


Vol 136 (2011)

Special Issue 136, C: Contemporary social inequalities



Vassilis Arapoglou, Thomas Maloutas

doi: [10.12681/grsr.47](https://doi.org/10.12681/grsr.47)

Copyright © 2011, Vassilis Arapoglou, Thomas Maloutas



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0](#).

To cite this article:

Arapoglou, V., & Maloutas, T. (2011). Segregation, inequality and marginality in context: The case of Athens. *The Greek Review of Social Research*, 136, 135–155. <https://doi.org/10.12681/grsr.47>

Vassilis Arapoglou, Thomas Maloutas***

SEGREGATION, INEQUALITY AND MARGINALITY IN CONTEXT: THE CASE OF ATHENS

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the contextual factors that shape the dynamics and the patterns of segregation in Athens. Migration and changes in the ethnic composition of the working class have not produced more segregation and widespread marginality, because employment opportunities and affordable housing were available in socially mixed areas. Attention, is drawn, however, to the dynamics of social polarization, the concentration of housing inequality and deprivation which have been reshaping the social map of the city since the 1990s. The suburbanization of higher social categories has been enhancing isolation of wealthy enclaves in the east and in parts of the centre. The indigenous working class population on the western periphery has become socially and spatially entrapped. At the same time a deprived and ethnically diverse population, has been concentrating in central, north-western and south-western districts.

Keywords: *segregation, immigration, ethnic segregation, Athens*

1. INTRODUCTION: SEGREGATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL LITERATURE

The definition of segregation is simple according to human geography dictionaries (Johnston et al., 1986: 424) and seems to have a general, inter-contextual, applicability (“The residential separation of subgroups within a wider population”). This simple metaphor from genetics, that subsequently

*Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Crete, Greece.

** Professor of Social Geography, Harokopio University, Greece.

became the dominant meaning of the term, owed its success to the fact that it reflected the conditions of the booming American metropolis of the first half of the 20th century. In this paper we focus on the contextual factors that shape both the patterns, the dynamics and the effects of segregation which are related to migration. We do so by undertaking a review of the international literature in the introduction, and of recent research on social and ethnic segregation in Athens in the subsequent sections.

Patterns of segregation can be studied in terms of social class separation and in terms of ethnic or racial separation. Noteworthy that social class concerns predominantly European research as opposed to racial concerns in US studies. A clear-cut racial segregation resulting from discrimination in the US metropolis is much less adapted to reflecting the complex patterns of social segregation in European cities. The clarity of the US segregation pattern in contrast to the complexity of the European one(s) is also a contrast between capitalist urbanization in *tabula rasa* conditions in the first case and an urbanization engrafted on the complex and socially mixed matrix of the pre-capitalist European city. Moreover, the American concern with ethnic and racial segregation was related to the arrival of European migrants and to the relocation of black Americans from the agricultural south to industrial cities in the North.

Although segregation is often defined and measured as a mere outcome, its conceptualization as a process requires reference to a particular contextual frame. Ecological determinism prevailed in the initial explanations of the Chicago school, and processes like invasion, succession and competition were used to describe the concentric, and later the sectoral, pattern of segregation. In the same line, the much more important role of suburbanization in US metropolitan growth has produced much more homogeneous residential space in social and ethnoracial terms than the spatially more compact growth of the European city. However, filtering down was a side effect of suburbanization, with inner city areas becoming the only affordable solution to disadvantaged populations. Moreover, since the 1980s a variety of urban restructuring processes were considered to be contributing to segregation. Gentrification of inner city areas has been associated with the displacement of disadvantaged populations, and sprawling with the dispersion of ethnic groups in outer city areas.

A large part of the literature historically focused on the creation of ghettos in US cities but tended to neglect the positive impact of living in ghettos, which pioneers like Louis Wirth, W.E.B. Du Bois and Jane Addams addressed in their studies. As Wacquant (1997) aptly summarized the con-

cept of the ghetto was related to an anti-urbanist discourse, which equated the impact of minority congregation with deviance, marginality, and social disorganization. Consequently, the solution to segregation was threefold: occupational and residential mobility and assimilation. To simplify the argument, as migrants advanced on the occupational ladder they moved to middle class suburbs and were assimilated into the American way of life. It took some time to re-approach minority concentration and to emphasize the positive effects of local solidarity and support which can be found in immigrant or ethnic enclaves (eg. Wacquant, 2010; Portes and Stepick, 1993; Zhou, 1992; Logan, Zhang and Alba, 2002).

