



# Preventing, curing, mitigating: Anti-segregation policies in urban Finland

Hannu Ruonavaara<sup>a,\*</sup>, Jarkko Rasinkangas<sup>a</sup>, Katriina Rosengren<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Social Research, University of Turku, Finland and Institute of Housing and Urban Research (IBF), Uppsala University, Sweden

<sup>b</sup> Department of Social Research, University of Turku, Finland and School of Arts, Design and Architecture, Aalto University, Finland

## ARTICLE INFO

### Keywords:

Segregation  
Cities  
Policy  
Finland  
Theory

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is (1) to develop a conceptual framework for analyzing policies against residential segregation and (2) to apply it in inquiring about anti-segregation policy (ASP) in three core cities in Finland: Helsinki, Tampere, and Turku. First, we develop a functional typology of preventive, curing, and mitigating ASP. Second, we cross-tabulate it with an operational typology of three kinds of ASPs, population dispersion, social mixing, and area-based projects, to create a combined typology of ASPs. With the help of combined typology, we analyze our primary empirical material and policy documents in the three cities. We ask two questions: 1) How do the three cities respond to a growing concern about residential segregation and its negative consequences? 2) How do their responses relate to our combined typology of ASPs? We find no notable differences in the palette of ASPs used in the three cities. However, Helsinki differs to some extent from the other two with its longer history of ASP and wider coverage of different policy instruments. All three cities use preventive and, to some extent, curing social mixing policies: trying to balance population structure in planning new neighborhoods and infill building in old neighborhoods. All cities use mitigating area-based policies, such as social policy interventions in vulnerable neighborhoods. We can tentatively say that this is the Finnish approach to segregation prevention. It does not include curing dispersal measures such as demolishing housing estates to change the population structure or limiting the share of particular population groups in residential areas.

## 1. Introduction

Many Western countries have been combating residential segregation for decades. However, the research findings show that segregation has only intensified despite efforts to tackle it. Drivers of segregation have been identified as the transformation of the global economy and labor markets with increasing economic inequalities between population groups (Sassen, 2001), physical decay and stigmatization of large housing estates of unattractive rented housing further reinforced by immigration and its concentration and integration problems (Hess et al., 2018), differentiated housing preferences of the affluent (Vaattovaara et al., 2018) and growing school segregation (Bernelius & Vilkkama, 2019). These impact the resources, preferences, and choices available to households for housing. There are also indications that, in addition to housing, there is a growing segregation of population groups in terms of work and leisure in urban space.

Although segregation is essentially a universal and global phenomenon (e.g., van Ham et al., 2021), its manifestations and influences are context-specific. It is a question of not only the welfare and housing

regimes but also political and administrative attention at the national and local levels. Ultimately, segregation is a local phenomenon involving the interaction of local labor and housing markets and demography with urban structure and planning history. Also, the policy response to residential segregation and its problems are mainly local. Our research contributes to the study of how local authorities respond to segregation problems.

This study has both theoretical and empirical objectives. First, we attempt to develop a clear, analytical definition of residential segregation, distinguishing “good” (non-harmful) and “bad” (harmful) segregation. Secondly, we aim to develop a fresh typology of possible policy responses to residential segregation, especially its bad variant. Thirdly, we are applying this theoretical framework to analyze anti-segregation policies of three major cities in Finland. The empirical analysis is utilizing as its primary research material policy documents produced by the three cities’ administration from the 2010s to 2020s.

The article’s theoretical contribution is to offer researchers of segregation policies a conceptual framework that helps them make sense of the complex reality of anti-segregation policies generally. To our

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: [hanruona@utu.fi](mailto:hanruona@utu.fi) (H. Ruonavaara), [jarkko.rasinkangas@utu.fi](mailto:jarkko.rasinkangas@utu.fi) (J. Rasinkangas), [katriina.rosengren@utu.fi](mailto:katriina.rosengren@utu.fi) (K. Rosengren).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2025.105838>

Received 9 February 2024; Received in revised form 13 December 2024; Accepted 23 February 2025

Available online 27 February 2025

0264-2751/© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

knowledge, no such comprehensive typology exists in the literature. The article's empirical contribution is twofold. The article contributes to the study of residential segregation in Finland by providing the first systematic analysis of local anti-segregation policies in three major urban centres. In this way, the article adds knowledge about the response to segregation in three of Finland's major cities. However, our article has a more general empirical contribution.

There is some evidence that Finland is a country with a relatively low level of residential segregation, even in European (Tamaru, Sinitsyna, et al., 2021) and Scandinavian comparison (Tunström et al., 2016, 37; Skifter Andersen et al., 2016). In a comparison of Nordic capital cities, it was found that the capital of Finland, Helsinki, had less socioeconomic and ethnic segregation than Stockholm, Copenhagen, and Oslo (Tunström et al., 2016, 37; see also Skifter Andersen et al., 2016). Earlier statistical research on the three cities investigated here shows levels of socioeconomic and ethnic segregation that can be considered modest (see Saikkonen et al., 2018). Moreover, in Finnish cities, there are no such highly segregated areas for which the neighbouring Sweden is internationally well-known, nor the kind of problems of social order that have been associated with segregated neighborhoods there (e.g., Malmberg et al., 2013; Holdo & Bengtsson, 2020). Nor has Finland felt the need to implement anything like Denmark's 'ghetto initiative' to disperse unwanted population concentrations in urban neighborhoods (e.g., Seemann, 2021 or Skærlund Risager, 2022).

Sweden, Denmark, and Finland all represent the Nordic or Scandinavian welfare regime, which has generally been seen as the welfare state model with the lowest income inequality and the broadest welfare safety net. It is expected that residential segregation will not be a major problem in such countries, as it is strongly connected with income inequality. However, these countries seem to have clear differences in this respect. Welfare state regimes, as understood as principles of provision of welfare in a society, seem not to protect a country from segregation problems. Has Finland done something right in its segregation policies, or is it just a latecomer to global development?

We will argue that analyzing the policies in the three cities opens a window to a specific Finnish response to residential segregation and the problems that follow from it. This is what we think is our more general, though tentative, empirical contribution.

## 2. The theoretical perspective

### 2.1. Focus on "bad segregation"

"An urban life characterized by segregation is detrimental to the development of democracy, spatial justice, and individuals' life chances for employment and education. Segregation functions as a manifestation of, and reinforces, inequalities and injustices in the built environment, the labor market, and the housing market."

