institutional change at multiple scales of government and/or governance. The reason why all of the authors of the volume examine the ways through which for example, private–public partnerships are formed or second-order institutions work to produce the city, is digging deeper into the question with regard to the 'governability' of megacities in the emerging countries, despite their size or the political regimes under which these cities were continued to be produced. Lastly, all of the city cases in the *Governing Megacities in Emerging Countries* are analyzed to provide more insights into 'growth coalitions', not only in between private and public sectors but also across different economic sectors (i.e. industry and/or financial) in the emerging countries, which further illuminates political natures of the urbanization processes. The volume is specifically useful for policy practitioners, and academics that undertake comparative work on urban governance and/or governments with its rich empirical accounts. Therefore, I strongly recommend this book.

Eda Acara

*Urban Policy Planning and Local Governments, Middle East Technical University,  
Ankara, Turkey*

[eacara@metu.edu.tr](mailto:eacara@metu.edu.tr); [eda.acara@queensu.ca](mailto:eda.acara@queensu.ca)

© 2016, Eda Acara

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2016.1154753>

**Social-spatial segregation. Concepts, processes and outcomes**, edited by Christopher D. Lloyd, Ian G. Shuttleworth, and David W. Wong, Bristol, Policy Press, 2015, xiv + 438 pp., £70.00 (Paperback), ISBN 9781447301356

Lloyd, Shuttleworth and Wong's edited collection takes stock of research on the spatial dimension of residential segregation that is available in English, and, based on empirical

evidence, suggests discrete, concrete and clear steps forward. ‘Discrete’ is a keyword here: the editors argue for more context-sensitive approaches and methods ‘that [should] identify [...] diversity [between differently “diverse” neighbourhoods] rather than conceal it by using measures that just focus on average situations’ (14). This claim directly speaks to recent works on residential segregation (e.g. Mudu 2006; Maloutas and Fujita 2012) that highlight a similar need for chiefly taking the specificities of the local context into account. As one of the most comprehensive studies in segregation research, this book is positioned as agenda setting. Remarkably, at the same time, it recognizes the limits of a strictly space-centred (and quantitative) approach and envisages, in the conclusion, more hybrid conceptual and methodological endeavours. Inside the comprehensive threefold architecture – concepts (Chapters 2–8), processes (Chapters 9–13) and outcomes (Chapters 14–16) – the 28 authors engage with a great variety of issues. These range from the fluid ‘meaning and ontology of ethnicity’ (165) to housing submarkets, to a new software for individual-based analyses.

The first part (concepts) suggests very precise ways for overcoming the limitations of traditional methods, for example, the index of dissimilarity or predefined statistical areas. Some of the most relevant contributions include introducing address change for measuring interaction between people (and not simply assuming its decay the more distance increases), working with individual data within a microgeography of segregation, rather than predefined areas (Chapter 5), and put class politics and global political economy on the agenda of multiculturalism and super-diversity studies, rather than explaining segregation in rather culturalist terms (Chapter 6). Finally, an important conceptual contribution concerns the variety and variability of the meanings of ‘ethnicity’ and ‘race’ across different countries: if we want to engage in transnational comparisons, which are increasingly important in the global order, we should be able to break down each country’s conceptualization of census categories and reassemble them in ways that conceal meaningful comparisons (Chapter 8). The second part (processes) highlights the need for considering segregation not just as a static phenomenon but as a changing and dynamic process. First and foremost, mobility emerges as a key dimension to be considered by scholars of segregation, both in combination to life course and ethnicity (Chapter 12) and in the context of the British Choice-based letting policy (CBL) which, contrary to expectations, does not seem to have reduced the levels of segregation (Chapter 11). The third part (outcomes) includes the impact of social-spatial segregation on health (Chapter 14) class (Chapter 15) and ethnic (Chapter 16) inequalities.

Probably, the most outstanding quality of this work is that each chapter represents an original contribution to a (more or less) large research subarea. Apart from critically expanding from the usual index of dissimilarity, all authors seem to converge in arguing for more attention to local spatial dynamics, meanings and processes, from the very beginning of the research design – i.e. the phases of conceptualization and methodological choices. The reader is, therefore, continually pushed to think outside the box, questioning in this way assumptions and conventional wisdom in segregation research. This is a rare quality in edited collections. Moreover, the authors, besides proposing something new, acknowledge the limits of their own contribution and sketch alternative ways in which their specific methodology or conceptualization can be adopted. For example, in the chapter by Paez et al (Chapter 5), the authors work on the 1880 US census, as only an example of individual-based research in which ‘confidentiality issues are largely immaterial’ (106).

Although the book includes very meaningful and important social-political contexts when it comes to segregation, including Northern Ireland and the US cities such as Saint

Louis, Baltimore and Sand Diego, its geographical reach is strikingly limited to the Global North (and only to ‘the US, UK and Europe (*sic*)’, 424). The implications of this limitation importantly intersect debates that have been circulating in urban studies for over a decade – how can typically Western disciplines such as sociology and geography learn from the Global South? (e.g. Robinson 2006; McFarlane 2011). It seems important, therefore, that the editors acknowledge, as they do in the conclusion, the importance of focusing also on the South. A second and last limitation is that out of 28 authors, only 4 are women. This appears as another disproportion which, especially in works addressing inequalities, one may hope to overcome. In conclusion, this edited volume comprehensively and critically assesses previous research on social-spatial segregation, brings knowledge on this phenomenon a step further and addresses precise venues and concrete ways for bringing it even further. As such, it can also be considered as a manual to keep close on the shelf, and frequently go back to.

## References

- Maloutas, T., and K. Fujita. 2012. *Residential Segregation in Comparative Perspective Making Sense of Contextual Diversity*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- McFarlane, C. 2011. *Learning the City. Knowledge and Translocal Assemblage*. Oxford: Wiley.
- Mudu, P. 2006. “Patterns of Segregation in Contemporary Rome.” *Urban Geography* 27 (5): 422–440. doi:10.2747/0272-3638.27.5.422.
- Robinson, J. 2006. *Ordinary Cities: Between Modernity and Development*. London: Routledge.

Giovanni Picker  
 Faculty of Cultural Sciences  
 European University Viadrina, Frankfurt  
 Oder, Germany  
[Picker@europa-uni.de](mailto:Picker@europa-uni.de)

© 2016, Giovanni Picker

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2016.1190511>

**Governing urban regions through collaboration. A view from North America**, by Joël Thibert, Ashgate, 2015, 280 pp., £65.00 (hardback), ISBN 978-1-4724-3559-0.

The author’s main motivation for the research – and this book – is ‘to understand why certain collaborative regional initiatives make a difference in terms of providing regional public goods, while others seem to have no effect beyond the confines of the collaborative process itself’ (13). In consequence, he initially focuses less on collaborative processes and the urban context, but ‘on the extrinsic significance of regional collaboration’ (26).

Many regional studies scholars are familiar with the difficulty to define the actual subject of his/her research – the urban region. A challenge the author is aware of when providing essential definitions in Chapter 1. A second challenge – and this is the focus of the book – is to actually measure the outcomes of regional collaboration (Chapter 2). Thibert’s conceptual and methodological framework is based on the findings from both quantitative and qualitative regional studies: He focuses on the development of two sets of variables that would allow him to measure collaboration outcomes: *types* of regional collaboration (functional, state-mandated and bottom-up collaboration) and *forms* (from consensus-based collaboration to ‘pure cooperation’, ‘understood in the sense of