In the 1990's an international debate was initiated as to whether the new wave of international migration changed the pattern and experiences of segregation. In the U.S., the central question has been whether the immigration from Latin America and Asia increases segregation, thereby consolidating the separation of affluent whites from poor non-whites or if the newcomers break the existing line of colour. The findings of most studies support that overall ethnoracial segregation and concentration of poverty decreased, and most U.S. cities have become more mixed in terms of housing (Jargowsky and Yang, 2006; Jargowsky, 2003; Glaeser, 2001; Logan et al., 2004; Strait, 2006; Waldinger and Bozorgmehr, 1996). At the same time, migration is associated with larger urban restructuring processes and in many cases are emerging pervasive forms of poverty in areas where African-Americans and Hispanics often share (Poulsten et al., 2003; Rumbaut and Portes, 2001; Marcelli, etc., 2005; McConville and Ong, 2003; Massey and Fisher, 2000). However, this negative development is not related to the settlement of new migrants in deprived areas but to the reverse movement of white middle class groups against African-Americans. Trends of ethnoracial isolation have been shaped either by the flight of middle class whites (white flight) from Afro-American neighbourhoods or by the return of whites in areas where regeneration primarily displaced the Afro-Americans (gentrification).

A similar debate developed in European cities where, despite fears of ghettoization, research confirms either stability or reduction of ethnic separation but also the dispersal of deprivation (review in Simpson and Peach, 2009; Bolt, 2009). The differences in the structures and traditions of America and Europe are also reflected in the terminology of the debate. From one side of the Atlantic the focus has shifted on the dangers of creating a "rainbow underclass" (the multiethnic composition of the underclass resembles the rainbow) while on the other side the focus has shifted to the

demise of “social cohesion”. At the same time significant similarities can be discerned. In demographic and geographic terms the literature reveals a common trend of dispersion of immigrants and, despite the difficult circumstances they face, an increased ethnic mixing in the areas they live.

At policy level, a shift from “multicultural” to “assimilative” local or community interventions has occurred (Crowley and Hickman, 2008; Brubaker, 2001). A theoretical support of this shift is the recent argument advanced by Putnam (2007) that ethnic diversity hinders the creation of social capital. Assimilation policies are seen as a means to prevent conflicts between minority groups that threaten the cohesion of local communities. The public concern over safety, ethnic conflicts, and crime, mainly targeted the asylum seekers and refugees and gradually acquired islamophobic and racial characteristics (Clark and Garner, 2010; Crowley and Hickman, 2008).

Another criticism to assimilation policies is that they ignore wider structural changes, which local communities cannot easily reverse. As noted by Waldinger, Lim and Cort (2007), for the U.S., the underclass is defined as the failure to advance in middle class status, and basically implies that this failure leads to social pathology. In this way, the working class disappears from the analysis and its place is given to the “the rainbow of the disinherited”. Arguments for the rise of a rainbow underclass also ignore the changes in ethnoracial composition and living conditions of the working class, which gradually incorporated most of the immigrants.

Wacquant (2008), comparing France to America, converges with the scenario of a rainbow underclass, although in a different explanation for the phenomenon. He argues that the multi-ethnic composition of the population in the areas of advanced marginality, which he calls “anti-ghettos”, reflects the widespread insecurity, the fragmentation of classes and the incapacity of the local resistance to policies of spatial stigmatization and criminalization. Such generalization, however, is not compatible with either large-scale quantitative data nor the specific local conditions and cultures that prevail in host communities of immigrants (for a critique to this interpretative schema in the south of Europe, Maloutas, 2009).

Extremely fruitful is the British debate, which, in the tradition of empirical research, brought to the fore again that material deprivation, poor housing and infrastructure deficits, affect the dignity of members of working class communities, either mixed or ethnically homogeneous, and in some cases lead to racism and social conflict (Amin, 2002; Clark and Garner, 2010). Ethnographic research in British cities revealed that the isolation of working class and migrant communities was overstated by planners whilst

concerns about stigmatisation, and the means to address everyday needs were common concerns among local residents (Hickman, Crowley and Mai, 2008; Amin 2002).

2. SOCIAL CLASS CHANGES AND PROCESSES OF SOCIAL SEGREGATION IN ATHENS

During the first four post-war decades economic development in Athens offered substantial opportunities that were transformed to a prolonged wave of social mobility, enabling rural migrants and working-class offspring to access intermediate occupational positions (Tsoukalas, 1987). This has produced a social structure relatively expanded in the middle with numerous self-employed positions, many of them being crucially integrated in spatially diffuse manufacturing networks, large numbers of professionals in the prestigious professions (medicine, law, engineering), and large numbers of positions in public employment. A large part of the higher and upper-middle occupational positions are in reality nearer the social middle than the top. Professionals and managers in Athens are rarely part of the corporate elite, and an even smaller part is part of the international corporate elite. The lower occupational pole has, on the contrary, been shrinking since the 1960s.

However, during the 1990s two processes have contributed to bringing an end to the growth of middle classes and to the shrinkage of the working class. First, economic restructuring has contributed to the decline of small crafts and trade and respectively to the numbers of small business owners and the self-employed. Moreover, the immigration wave has restructured the content and the ethnic composition of the working class. The employment share of service workers and construction workers, recruited from a diverse ethnic pool has increased, whilst the share of Greek manufacturing workers in skilled jobs has decreased. In principle, this change at the lower pole could have produced more segregation; but, in fact, it did not because the affordable housing stock was situated in socially mixed and densely built areas around the centre, leading to complement the city's "vertical" segregation in ethno-racial terms (Maloutas and Karadimitriou, 2001).