(Tunström et al., 2016, 37)

The quotation above is taken from a report on social segregation in Nordic cities, and it very well represents the common understanding of the term segregation by policymakers and researchers in the Nordic countries. It is an understanding that denies that there could be segregation that is not harmful. From this perspective, it is perverse to talk about good and bad segregation, as Peach does (Peach, 1996a, 1996b). Referring mainly to ethnic segregation (including that based on religion), Peach makes a distinction between urban villages created through people's preference to live with others like them (leading to good segregation) and ghettos created by factors that force people to live with similar people (leading to bad segregation). Marcuse also distinguishes between enclaves and ghettos (Marcuse, 2005).

Peach points out that though these two types of segregation are interrelated, they are conceptually distinct (Peach, 1996a, 380) – in fact, they are *ideal types*. The question is ultimately about the consequences of segregation: enclaves are thought to provide security and support

(good), ghettos vulnerability and stigma (bad). That they are interrelated entails the idea that both kinds of consequences might be present in a segregated neighborhood. A ghetto may provide support for the people deemed to live there at the same time as it makes them vulnerable and stigmatized. There is also theoretically a third type of segregation, one that has no significant good or bad consequences for the people living there (neutral segregation).

How can there be such different views about segregation? It is presumably because the term "segregation" is understood differently – or only one side of segregation is considered intellectually and politically engaging. To highlight the issues involved, we shall propose the following definition of urban residential segregation:

Urban residential segregation<sup>1</sup> refers to a process *and* a state of affairs by and in which

1. categories of people with different socioeconomic and/or cultural characteristics come to live in different parts of the urban area so that in particular neighborhoods, some categories are over- and others underrepresented;
2. neighborhoods formed by the process (1) come to be polarized into separated communities of cumulative advantage and cumulative disadvantage.

Overrepresentation means that the proportion of people who belong to a specific category in a neighborhood is higher than its proportion in the whole city, and underrepresentation means that its proportion is lower than in the whole city. The idea of polarization is a simplification, a special case. More realistically, we can, borrowing from Marcuse (2005, 15), speak of a hierarchical ordering of neighborhoods 'derived from a ranking system that reflects superiority based on wealth, status and power.' The vicious cycle of cumulative disadvantage is well described in Skifter Andersen's *Urban Sores* (Skifter Andersen, 2003, chapter 5): the concentration of disadvantage leads to stigmatization of the neighborhood, aversion of and flight from the neighborhood by more advantaged residents, declining investment there, worsening service provision et cetera. Similarly, the concentration of the advantaged has positive spill-over effects, especially in terms of services and investment. Tamaru and his co-authors show how residential segregation is linked to school segregation, workplace segregation, and spatial segregation of daily activities (Tamaru, Knapp, et al., 2021).

Writing about the uncritical use of "urban concepts" developed in researching the global North Wacquant takes "segregation" as an example: 'It conflates state and a process, spatial differentiation with spatial closure, result, and action, and typically omits the segregator from the equation' (Wacquant, 2022, 825–826). The definition above resolves at least the two first confluences. Admittedly, the action perspective, while desirable from the methodological point of view, is not prominent in our definition, nor is there any attention to the segregator. In the Nordic context, however, residential segregation is mainly a result of a social mechanism that distributes people with different amounts of economic capital (like Wacquant would define economic resources) to different locations in the urban space. The mechanism works through people's acts of acquiring housing, but the resulting distribution is an outcome that cannot be imputed to some specific actors' intentional actions.

However, it does make sense to say that some group's actions in the

<sup>1</sup> Urban residential segregation is a special case of segregation as a general social form referring to separation of different categories of people in any social or spatial realm, for example the occupational segregation of genders in the labor market. Moreover, our particular definition situates residential segregation in the scale of neighborhoods, as that is the scale municipal policies are operating on. Residential segregation can happen also in smaller scale, that of a block or even a building. Moreover, there can also be spatial segregation, that is, segregation of the use of urban space by different categories of people.

housing market may, as an intended or unintended consequence, serve as a driver for segregation. Apart from the unequal distribution of economic resources, there are at least two other root causes of segregation (e.g., Tammaru, Knapp, et al., 2021). Sometimes residential segregation results from discrimination by status characteristics (ethnicity, class, estate, religion, clan, et cetera), and in this case, there is a segregator, an actor aiming to create a segregated situation. The other root cause is homophily, the inclination to associate with others who are seen to be similar to oneself. Homophily affects interaction patterns and neighborhood preferences (e.g., Galster et al., 2021).

Everyone using the term “residential segregation” in a standard way will probably agree with our first definition (1), stating that segregation is the physical distance between different categories of people. However, many – if not *most* – would say that the term also refers to the second definition (2), the polarization of communities of advantage and disadvantage. It refers to a process, its outcome, and its particular and harmful welfare consequences – and the latter is often the special focus of interest. If segregation is defined by (1) AND (2), the question of whether segregation is bad or good is mainly irrelevant (assuming that we consider inequality bad, as most of us do). However, if we mean by segregation only (1), the creation of polarization (2) is a different question to be investigated separately. In this case, we can also discuss how bad segregation is in particular cases. Of course, separating people from different social/cultural categories may not be considered good, even if it does not lead to neighborhoods of cumulative disadvantage. It may be generally desirable for people from different backgrounds to encounter each other. This possibility does not, however, guarantee social contact or diminished social distance. Here, what we discuss as anti-segregation policies are ones targeted at bad segregation.

## 2.2. Types of segregation policies

Andersson, BråmÅ, and Holmqvist define *desegregation policies* as public policies that explicitly “aim to affect the demographic, social and ethnic composition of residential districts in such a way that cities become ‘less segregated’ than they would have been had such measures not taken” (Andersson, BråmÅ, & Holmqvist, 2010; Andersson, Dhalmann, et al., 2010, 238; quotation marks in original). They stress that such policies may have other important goals than just affecting segregation. Moreover, they add that the most effective public policies to diminish segregation are ‘affecting the allocation of economic resources among households in society’ (op. cit., 238). This refers to *one* root cause of segregation: the unequal distribution of economic capital in society. A similar conclusion about the most effective anti-segregation policies is reached by van Ham et al. (2018) in their extensive comparison of European capitals.

