

THE ŁÓDŹ ATLAS

Sheet LIII: Socio-residential structure of Łódź as in 2002

Szymon Marcińczak

According to a contemporary scholarly discourse (Cf. Fa i n s t e i n, H a r l o e 1992; M o l l e n k o p f, C a s t e l l s 1991; L i s z e w s k i 2004), the spatial segregation of individual social groups is an inherent feature of today’s urbanization. This is shown in the concept of a ‘dual city’ which states that in urban space the enclaves of poverty and affluence are juxtaposed in close propinquity (L i s o w s k i 2000). The occurrence of socio-spatial segregation has been confirmed many times, mainly in American and west European cities, but also in the capitals of post-socialist countries.

According to D o m a n s k i (2004), the main indicators of social status are the levels of education and profession. The main beneficiaries of systemic transition are people from higher management circles, followed by the intelligentsia. In the middle levels are three wide categories – technical, administrative, and office staff, while the ‘losers’ are unskilled manual workers (ibid.). It should be highlighted, however, that the above pattern refers to those who are paid for their work. Another feature of post-socialist Poland, resulting from the restructuring of economy, is the high rate of long-term unemployment, the outcome of huge unprofitable state enterprises being closed down.

In order to present the socio-residential diversification in Łódź in 2002, the author used 35 variables from the National Census (2002) referring to social and demographic characteristics, as well as to living conditions in the 722 surveying districts (census tracts) of Łódź.

The two poles of the social hierarchy were considered according to the following variables: level of education (higher or only elementary), profession (managers, higher officials, etc. or menial workers), and the unemployment rate. As can be seen in fig. 1, the highest percentage of those with higher education was recorded in the outer zone of the city. They were mainly areas of new housing estates consisting of small blocks of flats, built since the mid-1970s and during the period of the political system transformation, as well as single detached houses built behind them: Retkinia, Radogoszcz East and West, the Ustronna housing estate, New and Old Złotno with the Krakowska estate.

Exceptions from the pattern are enclaves of the well-educated, situated in and off the very centre of the city. The Central Residential District and the Akademicka district in the eastern part of the city centre (Śródmieście) should be mentioned. In the first area there are multi-storey apartment buildings erected in the late 1970s, and in the other – pre-war detached houses and luxurious tenement houses, already inhabited by the intelligentsia before 1939.

Areas with a concentration of those with the lowest level of education (elementary only) (fig. 2), is the reverse of the previous. Put crudely, they live mainly in the inner city, i.e. the part of Łódź built before the 1930s, but a high percentage lives in the peripheral zone, mainly its southern and eastern parts, and also on the outskirts in the industrial-warehousing areas from the 1970s.

Residential locations of the best earners (members of parliament, managers, higher officials, and other ‘specialists’) largely coincide with those of the population boasting higher education background (fig. 3). In other words, the most affluent population mostly live on the outskirts and peripheral zone. Apart from the already mentioned housing estates, they mostly live in detached or terrace houses in Smulsko, Teofilów, Julianów, Marysin, Stoki, Nowy Romanów, and Łagiewniki.

People with the lowest salaries (menial workers) live mainly in and off the city centre, as well as in the southern and eastern parts of the peripheral zone – a semi-circle shaped ribbon area (fig. 4). We also find considerable similarity between their distribution and that of those with the lowest level of education. A similar pattern in distribution can be seen in areas with a high concentration of the unemployed (fig. 5) who live mainly in the inner city and the former industrial districts from the 1970s.

Juxtaposing the figures for areas inhabited by people of higher and lower social status has allowed the author to find a general pattern in the diversification of the social space of Łódź. The main division between the middle and higher social categories and the lower runs along the border between the inner city (within the boundary of the ring railway line) and the outskirts. Such a division largely results from development priorities in the socialist period when the majority of resources and energy were directed towards the development of large microdistricts with blocks of flats in the vacant areas of the outskirts. The inner city, formed before World War II, was doomed to a slow physical and social decay. Apart from a few undertakings, such as infill building, the housing stock in the central part of the city was not renewed. The physical degradation of buildings was followed by an outflow of the better-off inhabitants to the new estates (L i s z e w s k i 1999). Inhabitants with a lower social status mostly remained in the city centre. However, there are exceptions to this general pattern of socio-spatial diversification which confirm the growing fragmentation of the social space of Łódź.