Due to its contextual origins and history, the concept of segregation implies mainly –if not exclusively– neighbourhood segregation. The social profile of neighbourhoods in Athens developed in the following way: the higher social categories resided in and around the city centre from the 19th century to the mid 1970s, when they started gradually to suburbanize following the rapid degradation of living conditions in central areas (Le-

ontidou, 1990; Maloutas, 2007). The working-class and other lower occupational categories increasingly expanded the city's periphery, especially on the western part of the agglomeration, as they massively migrated from rural areas and smaller cities during the first three post-war decades. The suburbanization of higher and intermediate social categories, that continues for more than thirty years, has gradually reshaped the social map of the city: from an opposition between a rich centre and a poor periphery to the opposition between wealthy enclaves in the east and in parts of the centre and lower status areas in the western immediate periphery as well as in most parts of the outer periphery of the metropolis (see Figure 1).

Before the 1990s, residential segregation in Athens was relevant only in terms of class. The higher occupational categories traditionally resided in and around the city centre, while the working class was mainly located at the periphery, and especially on the western part. Since the mid 1970s the geography of social segregation in Athens started to change (Maloutas, 2000). The new generations of the numerically expanding higher and upper-middle occupational groups opted massively for residence in the north-eastern and south-eastern suburbs; this suburbanization trend has continued during the first decade of the 21st century. At the same time, the shrinking native working-class has been residentially much less mobile and increasingly limited within the traditional working-class strongholds (i.e. the working-class suburbs on the western part of the metropolis; Maloutas, 2004).


Figure 1 shows a synthetic image of class segregation in Athens for 2001. A classification of the city's census tracts into five different social types was chosen to convey this image with rather clearly demarcated class features between the different types/clusters (see Table 1).¹ According to this classification, 10% of the city's residents live in areas dominantly in-

1. We constructed a very broad social typology of residential space in Athens using a combination of a binary correspondence analysis on 17 class variables to determine the main social axes of their spatial variation, and a K-means clustering to classify the city's 3,500 census tracts (average population: 1,000; average active population: 450) according to their position on the axes that resulted from the correspondence analysis. The class variables are a disaggregated version of the nine fundamental ESeC classes that (a) differentiates between managers and professionals; (b) uses separate categories for large employers and artists; and (c) distinguishes the members of intermediate and lower socio-economic classes employed in industry, construction and transport from those working in the services. Agriculture-related occupational categories have not been taken into consideration due to their limited numbers and their important spatial variance, which is not relevant to the object of this analysis. The variables used are directly available in the database application EKKE-ESYE (2005).

habited by higher and 22% by higher and intermediate occupational categories (clusters 1 and 2) while 17% reside in areas mainly inhabited by lower ones (cluster 5). The rest –the other half– live in socially mixed areas (clusters 3 and 4), which sometimes appear slightly polarised as they contain increased shares of both higher and lower occupational categories (cluster 3).

The location of the two higher clusters covers most of the eastern part of the city, including the traditional strongholds of the upper socio-economic classes in the city centre. The lower cluster covers the western, working-class part of the city and most of the residential areas very distant from the centre. The slightly polarised cluster is located around the centre in areas that are densely populated, and the mixed cluster is mostly, but not exclusively, located in the best residential areas of the western (working-class) part of the city (see Figure 1), which gather the socially –but not residentially– mobile offspring of the local population (Maloutas, 2004).

FIGURE 1
Social types/clusters in the residential space of Athens.*
Census tract level (2001)



Source: Maloutas (2007a: 753).

TABLE 1
Social typology of residential space in Athens (2001).
Cluster composition in terms of major occupational groups
(values above average in bold)

Social Clusters (occupations)	Large employers, professional, administrative and managerial occupations	Intermediate and lower technician occupations	Small employer and self employed occupations	Lower white collar and skilled occupations	Routine occupations	Percent distribution of the active population
Higher (cl 1)	50	18	15	9	8	10
Higher and Intermediate (cl 2)	34	24	16	16	11	22
Polarised (cl 3)	30	20	11	19	21	6
Mixed (cl 4)	19	21	17	24	19	46
Lower (cl 5)	13	15	16	26	31	17
All clusters	25	20	16	21	18	100

Data source: EKKE-ESYE (2005).

3. SOCIOETHNIC SEGREGATION IN ATHENS: PATTERNS AND DYNAMICS

The dispersion of immigrant communities, recent outbreaks of racist violence and the new assimilative policies in southern countries indicate a common trend with the rest of Europe (Arapoglou et al., 2009; Ventura, 2009; Papataxiarchis, 2009). However, the settlement of immigrants in major cities of southern Europe has distinctive characteristics, which have been shaped by different conditions to those of north European cities (Arbaci and Malheiros, 2009; Mingione, 2009; Malheiros, 2002).