If diminishing differences of economic power are taken to be an anti-segregation policy, then, for example, housing subsidies can be understood as a policy for countering segregation. ‘Although rental subsidies were not invented to decrease segregation, they certainly suppress it,’ writes Bolt – and continues that cuts in rental subsidies easily trigger discussion about their impact on residential segregation (Bolt, 2009, 399). This is probably so. However, we distinguish between *policies explicitly targeted to impact either residential segregation and/or its consequences* and *policies that are not so targeted but have an anti-segregation aspect or impact*. We will call only the former kind of policies anti-segregation policies. The national or local governments can profess such policies, but also any large-scale housing provider, for example, some non-profit organizations managing social housing. Here, we investigate policies that are in the jurisdiction of municipalities. In our case, some are municipal policies by origin, while others are nationally initiated policies municipalities have agreed to implement.

The definition given by Andersson and his colleagues is somewhat limiting even to their analysis as not all anti-segregation policies target changing the demographic composition of neighborhoods but rather relieving the welfare disparities and adverse neighborhood effects

following segregation. Moreover, *desegregation* refers to measures that reduce segregation in an already segregated area. The most usual measure is mixing different housing tenures and dwelling types in the area. However, when such policies are applied to entirely new residential areas, they are not intended to desegregate an existing segregation situation but to prevent it from developing.

We shall call policies targeted at future housing areas *preventive*. Any policy that aims to prevent social or ethnic segregation from emerging in a newly built area is a preventive one. Apart from social mixing, there could be regulations on the types of housing built in the area or even categories of people to whom new housing is allocated. Placing people representing the same social or cultural category in different parts of the city could be a preventive policy to prevent concentrations of people representing the same category. This is what has generally been done by public authorities, for example, in housing refugees. Preventing segregation from emerging is the function of all of our examples, and the typology we are developing in this paper is *functional*.

All other kinds of anti-segregation policies serve *reactive* functions. Some reactive anti-segregation policies intend to be *curative*, while others aim to *mitigate* the effects of segregation (c.f. Briggs, 2005). Curative policies are what Andersson et al. call desegregation policies. They aim to ‘lower the rates of spatial segregation’ in the already segregated area. For example, infill construction of a mixed-tenure housing development in a segregated neighborhood is a curative policy.

In contrast, *mitigating* or *compensating* (cf. Arnell-Gustafsson, 1982, 34) policies are targeted to diminishing ‘the social costs of that segregation without necessarily affecting spatial patterns themselves’ (Briggs, 2005, 250, italics removed). Improvements in connecting residential areas to the urban fabric can be seen as a mitigating policy. Access- and connectivity-based interventions aim to link large housing estates originally located in peripheral urban spaces. Poor transport connections can pose a risk to, for example, commuting to work. Targeted social and cultural policy measures for deprived neighborhoods are another mitigating policy. For example, adding resources for schools in deprived neighborhoods or projects to encourage community and care for the neighborhood can be seen as mitigating anti-segregation policies.

It is obvious that only preventive objectives and policy measures are insufficient to tackle segregation because of its multi-faceted nature. It is equally clear that the implementation of reactive measures only occurs once problems have been identified *and* there is a will to address them. The policy depends on the problem’s definition and the conception of the efficient response. These can be very context-specific.

Preventing a segregation process by, for example, planning a new mixed-tenure neighborhood can ‘cure’ the segregation situation of a larger city area. Curative policies are usually supposed to have mitigating elements by creating positive neighborhood effects and mitigating negative ones. Mitigating policies to counter the neighborhood problems and stigma may have curative consequences as the neighborhood becomes more appealing to people who otherwise would not consider living there. Uplifting the neighborhood might also prevent further polarization between neighborhoods by convincing more well-off residents to stay in the neighborhood (Arnell-Gustafsson, 1982, 34).

From these three, we can distinguish a fourth type of segregation policy that adapts to segregation, barely an anti-segregation policy. An *adaptive* (or *palliative*!) policy is not preventing, curing, or mitigating bad segregation but just remedying its symptoms, that is, keeping in check the disturbances caused by it by various social control measures. A statement by a Swedish police officer in a disadvantaged neighborhood shown in a Finnish TV program can be seen as referring to this function:

There is not much we can do about poverty, overcrowded housing conditions, or the fact that the young do not continue their studies after primary school (<https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-12333878>, accessed March 13, 2023; our translation).<sup>2</sup>

Poverty reduction by some area-based measure,<sup>3</sup> policies relieving over crowdedness, or helping the young to secondary education would be mitigating policies – but what is left for the police to do is targeted surveillance of the resident population and control of social disturbances, perhaps together with community representatives.

These four types of segregation constitute a functional typology of segregation policies. By typology of anti-segregation policies, we mean a conceptual construct that presents what we think is an exhaustive account of such policies from some analytical perspective. Above the perspective is a functional one. Our functional typology should be understood as an *ideal type* in the sense Max Weber understood the concept (see Weber, 2019, 85 or 96–98). It is a conceptual construct purified of the complexities of the real phenomenon that serves as an aid in thinking of the reality of segregation policies. The reality is assumed to be much messier than the ideational construct. Real policies can contain elements of different functions. Sometimes observable policies cannot be classified exclusively into one type or the other.

The typology developed here can be “cross-tabulated” with a more established typology of anti-segregation policies focused not on the policy’s function but the kind of intervention involved, that of Andersson, Bråmã, and Holmqvist (2010). We shall call their typology operational. They distinguish three policies: housing and social mixing, dispersal of residents, and area-based measures. Housing and social mixing, already discussed above, ‘intend to affect the distribution of households across urban neighborhoods by creating a new opportunity structure’ (op.cit., 239). Dispersal policies are ones where decision-makers have the power and opportunity to settle households in ways that either prevent segregation from developing or cure the existing segregated pattern by settling different types of households in the neighborhood. The article by Andersson et al. discusses at length the (failed) Swedish policy of dispersing the settlement of asylum seekers and refugees (2010, 247–249).

An example of another kind of dispersal policy is the Moving to Opportunity experiment in five United States cities in 1994–1998. In the experiment, randomly selected residents who fulfilled certain conditions and lived in high-poverty neighborhoods were offered support for moving to low-poverty neighborhoods (e.g., Feins & Shroder, 2005). One-quarter of eligible households accepted joining the program. So, this was a dispersal policy operating on carrots (economic incentives) rather than sticks (administrative decisions).