The picture of social diversification is completed with an integrated typology the results of which are presented in fig. 6 while the description of the groups is presented in tab. 1. The typology is based on 35 variables from the National Census 2002 referring both to the social and demographic features of the population inhabiting 722 surveying districts, and to the housing stock characteristics. In order to construct a typology in which very similar surveying districts belong to one type, and very different units to other types (in other words, the variance between groups of objects is maximised and the variance within minimised), multi-dimensional statistical techniques were applied: ‘multi-dimensional scaling’, ‘cluster analysis’ and ‘discriminant analysis’.

The typology so obtained has allowed the author to combine the variables referring to the population with those referring to the living conditions, and as a result established eight socio-residential areas of Łódź in 2002

- Type 1 – areas of low social status, with prevalent pre-war tenement buildings;
- type 2 – areas of middle social status, with prevalent old blocks of flats;
- type 3 – areas of low and very low social status, with prevalent sub-standard buildings;
- type 4 – areas of middle social status, with prevalent mixed buildings (blocks of flats and tenement houses)
- type 5 – areas of middle and high social status, with prevalent blocks of flats ;
- type 6 – areas of middle and high social status, with prevalent houses (detached and terraced)
- type 7 – areas of middle and high social status, with prevalent new blocks of flats
- type 8 – areas of high and low social status with prevalent mixed buildings (detached and smallholding type).

The result of the spatial analysis of the socio-residential diversification allows us to specify the foregoing patterns. The areas inhabited by the lower social categories, occupying old, pre-socialist housing stock, poorly fitted with technical infrastructure, are located concentri-

cally in the city centre and the surrounding, inner zone (type 1), and in the sectors adjacent to the inner city (type 3).

Areas of heterogenic social composition, demographically old and built-up with old blocks of flats from the first half of the socialist period (1945–1970), scattered in the inner city (type 2). Districts of this type are often mixed with type 1 districts.

The population that belongs to the middle and higher social categories, living in good or very good housing conditions, is concentrated primarily in the outer and peripheral zones (type 4, type 5, type 6 and type 7).

Areas with the highest percentage of people who are economically active, demographically young, well educated and having very good living conditions, are situated in the form of wedges on the outskirts of the city (type 7). An exception to this pattern is type 4 – concentrations of blocks of flats constructed mainly in the 1970s, and also after 1988, scattered in the inner city zone.

Type 7 districts are often found next to type 5 districts, also in the form of sectors. They are the large housing microdistricts built mainly in the 1970s: Retkinia, Widzew East, Radogoszcz West. They have social composition and living conditions similar to type 7. What is different is the demographic structure of the inhabitants – a population that is demographically older live in older blocks.

The highest social categories, living in the best housing conditions – mainly in detached and terraced houses – are found in the peripheral zone of Łódź (type 6). The social composition of this type shows a considerable percentage of those with higher education and a high concentration of those in the best-paid professions (members of parliament, higher officials, etc.).

Type 8, located mainly in former exurban areas of Łódź, has a slightly different character. Its social composition is indicative of the beginnings of social spatial dualisation, because on the one hand it has the highest percentage of members of parliament, managers, and higher officials, and on the other hand, farmers. The farmers strongly dominate in these areas newly incorporated into the city, which until 1989 had been part of the rural fringe of Łódź. This fact and the information of the age of the housing stock may serve as the evidence of an intensive urbanization process going on in the peripheral zone and of the socio-material differences between long-time inhabitants and newcomers.

Literature:

D o m a n s k i H., 2004, *Struktura społeczna*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warszawa.
 F a i n s t e i n S.S., H a r l o e M., 1992, *Introduction: London and New York in the contemporary world*, [w:] F a i n s t e i n S.S., G o r d o n I., H a r l o e M. (red.), *Divided Cities*, Blackwell, Oxford, s. 1–22.
 L i s o w s k i A., 2000, *Dualne miasto – metafora a rzeczywistość*, Przegląd Geograficzny, 72(3), s. 231–247.
 L i s z e w s k i S., 1999, *Elity intelektualne w przestrzeni miasta. Przykład Łodzi*, [w:] *Zróżnicowanie przestrzenne struktur społecznych dużych miast*, XI Konferencjum Wiedzy o Mieście, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź, s. 9–21.
 L i s z e w s k i S., 2004, *Przemiany struktury przestrzennej aglomeracji przemysłowej w okresie transformacji ustrojowej (przykład łódzkiej aglomeracji miejskiej)*, [w:] S ł o d c z y k J. (red.), *Przemiany struktury przestrzennej miast w sferze funkcjonalnej i społecznej*, Uniwersytet Opolski, Opole, s. 9–25.
 M o l l e n k o p f J.H., C a s t e l l s M., (red.) 1991, *Dual city. Restructuring New York*, SAGE, New York.