The first studies in Athens in the early 1990s identified inner city areas of exclusion of Albanian immigrants (Psimmenos, 1998, 1995) and isolation of Greek repatriates from the Soviet Union on the urban periphery (Kasimati, 1998, 1992). However, variance in local demand for employment and local government response, gender differences and the more recent diversification of sending countries create a more complex picture (indicative of recent studies: Vaiou and Stratigaki, 2008; Psimmenos and Skamnaki, 2008; Iosifides et al., 2007; Kassimatis and Mousourou, 2007; Cavounidis, 2006; Bagavos and Papadopoulou, 2006). A number of recent studies have documented that segregation of migrants is rather moderate

relating to both central concentration and peri-urban dispersal (Arapoglou and Sayas, 2009; Maloutas, 2007). This section maps into more detail the pattern of migrant settlement. It also elaborates how processes of urban change and labour market dynamics contribute to the shaping of migrant concentrations.

Figure 2a presents the distribution of migrants in the metropolitan region of Athens drawing on a classification of neighbourhoods by Johnston, Poulsen and Forrest (2003). Their classification was specifically designed to enable comparative research and explore if there are ghettos or enclaves within European metropolises. According to their criteria there is no area in Athens that could be classified as ghetto, even if one takes into account the very recent arrival of refugees and asylum seekers. Modifying their classification to fit the Greek context, neighbourhoods of the metropolitan region of Attiki can be classified into 5 categories:


“Homogenous neighbourhoods” with less than 10% of the migrants in resident population which is a bit higher than the metropolitan average.

“Host neighbourhoods” where migrants form between 10% and a fourth of the total population. Hosting neighbourhoods are the locus of a considerable dispersal of migrants, mainly the Albanians, and also of changes for both the majority and the minority populations. It is expected that within hosting neighbourhoods processes of assimilation to established cultural norms will tend to prevail.

“Migrant neighbourhoods” where migrants in the local population are three times more than the metropolitan average or more than 25% of the population. Experimentation with the data and alternative thresholds verified that most migrant neighbourhoods are ethnically mixed; one group very rarely representing more than 60% of the migrant population. However, to depict with greater accuracy their ethnic composition, migrant neighbourhoods were further broken down to *“Plural migrant neighbourhoods”* (where no ethnic group represents more than 50% of the migrant population); *“Primarily Albanian neighbourhoods”* (where Albanians represent more than 50% of the migrant population) and *“primarily Asian neighbourhoods”* (where various Asian ethnic groups sum more than 50% of the migrant population).


Figure 2a depicts a pattern of migrant settlement at both central and peri-urban areas. Symbols on the map signify the dynamics of urban change. The largest part of the Athenian space is ethnically homogenous. On the one hand, ethnic homogeneity is mostly evident within suburban areas on the west and east side of the city. West side working class sub-

FIGURE 2A
Migrants in the region of Attiki



Data Source: EKKE- ESYE (2005).

FIGURE 2B
Migrants in the main tenement city Athens-Piraeus



Data Source: EKKE- ESYE (2005).

urbs (see also cluster 5 on Figure 1) develop and become more compact without attracting significant numbers of migrants. The same is true for mainly upper or middle class suburbs (see also clusters 1 and 2 on Figure 1) with a few exceptions relating to the development of trade along the waterfront and concentration of domestic workers within upper class enclaves. On the other hand, socio-ethnic diversity is related to a slowly progressing filtering-down within the main tenement city and to strong pressures for urban expansion and leapfrog development. A large cluster of host neighbourhoods has emerged in the main tenement city, two more clusters appear at the city edges and a number of dispersed host communities are to be found at peri-urban areas of sprawl. As will be explained later, the growth of construction activities, in such areas, functions as a pulling force for migrants.

The main concentration of migrants is to be found in neighbourhoods spanning along the two major administrative and economic centres of the region, namely from the central city of Athens to the port of Piraeus (Figure 2b). Within this densely built and populated area migrant neighbourhoods gradually emerge. Figure 2b depicts a highly plural concentration of migrants in the heart of the tenement city “Kypseli” and “Patisia”, neighbourhoods representing the ideal of middle class settlement during the 1960s and 1970s. Within such plural neighbourhoods Poles, Russians, and members of African communities reside together with Albanians and Greeks. Often an apartment building may host households belonging to three or four different ethnic origins. The level of the flat and the size of living space signify economic and social distinction among the residents of the building. A couple of bus stops to the north, the proportion of Albanians increases but there is no dramatic change in the composition of the migrant population. Within walking distance, neighbourhoods surrounding “Omonoia square”, a popular meeting place of migrants, make up a highly diverse concentration of population with no single group representing the absolute majority. In between Athens and Piraeus, a cluster of neighbourhoods with Asian migrants is located within an area of light manufacturing, and storage facilities along the road and the train tracks that connect the port to the city. Notably, the neighbourhoods of migrants from the Indian peninsula are hosted within a wider community of Greek repatriates from Russia and Georgia.

To the North-West a first concentration of migrants develops close to the city edge which initially received Greeks repatriating from the former Soviet Union (Figure 2a). Reconstruction, after the 1999 earthquake, construc-

tion of road infrastructures and nearby sport facilities for the 2004 Olympics attracted also a significant amount of Albanian workers in this area which has a working class profile and gradually merges into the main urban tissue. In good proximity but separated by the highway, is a second concentration of migrants at the North-East edge of the city. This is an area of expanding professional and upper middle class settlements. The building of villas and condominiums and the concentration of trade and commercial activities for the service of middle class new residents in the area create strong pressure to expand the urban limit. Migrants, locally recruited in small building operations and routine jobs in retail and wholesale trade, usually settle in old cottages with cheap rents.