The Danish “ghetto initiative” from 2018 represents another dispersal policy using sticks (see, e.g., Seemann, 2021 or Skærlund Risager, 2022). The law gave authorities legal powers to intervene in the social composition of vulnerable neighborhoods (defined by specific criteria) where the percentage of immigrants or immigrants exceeds 50. In these neighborhoods, the percentage of social housing can be reduced to 40 %, leading to demolition and privatization of the social stock and displacement of thousands of tenants. This is, in fact, a way of dispersing people from population concentrations deemed undesirable. The program also contains several other measures, some of which, like creating job centres in the neighborhood, belong to area-based policies.

Area-based policies refer to a wide variety of targeted support policies for distressed neighborhoods aiming to improve the opportunities

for people living there. The article discusses the Swedish Metropolitan Development initiative, a time-limited national program targeted to neighborhoods in three big cities: Stockholm, Gothenburg, and Malmö. It included measures concerning ‘education, employment, health, democratic participation and culture, all with a neighborhood focus’ (Andersson, Bråmã, & Holmqvist, 2010; Andersson, Dhalmann, et al., 2010, 250). It differed from similar policies in other Western countries because it did not entail physically improving housing and local infrastructure.

The two typologies are cross-tabulated in the table below to create a comprehensive map of anti-segregation policies. Each cell in the table is illustrated with an example of a policy conforming to the type (Table 1).

In the results section, we use the above cross-tabulation of Andersson, Bråmã, and Holmqvist (2010) and Andersson, Dhalmann, et al. (2010)’s operational typology and our own functional typology of anti-segregation policies both in analyzing and presenting our analysis. We discuss how our case cities use preventive, curing, and mitigating policies (i.e. functional policies) within housing and social mix, dispersal policies, and area-based initiatives (i.e. operative policies) in three of the largest core cities in Finland.

### 3. Research design

#### 3.1. The context of three case cities

This paper focuses on the central cities of three major urban areas in Finland: Helsinki, Tampere, and Turku. The country’s largest and densest urban area comprises the capital city, Helsinki, and its surrounding municipalities. In 2021, around 1,200,000 persons lived in the region, and the central city’s population, that of Helsinki, was around 584,000. The other major urban areas are those around two much smaller cities than Helsinki, the cities of Tampere (244,000 inhabitants in the city and 422,000 in the urban region) and Turku (195,000 inhabitants in the city and 338,000 in the urban region). These three cities are the heads of the “growth triangle,” which is anticipated to be

**Table 1**  
A combined typology of anti-segregation policies (with examples of policies).

		Operative		
		Housing and social mix	Dispersal policies	Area-based policies
Functional	Preventive	Planning new residential neighborhoods with varied (demographic, ethnic, tenure and housing type) mix	Dispersed settlement of residents representing the same sociocultural category	
	Curative	Balancing the composition of the resident population in a segregated neighborhood by resident selection or infill construction of mixed housing	Dissolving concentrations of residents of the same sociocultural group by resettling them elsewhere	Improving the attractiveness of segregated neighborhoods by regeneration and infill construction
	Mitigating			Projects for social, educational, cultural, and political resources of the population in a disadvantaged neighborhood

<sup>2</sup> This statement taken from Finnish Broadcasting Company news app is not a *verbatim* transcript of what the police officer actually says in the program but the content is practically the same.

<sup>3</sup> A general poverty reduction by, for example, basic income would tackle the root causes of segregation but would *not* be an anti-segregation policy as defined it here.

attracting increasing migration in the future. Their population growth rate is higher than in most other municipalities, mainly due to the growth of the immigrant population.

As the three cities are the historic core of urban Finland, it is interesting to look at how they have dealt politically with the problem of segregation. There are also other reasons for focusing on the three cities. These are cities where house prices and rents have been rising more than in most other cities (Sutela, 2023) and also ones attracting immigrants. Additionally, these three larger cities have an urban policy framework capable of dealing with a multi-faceted issue such as segregation, e.g., an integrated land use and housing program.

The best situation concerning existing knowledge about residential segregation is in Helsinki. Segregation patterns in the Helsinki area have been researched since at least the late 1990s. In one of the first studies on the topic, Mari Vaattovaara showed that in Helsinki, a polarization between neighborhoods of poverty and wealth was not visible. Instead, the area was a social mosaic where poverty and affluence were located in the same neighborhoods (Vaattovaara, 1998; see also, e.g., Dhalmann & Vilkama, 2009; Tunström et al., 2016). Since the 1990s, the situation and the perspective on it have changed. In 2015, Vaattovaara and Matti Kortteinen published an article where they argued that while the social mosaic view was broadly accurate on a larger spatial scale, bad segregation on the block level between 1990 and 2010 had been increasing: multiple deprivations had started to cluster in certain neighborhoods (Vaattovaara & Kortteinen, 2015). Ruoppila and Turtiainen have questioned Kortteinen and Vaattovaara's conclusions about clustering of disadvantage exaggerated – maybe some of the indicators used are not actually measuring deprivation (Ruoppila & Turtiainen, 2024).

All three case cities and their urban areas were studied in the research project Urbanization, Mobilities and Immigration (URMI). The project investigated ethnic and income segregation in 2005–2014 (Saikkonen et al., 2018). The research found a rather stable pattern of ethnic segregation with an index of dissimilarity score of around 30 in the Helsinki and Tampere regions and around 40 in Turku. Subsequent research has confirmed that in Turku, ethnic segregation has been higher than in the two other cities. It also seemed that there was more increase in income than ethnic segregation, especially that of low-income households from high and middle-income households – though the index numbers showed only low or moderate segregation.

A later contribution to the literature on segregation in Finland is an article analyzing socioeconomic and ethnic segregation between 2000 and 2018 in 20 Finnish cities (Kurvinen et al., 2025). The general conclusion of the analysis is that residential segregation has increased in Finnish cities – in whatever scale it is measured. This is also the case in our three cities, underlining the political importance of the issue.

### 3.2. Research questions, materials and methods

As stated above, we focus on local anti-segregation policies in our three case cities. Segregation does not happen only along municipal borders, and in researching segregation patterns, it is sometimes fruitful to look at larger urban areas rather than single municipalities. However, this is different in policy: municipalities are the makers of anti-segregation policy, especially in the Finnish system where municipalities have much autonomous power in urban policy (see, e.g., Sutela, 2023). Despite the occasional importance of segregation in government programs, the government's toolbox in anti-segregation policy is quite limited. Therefore, municipalities remain in the key position in responding to segregation problems.

We will ask our research materials on municipal policies two questions: 1) How do the three central cities respond to the growing concern about residential segregation and its negative consequences (“bad” segregation)? 2) How do their responses relate to our typology of anti-segregation policies?