Table 1: Statistical description of types

Variable	Mean values								
	Typ 1	Typ 2	Typ 3	Typ 4	Typ 5	Typ 6	Typ 7	Typ 8	Łódź
Flats fitted with piped water ***	96.66	99.41	79.49	96.95	99.15	90.21	98.85	86.94	96.28
Flats fitted with central heating***	28.76	93.17	22.02	77.88	97.15	68.92	96.42	69.47	74.84
Flats fitted with gas***	69.10	94.35	17.23	74.94	96.14	64.97	94.78	42.59	79.80
Unemployment rate	32.41	21.99	35.22	20.68	17.93	21.73	18.07	19.12	23.13
Population with higher education*	7.79	13.90	5.38	19.47	19.11	16.37	17.11	14.62	14.08
Population with only secondary education*	32.31	40.12	29.00	40.02	43.67	38.01	44.39	35.23	38.77
Population with vocational education*	22.74	15.34	24.40	14.70	14.66	15.89	15.95	17.42	17.28
Population with only elementary education*	33.89	27.46	37.37	23.41	20.68	26.89	20.75	29.40	27.12
Parliamentary members, higher officials, managers**	5.00	6.77	4.76	8.75	9.12	11.11	9.25	11.66	7.72
Other specialists**	11.31	19.12	8.12	23.12	22.44	18.73	20.08	16.58	17.80
Technicians and other middle management**	12.46	16.70	11.37	16.13	18.19	15.12	18.07	13.08	15.67
Office workers**	9.02	10.49	8.33	9.36	10.37	8.00	10.74	6.74	9.64
Personal service workers and shop-assistants**	15.27	13.33	15.63	12.06	12.30	12.37	12.17	11.93	13.28
Manual workers and machinery operators**	33.31	25.53	37.00	22.68	21.06	26.00	23.18	26.67	26.44
Farmers**	0.39	0.28	1.06	0.41	0.27	2.07	0.43	6.14	0.91
Unskilled**	12.61	7.18	13.14	6.43	5.72	6.20	5.77	6.39	7.94
Population aged 0–14 ****	25.14	20.66	27.53	19.25	19.05	28.44	20.73	28.52	22.45
Population aged 15–24****	15.86	10.87	16.11	12.92	10.72	14.32	11.11	15.02	12.65
Population aged 15–24****	17.04	12.01	15.67	16.79	12.75	14.28	19.28	15.93	14.65
Population aged 25–64****	26.58	26.86	26.79	29.44	31.80	26.66	31.25	26.61	28.29
Population aged 65 and over****	17.65	21.71	13.94	11.91	17.08	15.42	10.49	14.97	17.27
One person households *****	39.33	41.01	39.50	33.83	32.93	32.53	24.26	24.99	35.38
2 person households*****	24.32	31.83	23.64	26.30	31.34	26.61	26.11	24.15	28.23
3–4 person households*****	31.81	25.09	32.32	36.42	33.30	36.03	46.19	42.46	32.82
5 and more person households*****	4.54	2.07	4.54	3.45	2.44	4.83	3.44	8.40	3.56
Flats built before 1944***	88.23	11.56	87.59	35.22	4.19	39.43	6.15	31.85	31.86
Flats built in 1945–70***	8.35	78.16	7.98	7.07	4.60	34.95	2.01	25.26	30.04
Flats built in 1971–78***	1.70	8.45	1.15	26.77	82.35	5.76	4.41	10.38	21.78
Flats built in 1978–88***	0.85	1.18	1.87	12.74	4.24	6.09	69.11	12.95	10.16
Flats built in 1989–2002***	0.87	0.65	1.42	18.20	4.62	13.77	18.32	19.56	6.17
Private flats***	16.47	3.06	39.36	14.32	2.48	51.87	3.09	80.79	16.23
Co-operative flats***	1.14	29.82	0.33	30.29	64.38	4.66	68.04	1.78	30.11
Municipal flats***	36.61	5.14	41.79	19.93	2.55	17.51	9.81	9.59	14.46
Flats in buildings which are common property***	45.78	61.98	18.52	35.46	30.59	25.96	19.05	7.84	39.20
Flat area (m2 per person)	19.48	19.45	17.32	21.50	20.01	27.23	20.05	30.17	20.83

*– % in the total population; ** – % in the total of employees; *** – % in the total number of flats; **** – % in the total population; ***** – % in the total number of households

Source: Author’s compilation based on data from National Census 2002

LIII