Areas of leap-frog development and sprawling at the east of the conurbation have also become major migrant destinations (Figure 2a). The coastal front to the East is a cluster of diversifying host communities that experience growth of small trade and leisure activities and transformation of second residences to primary ones. Leap-frog development is a feature of many communities scattered in the wider peri-urban area (Arapoglou and Sayas, 2009; Leontidou et al., 2007). Some of them have a primarily residential character, others rely more on small trade and manufacturing, whilst a few depend on tourism and recreation.

Significantly, migrant neighbourhoods in Athens do not constitute “enclaves” by international standards for two basic reasons (Logan et al., 2004 provide a summary of the literature on enclaves). They do not include significant numbers of ethnic enterprises to recruit members of ethnic communities and to sustain an economy of interrelated activities. Nonetheless, the functions of local labour markets, especially in constructions and domestic services, contribute to shaping the pattern of migrant settlement.

Table 2 shows the percentage that migrant construction and domestic workers represent in the total employed population within different types of neighbourhoods. The share of migrant construction and domestic workers is low within homogenous neighbourhoods but increases within host communities and migrant neighbourhoods. Particularly, within plural and predominantly Albanian neighbourhoods the total share of construction and domestic workers is above 15% of the total employed population. The highest share of construction workers is recorded within Albanian neighbourhoods reflecting the advantageous position of Albanians in the construction industry. Significantly, bonding among Albanian migrants relies on kinship rather than ethnic ties, and this form of association facilitates assimilation to the Greek culture (Iosifides et al., 2008).

The highest share of domestic workers is recorded within plural migrant neighbourhoods, a reflection of the fact that women from central and eastern European countries are well placed within migrant niches close to the city centre. Central tenement for migrant women is also part of a job search strategy to increase employment probabilities within densely populated areas. Recent studies highlight informal interactions among Greek women employers and migrant domestic workers that facilitate social integration in Athenian neighbourhoods (Vaiou and Lykogianni, 2006; Vaiou and Stratigaki, 2008). Interactions of this kind include job references and recommendations, mediation in housing search, assistance in accessing health services and schools, and support in dealing with bureaucratic procedures for work and residence permits.

TABLE 2
Shares of migrant workers in total employment

Type of Neighbourhood	Migrant construction workers	Migrant domestic workers
Homogenous	1,3	0,8
Host	4,2	2,7
Plural migrant	9,6	7,8
Albanian	10,1	5,6
Asian	6,1	2,8

Data Source: EKKE- ESYE (2005).

Moreover, neighbourhoods are not simply areas of affordable housing where construction and domestic workers reside whilst they daily commute to their places of work. Neighbourhoods are privileged sites for economic and social integration because there develop strong linkages between residences and workplaces (Arapoglou and Sayas, 2009). Residence-employment linkages are most evident in commuting patterns of construction workers. According to census data, 80% of construction workers do not travel to work outside the boundaries of the municipality of their residence, as compared to 53% of domestic workers and 51% of the total employed population in the region. Short commuting distances indicate that the building industry is well embedded in local cultures and social relationships and very much relies on local labour markets which attract migrants. The pull of local demand is best illustrated in areas of city expansion, at the edges of the urban periphery or at the eastern coastal

zone. But, impressively enough, local demand has significant effects within the central city, where short commuting distances are also recorded for construction workers. In central areas, migrant labour is utilised to meet demand in construction of new buildings, but also in repairs, renovations, and urban renewal projects. A similar role is played by small Greek sub-contractors, who tap pools of migrant labour and undertake small parts in infrastructural or mega projects within their local areas.

Labour demand in peri-urban areas also explains why central city neighbourhoods are not the only points of entrance to the city for migrants, as would have been assumed by the theory of spatial assimilation. It is estimated that 65% of most recent arrivals are directed outside the two central municipalities of Athens and Piraeus. Moreover, the significance of the local context is verified when examining the residential mobility of migrants. According to census data, 89% of migrant construction workers were registered within the same municipality for at least five consecutive years, as compared to 85% for the total migrant population. The decentralisation of administrative functions, legalisation procedures, social insurance, and public employment offices, which began in the late 1990s, has strengthened the power of local actors. For migrants it is easier to deal with rather harsh and complicated bureaucratic procedures locally with the assistance of their colleagues, co-patriots, employer mediators and employers. Nevertheless, on the basis of existing research we can argue that local networks of this type are based on an assimilative work ethic which prioritizes control and discipline of cheap labour (Psimmenos and Kasimati, 2002; Baldwin Edwards, 2004; Iosifides et al., 2007).