The primary data for this paper consists of 41 urban policy documents from the late 2010s to the early 2020s. An essential criterion for

selecting documents was that they should be declarative, politically approved, and guiding municipal practices. As a supplement to the primary data, we have used four expert interviews done for the needs of this project in 2019, as well as around forty interviews made in the three cities in connection with research projects our team has been involved in 2017 and 2018. The documents, however, are clearly the primary form of data.

An important category of documents were ones about the three cities' *MAL agreements* (10 documents) They are regional land use, housing, and transport agreements between the Finnish state and these cities (see e.g. Rosengren et al., 2024). Helsinki has made three such agreements, Tampere and Turku two. All cities have documents about *city strategies* (7 documents), sometimes serving the function of city marketing. There were also documents about plans and principles of *land policies with or without link to housing* (10 documents), as well as documents concerning *housing strategies and policy programs* (7 documents). Of special interest are the three documents about “*areal differentiation*” and segregation. At last there were four miscellaneous documents, hard to classify in any general category.

The primary data was first analysed with the help of a coding frame of different policy goals and tools developed and elaborated by several rounds of going through the documents using both NVivo and Excel. The data was thematically coded independently by two researchers. The coding variables were informed by research literature and our preliminary data observations, so the procedure can be considered partly theory- and partly data-driven. The coding frame analysis operates on a simple yes/no logic: a state of affairs coded either is or is not present in the municipality data. This level of analysis does not recognize differences in grade. Themes were eventually combined or collapsed, if overlapping. Some themes which did not have a direct relevance to the core research questions, responses to segregation (such as the recognition of segregation, covered in a separate article), were deleted from this analysis.

In the second stage, we looked at the first stage findings through the lens of our typology. Whether a goal or a tool is targeted to affecting the socioeconomic composition of a neighborhood in development, its function is preventive. The goals and tools, reacting to already developed segregation by changing the socioeconomic composition of neighborhoods, are serving the curing function. If the policy goal or tool is to affect living conditions in a neighborhood without changing the socioeconomic composition of the neighborhood, it is mitigating.

The cross-tabulation of segregation responses (first research question) with our typology of anti-segregation policies (second research question) is the assessment of the three authors. In many cases, this was not straight-forward and segregation responses often fell into several categories. This reflects the array of segregation responses in the larger cities, where goals and tools can be preventive in one area and curative or mitigating in others simultaneously. For example, a city may, as a strategy, aim to have neighborhoods with a diverse housing and population mix (preventive). At the same time, it can take reactive measures to address perceived problems, either by providing additional support for services in the area (mitigating) or by pursuing more concrete structural (e.g. housing stock) changes in the area (curative).

## 4. Empirical results

We have conceived anti-segregation policies as containing three elements: the recognition of bad segregation as a problem, the goals adopted for tackling the situation and the tools used to fulfilling the goals. As we have discussed the issue of recognition in another article, we focus here on the two other elements. The operational typology gives us a ready-made classification of three tools of anti-segregation policy.

### 4.1. Policy goals and tools for managing segregation

In the following four tables, we identify different aspects of the three

cities’ segregation policies and relate them to the typology of anti-segregation policies. The rows of the tables represent different characteristics of municipalities’ policy goals and tools. However, we are not now looking at whether the goal or characteristic is present or absent in the data; we are judging whether and in what combinations they involve prevention, curing, and mitigating.

4.1.1. Policy goals

In the first table, we use our classification grid to analyze what policy we can distinguish in the policy documents and the interviews and what kinds of differences we can find between cities (Table 2).

The three cities’ policy goals seem quite similar. All, for example, share general goals of spatial justice, inclusion, and cohesion, and on a more practical level, aim to guarantee diversity of housing and adequate service provision in neighborhoods. All also attempt to control marketization. By this, we refer to planning to restrict speculative private development in the neighborhoods. An example is planning regulations preventing the excessive building of small flats in neighborhoods.

There are, however, some differences between the cities in the types of policies under these general goals. In Helsinki, spatial justice is pursued as a preventive policy, whereas in Turku and Tampere, it has also been pursued as a curative policy – the order of the policy types means here that Turku pursued the goal with a curative policy and then moved on to a preventive one while the order in Tampere was different. Local service accessibility is pursued in Helsinki with all types of policies, whereas in Turku and Tampere, the mitigating aspect is absent in policy statements.

4.1.2. Social mixing as preventive and curative tool

Social mix policies are a significant way for municipalities to prevent and cure residential segregation. Mixing larger and smaller dwellings as well as tenures in an area will probably create a socioeconomic mix of residents. In most societies, well-off people are homeowners more commonly than less well-off, so neighborhoods with only one housing tenure quickly become homogenous in socioeconomic terms. Also, a mix of dwelling types can contribute to a heterogeneous social composition of the population in the neighborhood. New residential neighborhoods can be planned for various housing types and tenures, but housing mix can also be used in redeveloping old neighborhoods. The following table discusses the social mix policies in the three cities (Table 3).

All three cities use various social mixing strategies, planning residential areas with diverse housing stock, providing land to construct social rental housing, and planning owner-occupied housing in deprived areas. Unit size and type mixing are used systematically or on a case basis in all three cities. Mixing is done on the neighborhood scale in all these cities, and the measures used can be considered focused in the sense that there are clear planning targets to be reached (e.g., a certain percentage of plots reserved for social housing). According to a 2017 interview in Helsinki, there is consensus about the importance of social mixing, and it is done as an ‘unwritten rule’ (housing provision

Table 2 Segregation policy goals in the three cities.

	Helsinki	Turku	Tampere
General spatial diversity of housing	Preventive	Preventive	Preventive
Spatial justice, balanced spatial development	Preventive	Curative, Preventive	Preventive, Curative
Social inclusion and cohesion	Preventive, Mitigating	Preventive, Mitigating	Preventive, Mitigating
Local service accessibility	Preventive, Curative, Mitigating	Preventive, Curative	Preventive, Curative
Control of marketization	Preventive, Curative	Preventive, Curative	Preventive, Curative

NOTE: The order of the policy types refers to the temporal order of adopting a type of policy.

Table 3 Social mixing in the three cities.