4. SOCIOETHNIC SEGREGATION IN ATHENS: THE RAINBOW OF DEPRIVATION

If social cohesion is to be understood not only in cultural or ideological terms, then material inequality and deprivation must be taken into consideration. Especially, housing deprivation is closely related to the living conditions of residents in segregated areas. Here we shall consider three measures of housing inequality: a) Functional living space measured as housing surface per person. We consider the surface of 20 m² per capita as the level under which a household may be considered as deprived, b) Building construction period. We consider more than 30 years of buildings' age to increase the possibility of deprived conditions, c) Tenure, and the consideration of renting from the private sector as a potential source of disadvantage.

Figure 3 shows that a significant proportion of the Greek population experiences some form of housing deprivation, ranging from approximately one quarter (24,1% in per person living space) to approximately one third (33,8% for buildings' age over 30 years). Immigrants are obviously disadvantaged in relation to the Greek population in all three respects. The percentage of deprived immigrants is almost three times higher than for the Greek population. Significant ethnic differences also emerge. Deprivation is most widespread among the Albanian population. Despite high levels of deprivation, immigrants from less developed countries and new EU countries are placed in a better position than Albanians. A substantially better picture is shown for immigrants from the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. In part, this is because this category includes expatriates who have strong social networks and access to public assistance schemes.


The concentration of the poor and deprived population is internationally used to assess the living conditions in ghettos and enclaves (Jargowsky 1997, Strait 2006). An area can be considered to suffer from high deprivation when more than 40% of the resident population is found in some form of poverty or deprivation. Figures 4a and 4b map the concentration of

FIGURE 3
Housing deprivation of the Greek and the migrant population




Data Source: EKKE- ESYE 2005, own estimations.

FIGURE 4A
Population deprived of living space as a share of total residents



Data Source: EKKE- ESYE 2005, own estimations.

FIGURE 4B
Share of deprived immigrants in total deprived population within neighborhoods of high deprivation



Source: 2005 IURS-NCSR census database, own estimations.

deprived population in terms of living space in the metropolitan region of Athens. Taking into account that deprivation of living space is a very good proxy of poverty in the Greek case (Emmanoul, 2004; Tsakloglou and Papadopoulos, 2002; Bouzas, 1990) Figures 4a and 4b are an approximation for the spatial concentration of poverty as well.

Figure 4a charts the percentage of the housing deprived population (Greeks and migrants) in the total resident population of each neighborhood. In approximately one fifth (20%) of neighborhoods the deprived population exceeds 40% of the total residents and so they can be considered as neighborhoods of relatively high deprivation. Figure 4b charts the percentage of deprived migrants in the total deprived population within those neighborhoods where housing deprivation is high. It appears that migrants constitute a significant share (above 30%) of the deprived population only in one third of high deprivation neighborhoods.

Figure 4a shows the impact of the historical model of social division which shaped the city into western and eastern areas significantly opposed in terms of residential inequalities. Migrants have a low presence in most of the traditional working class districts and deprived neighbourhoods (see also cluster 5 in Figure 1). One factor that contributes to the limited presence of migrants in these areas is the prevalence of home ownership, as a result of self-built practices in the preceding decades, and consequently the lack of housing stock for rent. In the most deprived neighbourhoods on the western outskirts of the agglomeration (Egaleo, Ano Liosia, Kamatero, Drapetsona etc.) over 90% of the population are Greek homeowners with no access to finance or real estate markets and culturally isolated.

However, new social and spatial divisions become evident, as a mosaic of immigrant communities face difficult housing conditions mainly in the centre and outskirts of the agglomeration. Areas of deprivation are identified along the axis of Piraeus-Patission avenues. A second line of deprivation emerges around the northbound highway (Athens-Thessaloniki) in the neighbourhoods of New Philadelphia, Acharnes and Metamorphosis. A third spatial unit of deprivation is formed by the contiguous areas of Kamatero, Ano Liosia Acharnon and Zefyri. Scattered pockets of deprivation are situated in the western districts of Aspropyrgos, Eleusis and Mandra; and in Markopoulo, Anthousa, and Rafina in the east. The mixing of indigenous Greeks and migrants in these areas is high. Vertical differentiation particularly in central areas, contributes to ethnic mixing and simultaneously marks social differences between neighbours (Maloutas and Karadimitriou, 2001). Diversity and deprivation occur within the same ar-

eas, because different groups of migrants and Greeks lack adequate living space and use a rented housing stock which is old and poorly maintained.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Research findings suggest that immigration has contributed to reducing the total social segregation in Athens in contrast to dominant representations about the rise of ghettos (Maloutas, 2007; Arapoglou and Sayas, 2009). Migrant workers and migrant labourers, production and service workers, are grouped in the city centre, even though there are different patterns of settlement for different ethnic and professional groups. Following an unprecedented process the Greek capital acquired an ethnically diverse working class hosted mainly in traditional middle class areas. So changing the ethnic composition of the working class has supported a dual class and ethnic mix (Arapoglou and Sayas, 2009). Moreover, the trend of middle class flight contributed to the ethnic homogenisation of suburban areas. At the same time, the demise of traditional lower middle class strata creates tendencies of polarization within central city areas. In peri-urban areas, however, where sprawling is accelerated by unplanned and speculative construction, the migrant workers mix with a socially diverse population including small traders, artisans and professionals who relocate there.