	Helsinki	Turku	Tampere
Systematic control of socio-spatial differentiation in new construction	Preventive, Curative		Preventive, Curative
Allocation of land/sites for social housing companies	Preventive	Curative	Preventive, Curative
Allocation of land for other non-profit production	Preventive		
Systematic mixing of unit sizes and types	Preventive		
Case-by-case mixing of unit sizes and types		Curative	Curative
Owner occupancy in deprived areas in the infill projects	Curative		Curative
Clear practice for the allocation of plots between different tenures	Preventive		Preventive
Long-time perspective in tenure mixing	Preventive		Preventive
Multi-sector cooperation groups in housing policy issues	Preventive, Curative		Preventive, Curative

administrator, Helsinki) (see also Sutela, 2023). Also, in Tampere, an interviewee considered the ‘conscious mixing of resident population’ to be the ‘backbone’ of land use planning (housing provision administrator, Tampere).

Helsinki stands out from the other two as a city where preventive and curing social mixing is many-sided and has a long history. Due to youth disorder problems in one Helsinki neighborhood in the mid-1960s, the city wanted to avoid creating neighborhoods with large concentrations of rental housing by dispersing rental housing among housing of other forms of tenure. The policy was first applied on the block level so that blocks of rental housing were placed alongside blocks of owner-occupied housing. Later, the policy was changed so that the mixing units were residential buildings: architecturally similar houses of tenants were side by side with those of owner-occupiers. (Vaattovaara et al., 2018; also, Tunström et al., 2016.) In Helsinki, an experiment was also conducted on the micro-scale mixing of apartments of different tenures in identically built houses (see Juvenius, 2023).

Tampere is not much different from Helsinki in terms of its social mixing policies, whereas Turku stands out as a city where social mix policies are less prominent than in the other two. Social mixing is the primary curative, while it is also strongly preventive in the other two cities. Social mixing has not had a long history in Turku, and the segregation situation is not systematically controlled (monitored) as in the other two cities. The variable ‘multi-sector cooperation’ refers to cooperation between different branches of local government in creating a coordinated and holistic anti-segregation policy. Such measures are found in Helsinki and Tampere but not in Turku. In the stakeholder events we have organized in connection with this research, the lack of such cooperation has been mentioned as a problem for coordinated anti-segregation policy. A usual way of expressing this concern has been the discussion of ‘silos’ of local governments that do not communicate with each other.

4.1.3. Area-based policies as a mitigating tool

The table below shows our findings about area-based policies. The variable ‘compact development’ refers to infill construction targeted at the densification of neighborhoods. Such developments attempt to increase the number and diversity of the resident population and the neighborhood’s functions by planning and constructing spaces for new services and possibly workplaces. In that sense, it is both a preventive and curative policy. Compact development is a national land use goal, and consequently, it is also a goal for the three cities (Table 4).

In Finland, various nationally or locally initiated interventions have been targeted to deprived areas to mitigate – or compensate – the lack of residents’ resources and to prevent negative neighborhood effects.

**Table 4**  
Area-based interventions in the three cities.

Compact development: services and accessibility	Preventive, Curative	Preventive, Curative	Preventive, Curative
Interventions in problem areas	Curative, Mitigating	Curative, Mitigating	Curative, Mitigating
Resident-related measures (such as additional assistance to schools)			
Suburban development program participation, number of 4-year projects 1995–2022	17	8	8

However, Finnish “concrete suburbs,” as Stjernberg called the 1960s and 1970s housing estates on the outskirts of towns, have not been as massive, poverty-stricken, and deteriorated as rental housing estates in many other European countries (see, e.g., Hess, Tammaru & van Ham, 2018), the goal of these programs has been rather preventive of future problems than curative of existing ones. The programs may involve renewing housing stock, improving the neighborhood infrastructure and the residential environment, providing new public or third-sector services, activating residents, promoting cooperation between residents and the municipality, or boosting local identity. Such mitigating actions aim to improve the inhabitants’ life chances and the neighborhood’s general condition. If successful, they may make the neighborhood more appealing to those who otherwise would not be interested in moving there and thus might contribute to changing the social composition of its population. One recent example of such a program is the Ministry of Environment’s Suburban Development Program 2020–2022, funding 24 projects in 13 cities (<https://ym.fi/en/suburban-development-programme>).

Helsinki has had about twice as many projects in suburban programs as Turku and Tampere, but then again, Helsinki is more than twice as big as the two others. All three cities employ curative and mitigating interventions for problem areas. Resident-related measures refer to “positive discrimination” concerning schools, residents’ guidance against eviction risks, and case-based consideration in selecting residents for social housing. Our three cities share all of these mitigating measures.

#### 4.1.4. Dispersal policies as a preventive and a curative tool

The examples of dispersal policies in the theory section were settling immigrants in different geographical locations, the American Moving to Opportunity project, where households voluntarily moved to new neighborhoods, and the Danish “ghetto policy,” where municipalities were compelled to disperse concentrations of people.

Looking at the municipal anti-segregation policies, we do not find traces of dispersal-based policies encouraging poor residents to relocate to higher-status neighborhoods or breaking down existing population concentrations by relocating residents. Municipal social housing companies select residents for their vacant dwellings according to their social characteristics, as the companies are obliged to favor applicants with pressing housing needs and modest or poor financial situations. These residents are selected for existing housing stock in areas where tenures and dwelling types are or are not mixed. There is an element of dispersal involved in the relocation of residents. However, our interviews indicate that city officials *do* exercise some consideration based on applicants’ housing history (e.g. disturbances) in steering applicants to what they consider “right areas” for the applicant (see also Dhalmann & Vilkkama, 2009).

## 5. Discussion

Our empirical contribution is providing an analysis of segregation policies in the three major cities we are looking at that is more comprehensive than what has been done before (e.g., by Saikkonen et al., 2018). The comparative research design always seeks similarities

and differences between cases. In the cases investigated here, there do not seem to be any considerable differences in anti-segregation policies. In all three cities, there is a shared concern about the increase in segregation; all use social mixing as a preventive and curing policy instrument, et cetera. One difference between the cities is in how much segregation is monitored with documentation of the situation. With its long research tradition, both by the city itself and by academic researchers and superior resources, Helsinki stands out. Also, in other respects, anti-segregation policies in Helsinki are somewhat more varied than in the other two cities. According to our data, policies in Turku appear to be slightly weaker than in the other two cities – even though the previous research cited in the paper shows a higher level of ethnic segregation than in the other cities.

Regarding the typology of anti-segregation policies, a relatively uniform approach to countering segregation is visible in our results. On the one hand, there is an emphasis on preventive and curative social mixing, and on the other hand, on mitigating area-based projects, both nationally and locally promoted and funded. Helsinki has professed preventive social mixing for a long time, and the other two cities adopted social mixing later, with Turku first as a curing policy and then as a preventive one. Area-based interventions emerged in the 1980s and became a more stable policy option in the next decade.

What we do not see on a large scale is the kind of curing policy where worn-out social housing is demolished, and the previous population is displaced, making room for the area’s gentrification. However, there are some signs of displacement of vulnerable tenants following the renewal of social rental housing (see Perälä et al., 2023). There are more positive examples of curing policies, e.g., the urban renewal of a previous rental housing area in Helsinki where the one-sided population structure was transformed – without displacement (Ventovuori, 2021; see also Lilius & Hirvonen, 2023). In Finland, we also do not see dispersal policies, such as the Moving to Opportunity experiment in the U.S., through which individual households were offered a chance to relocate from a lower-status neighborhood to a higher-status one.

Our results also show that the strong autonomy of municipal decision-making characteristic of Finnish society enables the toolbox to address local challenges in its efforts to manage segregation, at least if it wishes. In our three target cities, the interventions have clearly been more diversified and sustained than national-level management. Unlike many countries, Finland does not have a strong decision-making body at the regional level to steer housing policy, for example. On the other hand, this has also been seen as a problem in managing segregation, as segregation is always linked to the wider housing and labor market region, and urban regions comprise many individual municipalities. Partial optimization is, therefore possible rather than an overall benefit. Our results also show that, although segregation in Finland is still relatively moderate according to the research results, large cities have increasingly had to resort to curative and mitigating measures to control it. It seems that Finland’s qualities are more likely to catch up with the rest of Europe than to result from particularly successful segregation management measures.

The obvious limitation of this paper is that it looks at anti-segregation policies at the level of policy statements. Therefore, we do not look at the path from chosen goal-oriented policies to outcomes: concrete land-use decisions, housing policy, or funding area-based interventions. Such an analysis would have needed more fine-grained case research than what was possible to do for this article. Moreover, the data used in this article does not allow for assessing whether policies impact the actual segregation rates measured by segregation indexes or other statistical means. In any case, the impact of policies is likely to be seen only after some time, and assessing the impacts of policy in an open system like a city is quite a demanding research task, as many other factors outside of the jurisdiction of municipalities are impacting segregation patterns.

## 6. Conclusion

On the basis of our analysis, we argue that relying on preventive and curative social mixing and mitigating area-based projects is the “Finnish way” to respond to bad residential segregation. The approach can be considered a “soft” one, as it does not involve dispersal of population concentrations. Of course, this is a tentative conclusion based on the investigation of just three cases – but these are cases where segregation problems and responding to them have been most prominent in Finland.

Apart from providing an empirical analysis of a Finnish case, our paper seeks to provide a general contribution to how residential segregation policies are approached in research. We provide a particular analysis of residential segregation, emphasizing its many-faceted nature: it can be bad but also good or neutral. The term “segregation” should not focus only on the existence and creation deprived neighborhoods but also all kinds of separation of different categories of people in residential space. We introduce a comprehensive analytical typology of anti-segregation policies based on earlier contributions to this issue. We develop further what we call a functional typology (Briggs, 2005; Smets & Salman, 2008) and “cross-tabulate” it with what we call an operational typology (Andersson, BråmÅ, & Holmqvist, 2010; Andersson, Dhalmann, et al., 2010). As defined here, the combined typology is developed to make sense of all policy instruments against bad residential segregation. It can be used for researching anti-segregation policies in contexts other than ours, and if needed, it can act as a basis for developing better typologies more suited to the contexts at hand. The typology is intended as a working tool, not the one true classification of policy types.

## CRedit authorship contribution statement

**Hannu Ruonavaara:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Project administration, Conceptualization. **Jarkko Rasinkangas:** Writing – review & editing, Data curation. **Katriina Rosengren:** Writing – review & editing, Data curation.

## Funding

This work was supported by the Finnish Strategic Research Council at the Research Council of Finland (decisions No. 352450, 352451).

## Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests: Hannu Ruonavaara reports financial support was provided by The Research Council of Finland. Hannu Ruonavaara reports a relationship with University of Turku that includes: employment. If there are other authors, they declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## Acknowledgement

We thank Master of Political Sciences Inka Elomaa for research assistance.

## Data availability

Data will be made available on request.

## References

Andersson, R., BråmÅ, Å., & Holmqvist, E. (2010). Counteracting segregation: Swedish policies and experiences. *Housing Studies*, 25(2), 237–256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673030903561859>