There is no evidence to support that a “rainbow underclass” or “ghettos” have been formed in Athens. But we should draw attention to the “rainbow of local deprivation” by referring to the ethnic mix of populations in areas with an aging housing stock in rented accommodation, with high building and population density, and deficits in public infrastructure. In this sense, the potential threat for social cohesion is reflected primarily in terms of deprivation and material inequality, and it is in these terms that it should be first of all addressed. The threat of conflict or disrupted social ties results also from symbolic divisions, ideological and political mediations. Particularly in the Municipality of Athens, middle class groups feel trapped in a common destiny with new immigrant populations against the upper-middle classes who prosper and thrive in “good suburbs” (Arapoglou et al., 2009; Kavoulacos and Kandylis, 2010). Social conflict is a result of territorial stigmatisation, racist policing and the political capitalization of fear.

REFERENCES

- Amin A., 2002, *Ethnicity and the Multicultural City: Living with Diversity*, Report for the Department of Transport Local Government and the regions and the ESRC cities initiative, University of Durham.
- Arapoglou V.P., 2006, "Immigration, segregation, and urban development in Athens; the relevance of the LA debate for Southern European Metropolises", *The Greek Review of Social Research*, Special Issue, 121C: 11-38.
- Arapoglou V.P., Sayas J., 2009, "New facets of urban segregation in Southern Europe: Gender, migration and social class change in Athens", *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 16 (4): 345-362.
- Arbaci S., Malheiros J., 2009, "De-segregation, peripheralisation and the social exclusion of Immigrants: Southern European cities in the 1990s", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36 (2): 227-255.
- Bolt G., 2009, "Combating residential segregation of ethnic minorities in European cities", *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 24: 397-405.
- Brubaker R., 2001, "The return of assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany and the United States", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24 (4): 531-548.
- Cavounidis J., 2006, "Labor market impact of migration: employment structures and the case of Greece", *International Migration Review*, 40 (3): 635-660.
- Crowley H., Hickman M., 2008, "Migration, postindustrialism and the globalized nation state: social capital and social cohesion re-examined", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 31 (7): 1222-1244.
- Drydakis N., 2010, "Ethnic differences in housing opportunities in Athens", *Urban Studies (in press)*.
- Emmanuel D., 2004, "Socio-economic inequalities and housing in Athens. Impacts of the monetary revolution in the 1990s", *The Greek Review of Social Research*, 113A: 121-44.
- Glazer J., 2001, *Racial Segregation in the 2000 Census: Promising News*, The Brookings Institution survey series.
- Hickman M., Crowley H., Mai N., 2008, *Immigration and Social Cohesion in the U.K.: The Rhythms and Realities of Everyday Life*, London, London Metropolitan University and Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Iosifides T., Lavrentiadou M., Petracou E., Kontis A., 2007, "Forms of social capital and the incorporation of Albanian Immigrants in Greece", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33 (3): 1343-1361.
- Jargowsky P.A., 2003, *Stunning Progress, Hidden Problems: The Dramatic Decline of Concentrated Poverty in the 1990s*, Living Cities Census Series, Center on Urban and Metropolitan Studies, Washington D.C., The Brookings Institution.
- Jargowsky P.A., 1997, *Poverty and Place: Ghettos, Barrios and the American City*, New York, Russel Sage Foundation
- Jargowsky P.A., Yang R., 2006, "The Underclass revisited: A social problem in decline", *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 28 (1): 55-70.
- Joassart-Marcelli P., Wolch J., Alonso A., Sessoms N., 2005, "Spatial segregation of the poor in Southern California: A multidimensional analysis", *Urban Geography*, 26 (7): 587-609.
- Johnston R.J., Gregory D., Smith D.M., 1984, *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- King R., 2000, "Southern Europe in the changing global map of migration", in King R., La-