- Andersson, R., Dhalmann, H., Holmqvist, E., Kauppinen, T., Magnusson Turner, L., Skifter Andersen, H., Søholt, S., Vaattovaara, M., Vilkkama, K., Wessel, T., & Yousfi, S. (2010). *Immigration, housing and segregation in the Nordic welfare states*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Department of Geosciences and Geography.
- Arnell-Gustafsson, U. (1982). On strategies against socioeconomic residential segregation. *Acta Sociologica*, 25(Supplement), 33–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000169938202500105x>
- Bernelius, V., & Vilkkama, K. (2019). Pupils on the move: School catchment area segregation and residential mobility of urban families. *Urban Studies*, 56(15), 3095–3116. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098019848999>
- Bolt, G. (2009). Combating residential segregation of ethnic minorities in European cities. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 24(4), 397–405. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-009-9163-z>
- Briggs, X.d. S. (2005). Conclusion. *Desegregating the city*. In D. P. Varady (Ed.), *Desegregating the City. Ghettos, enclaves, and inequality* (pp. 233–257). State University of New York Press: Ithaca.
- Dhalmann, H., & Vilkkama, K. (2009). Housing policy and the ethnic mix in Helsinki, Finland: Perceptions of city officials and Somali immigrants. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 24(4), 423–439. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-009-9159-8>
- Feins, J. D., & Shroder, M. D. (2005). Moving to opportunity: The demonstration’s design and its effects on mobility. *Urban Studies*, 42(8), 1275–1299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980500150599>
- Galster, G. C., Turner, L. M., & Santiago, A. M. (2021). Neighbourhood selection by natives and immigrants: Homophily or limited spatial search? *Housing Studies*, 39(1), 75–101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2021.2014415>
- Hess, D. B., Tammaru, T., & van Ham, M. (Eds.). (2018). *Housing estates in Europe: Poverty, ethnic segregation and policy challenges*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92813-5>.
- Holdo, M., & Bengtsson, B. (2020). Marginalization and riots: A rationalistic explanation of urban unrest. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 37(2), 162–179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2019.1578996>
- Juvenius, J. (2023). Well-behaved owners and troublesome tenants? How dense social mixing shapes housing communities and dispels prejudices. *Housing, Theory and Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2023.2264311>
- Kurvinen, A., Karhula, A., & Ala-Mantila, S. (2025). Socioeconomic and ethnic segregation in Finland: A multi-scale analysis of diverse urban sizes. *Cities*, 157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2024.105599>
- Lilius, J., & Hirvonen, J. (2023). The changing position of housing estate neighbourhoods in the Helsinki metropolitan area. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 38, 121–140. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-021-09890-5>
- Malmberg, B., Andersson, E., & Östh, J. (2013). Segregation and urban unrest in Sweden. *Urban Geography*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2013.799370>
- Marcuse, P. (2005). Enclaves yes, ghettos no. Segregation and the state. In D. P. Varady (Ed.), *Desegregating the city. Ghettos, enclaves, and inequality* (pp. 15–30). Ithaca: State University of New York Press.
- Peach, C. (1996a). Good segregation, bad segregation. *Planning Perspectives*, 11(4), 379–398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/026654396364817>
- Peach, C. (1996b). The meaning of segregation. *Planning Practice and Research*, 11(2), 137–150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02697459650036297>
- Perälä, R., Niemi, V., Mäki, J., & Ilmoniemä, M. (2023). Displacement and inequality: An analysis of the negative consequences of displacement at society’s margins. *Nordic Welfare Research*, 8(2), 152–164. <https://doi.org/10.18261/nwr.8.2.7>
- Rosengren, K., Kauppinen, T. M., Lilius, J., Rasinkangas, J., & Ruonavaara, H. (2024). Conflicting regional policy goals: Accessibility and segregation in the Helsinki metropolitan area. *Urban, Planning and Transport Research*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/21650020.2023.2301063>
- Ruoppila, S., & Turtaainen, P. (2024). Lähiö suomalaisessa lähiötutkimuksessa. *Yhdyskuntasuunnittelu*, 61(2), 45–72. <https://journal.fi/yhdyskuntasuunnittelu/article/view/129151>.
- Saikkonen, P., Hannikainen, K., Kauppinen, T., Rasinkangas, J., & Vaalavuo, M. (2018). *Sosiaalinen kestävyys: asuminen, segregaatio ja tuloerot kolmella kaupunkiseudulla*. Helsinki: Terveystien ja hyvinvoinnin laitoks.
- Sassen, S. (2001). *The global city: New York, London*. Tokyo: Princeton University Press.
- Seemann, A. (2021). The Danish ‘ghetto initiatives’ and the changing nature of social citizenship, 2004–2018. *Critical Social Policy*, 41(4), 586–605. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018320978504>
- Skærlund Risager, B. (2022). Territorial stigmatization and housing commodification under racial neoliberalism: The case of Denmark’s ‘ghettos’. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 55(4), 850–870.
- Skifter Andersen, H. (2003). *Urban sores. On the interaction between segregation, urban decay, and deprived neighbourhoods*. Burlington (VT): Ashgate.
- Skifter Andersen, H., Andersson, R., Wessel, T., & Vilkkama, K. (2016). The impact of housing policies and housing markets on ethnic spatial segregation: Comparing the capital cities of four Nordic welfare states. *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 16(1), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616718.2015.1110375>
- Smets, P., & Salman, T. (2008). Countering urban segregation: Theoretical and policy innovations from around the globe. *Urban Studies*, 45, 1307–1332. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098008090676>
- Sutela, E. (2023). The role of municipalities in promoting housing affordability: An analysis of three Finnish cities. *Urban Research & Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2023.2206793>
- Tammaru, T., Knapp, D., Silm, S., van Ham, M., & Witlox, F. (2021). Spatial underpinnings of social inequalities: A vicious circles of segregation approach. *Social Inclusion*, 9(2), 65–76.
- Tammaru, T., Sinitsyna, A., Akhavadegan, A., van Ham, M., Marciničzak, S., & Musterd, S. (2021). Income inequality and residential segregation in European cities.

- In G. Pryce, Y. P. Wang, Y. Chen, J. Shan, & H. Wei (Eds.), *Urban inequality and segregation in Europe and China. A global perspective*. Cham: Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-74544-8\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-74544-8_3).
- Tunström, M., Anderson, T., & Perjo, L. (2016). *Segregated cities and planning for social sustainability - A Nordic perspective*. Stockholm: Nordregio.
- Vaattovaara, M. (1998). *Pääkaupunkiseudun sosiaalinen erilaistuminen: ympäristö ja alueellisuus*. Helsinki: Helsingin kaupungin tietokeskus.
- Vaattovaara, M., Joutsiniemi, A., Kortteinen, M., Stjernberg, M., & Kempainen, T. (2018). Experience of a preventive experiment. Spatial social mixing in post-world war II housing estates in Helsinki, Finland. In D. B. Hess, T. Tammaru, & M. van Ham (Eds.), *Housing estates in Europe: Poverty, ethnic segregation and policy challenges* (pp. 215–240). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92813-5\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92813-5_1)
- Vaattovaara, M., & Kortteinen, M. (2015). Segregaation aika. *Yhteiskuntapolitiikka*, 80(6), 562–574.
- van Ham, M., Tammaru, T., & Janssen, H. J. (2018). A multilevel model of vicious circles of socioeconomic segregation. In *Divided cities: Understanding intra-urban inequalities* (pp. 135–153). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264300385-8-en>.
- van Ham, M., Tammaru, T., Ubarevičienė, R., & Janssen, H. (2021). Rising inequalities and a changing social geography of cities. An introduction to the global segregation book. In M. van Ham, T. Tammaru, R. Ubarevičienė, & H. Janssen (Eds.), *Urban socio-economic segregation and income inequality*. Cham: Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64569-4\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64569-4_1).
- Ventovuori, M. (2021). *Urban renewal and residential displacement in Myllypuro* (Master's Thesis in Economics). Helsinki: Aalto University [https://aaltodoc.aalto.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/110362/master\\_Ventovuori\\_Marika\\_2021.pdf?sequence=1](https://aaltodoc.aalto.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/110362/master_Ventovuori_Marika_2021.pdf?sequence=1).
- Wacquant, L. (2022). Rethinking the city with Bourdieu's trialectic. *City*, 26(5–6), 820–830. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2022.212518>
- Weber, M. (2019). *Economy and society: A new translation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.