- zaridis G., Tsardanidis C. (eds), *Eldorado or Fortress? Migration in Southern Europe*, Macmillan, London, pp. 1-26.
- Kingsley G., Pettit K., Pettit T., 2003, *Concentrated Poverty: A Change in Course*, The Neighborhood change in Urban America Series, Washington DC, Urban Institute.
- Leontidou L., 1990, *The Mediterranean City in Transition: Social Change and Urban Development*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Leontidou L., Afouxenidis A., Kourliouros E., Marmaras E., 2007, "Infrastructure-related Urban Sprawl: Mega-events and hybrid peri-urban landscapes in Southern Europe", in Couch C., Leontidou L., Petchel-Held G. (eds), *Urban Sprawl in Europe: Landscapes, Land-use Change and Policy*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Logan et al., 2004, "Segregation of minorities in the metropolis: two decades of change", *Demography*, 41: 1-22.
- Malheiros J., 2002, "Ethni-cities: Residential patterns in Northern European and Mediterranean Metropolises- Implications for policy design", *International Journal of Population Geography*, 8: 107-134.
- Maloutas T., 1993, "Social segregation in Athens", *Antipode*, 25 (3): 223-39.
- Maloutas T., 2004, "Segregation and residential mobility: spatial entrapped social mobility and its impact on segregation in Athens", *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 11 (2): 171-187.
- Maloutas T., 2007, "Segregation, social polarization and immigration in Athens during the 1990s: theoretical expectations and contextual differences", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 31(4): 733-758.
- Maloutas T., 2009, "Urban Outcasts: A contextualized outlook on advanced marginality", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 33 (3): 828-834.
- Maloutas T., Karadimitriou N., 2001, "Vertical social differentiation in Athens: alternative or complement to community segregation?", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 25 (4): 699-716.
- Massey D., Fisher M., 2000, "How segregation concentrates poverty", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23: 670-691.
- Massey D. et al., 1996, "The dimensions of segregation revisited", *Sociological Methods and Research*, 25: 172-206.
- Massey D.S., Gross A.B., Eggers M.L., 1991, "The ecology of inequality: Minorities and the concentration of poverty 1970-1980", *The American Journal of Sociology*, 95: 1153-1188.
- McConville S., Ong P., 2003, *The Trajectory of Poor Neighborhoods in Southern California: 1970-2000*, Washington D.C., The Brookings Institution, Living Cities, Census Series.
- Mingione E., 2009, "Family, welfare and districts: the local impact of new migrants in Italy", *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 16 (3): 225-236.
- Portes A., Stepick A., 1993, *City on the Edge: The Transformation of Miami*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- Putnam R., 2007, "E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and community in the 21st century", *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30 (2): 137-174.
- Rumbaut R., Portes A., 2001, *Ethnicities: Children of Immigrants in America*, Berkeley, University of California Press and Russell Sage Foundation.
- Simpson L., Peach C., 2009, "Measurement and analysis of segregation, integration and diversity: Editorial introduction", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35 (9): 1377-1380.
- Strait J.B., 2006, "Poverty concentration in the prismatic metropolis: the impact of compositional and redistributive forces within Los Angeles, California, 1990-2000", *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 28 (1): 71-94.

- Tsakoglou P., Papadopoulos F., "Aggregate level and determining factors of social exclusion in twelve European Countries", *Journal of European Social Policy*, 12 (3): 211-225.
- Wacquant L., 1997, "Three pernicious premises in the study of the American ghetto", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 21 (2): 341-353.
- Wacquant L., 2008, *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Wacquant L., 2010, "A Janus Faced Institution of ethnoracial closure: a sociological specification of the Ghetto", in Hutchinson R., Haynes B. (eds), *The Ghetto*, CO, Boulder, Westview Press.
- Waldinger R., Lim N., Cort D., 2007, "Bad jobs, good jobs, no jobs, The employment experience of the Mexican American second generation", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33 (1): 1-35.
- Waldinger R., M. Bozorgmehr (eds), 1996, *Ethnic Los Angeles*, New York, Russell Sage.
- Zhou M., 1992, *Chinatown: The Socioeconomic Potential of an Urban Enclave*, Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

In Greek

- Arapoglou V., Kavoulakos K., Kandyli G., Maloutas T., 2009, "The new social geography of Athens: migration, diversity and conflict", *Contemporary Issues*, 107: 75-66.
- Bagavos C., Papadopoulou D. (ed), 2006, *Immigration and Integration of Immigrants in Greek Society*, Athens, Gutenberg.
- Bouzas N., 1990, "Poverty and housing", in Karagiorgas S. et al. (eds), *Dimensions of Poverty in Greece*, Athens, NCSR.
- Emmanuel D., 2002, "Segregation, polarization and inequality in the geography of Athens: the role of market mechanisms and residential housing development (1980-2000)", *Geographies*, 3: 46-70.
- Kassimatis K. (ed.), 2003, *Immigration and Integration Strategies: The Case of Albanian and Polish Immigrants*, Athens, KEKMOKOP-Gutenberg.
- Kassimatis K., 1992, *Pontian Immigrants from the Former Soviet Union: Social and Economic Integration*, Athens, General Secretariat of Greeks Abroad and KEKMOKOP.
- Kassimatis K., Mousourou L., 2007, *Gender and Migration. Volume I. Theoretical Reviews and Empirical Investigation*, Athens, KEKMOKOP-Gutenberg.
- Papataxiarchis E., 2009, "On the edge of the gaze: The crisis of hospitality in the age of porous borders", *Contemporary Issues*, 107: 67-7.
- Psimmenos J., 1995, *Migration from the Balkans: Social Exclusion in Athens*, Athens, Glory-book-Papazisis.
- Psimmenos J., 1998, "Creating spaces social exclusion: The case of Albanian immigrants in informal center of Athens," in Kasimati K. (ed.), *Social Exclusion: The Greek Experience*, Athens, KEKMOKOP-Gutenberg.
- Psimmenos J., Skamnakis H., 2008, *Domestic Labor and Immigrant Social Protection: The Case of Women from Albania and Ukraine*, Athens, Papazisis.
- Ventura L., 2009, "National State and modern migration: trends, policies, approaches", *Contemporary Issues*, 107: 23-36.