TRAMES, 2017, **21**(**71/66**), 4, 345–369

DISTRUST, POWERLESSNESS AND SOCIOSPATIAL DIFFERENTIATION IN LITHUANIAN CITIES

Artūras Tereškinas and Apolonijus Žilys

Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania

Abstract. Drawing on the population survey of social exclusion in Lithuanian cities, the article examines how residents' distrust of their power to change neighborhoods and influence local authority decisions reflects more general processes of sociospatial segregation and differentiation. We argue that this distrust is spatially driven, although there is a limited evidence to suggest consistent sociospatial differentiation between prestigious city areas (city centers and suburbs) and low-end zones (working-class neighborhoods and Soviet-era housing areas). Pointing to the residents' emotions of distrust and powerlessness related to 'messy' social exclusion processes, the article contributes to the research of both emotional geography and sociospatial differentiation in post-socialist cities.

Keywords: Lithuanian cities, neighborhood, emotional orientations, distrust, powerlessness, sociospatial differentiation

DOI: https://doi.org/10.3176/tr.2017.4.04

1. Introduction

A city and its neighborhoods are places where their residents conduct their daily lives and activities. Emotional attachment and emotional orientations guide them in dealing with physical structures they encounter each day. In the words of Thrift, emotions are an expression of persistent urban experience; nowadays, this experience is "more and more likely to be actively engineered with the result that it is becoming more akin to the networks of pipes and cables that are of such importance in providing the basic mechanics and root textures of urban life" (Thrift 2004:58). Urban dwellers lead their lives in suffering, loss, elation, anger, love, confidence, anxiety and distrust in one another. Therefore one cannot ignore the power of emotional relations in cities that could be seen as containers of diverse emotions (Anderson and Smith 2001, Dillabough and Kennelly 2010).

Analyzing ways in which individuals experience their urban neighborhoods as organized fields of social practices, researchers construct urban emotional geographies that include the conflicts unraveling in cities as well as dilemmas and survival strategies.

Pedrazzini and Desrosiers-Lauzon argue that currently the sense of spatial insecurity is the most common urban emotion (Pedrazzini and Desrosiers-Lauzon 2011:99). Yet this spatial insecurity often arises less from actual threats or violence than from the emotion of fear that city dwellers generally associate with urban space. Each day they are confronted by feelings of belonging to the place they live, security therein or, on the contrary, disaffection for their environment, frustration and threat. All these emotions or emotional orientations could be examined not just as effects of urban neighborhoods (Atkinson and Kintrea 2001, Mirowsky and Ross 2009), but also as factors that can affect the dynamic of sociospatial segregation and differentiation in the city.

Sociospatial segregation is often defined as "the degree to which two or more groups live separately from one another, in different parts of the urban environment" (Massey and Denton 1988:282). Segregation is the existence of sociospatial formations defined by a marked domination of a group within a specific location (Sykora 2009:431). It is characterized by the uneven distribution of various socially significant elements (such as income, education, social status, ownership, etc.) in the city. Segregation processes are a readily perceivable and conventional form of social exclusion, since they are maintained by sustained shortage of social, cultural and economic capital. In this case, social and spatial boundaries overlap, reinforcing social exclusion where some groups get integrated, while others are subjected to scarcity of capital alongside processes of stigmatization due to a lack of significant resources in space.

The classic view (Massey 2005, 2007, Wacquant 2008) approaches segregation as a form of social inequality or a social process that accentuates cultural differences: different processes of social stratification are reflected in different social strata in different city areas. Urban decline of certain places in the city and increasingly perceptible sociospatial differentiation could be regarded as a milder form of segregation. While economic investment brings renovation, prosperity and rising standards of living to certain city zones, others are often left behind this economic change. As a result, spatial differentiation can show how the socially heterogeneous city concentrates social groups in particular spaces. Although this article uses both terms, that of sociospatial differentiation is the preferred one.

Research into post-socialist cities mostly focuses on their spatial restructurization, defined as the transfer of assets, resources and opportunities from the public to the private sector. This restructurization has brought greater variety of individual choices and life standards, accompanied simultaneously by a general decline of standards of living (Stanilov 2007:10–11, Andruzs, Harloe and Szelényi 1996). A far less well researched aspect of these cities is emotional geographies and urban emotionology. There has been hardly any inquiry into how living in certain neighborhoods of a city can affect people's emotions. This is especially

true in Lithuania's case. Urban research here has been underdeveloped and often limited to generalized speculations about urban space transformations and urban discourse, unsubstantiated by any empirical data (Samalavičius 2005, Burneika, Kriaučiūnas and Ubarevičienė 2010, Lavrinec 2011) or general reflections on urban culture (Samalavičius 2009, 2010). Lately, the most thoroughly analyzed aspects have been discursively constructed identities of particular cities (Maniukaitė et al. 2014, Petrušonis 2005, Grunskis 2005), urban subcultures (Kraniauskas 2012a, 2012b), safety and sustainability in Lithuanian cities (Ceccato and Lukyte 2010, Acus 2011, Tamutienė 2013), and housing policies (Aidukaitė 2013, Aidukaitė et al. 2014). Hardly any attempt has been made to look into empirically-based processes of sociospatial segregation and differentiation in the post-socialist cities. In general, there is a marked dearth of statistical data on sociospatial change in Lithuanian cities (Juškevičius 2006, Žilys 2013, Tereškinas and Žilys 2014). This article is therefore meant to narrow the gap in research of both emotional geography and sociospatial segregation and differentiation processes in post-socialist cities.

Drawing on data from the 2012 population survey "Social Exclusion in the Lithuanian Cities: Forms of Spatial Segregation and Polarization," this article analyzes people's confidence (or lack thereof) in their own power to improve local community life – as it relates to the issues of power and powerlessness, activity and passivity – in three of Lithuania's biggest cities, Vilnius, Kaunas, and Klaipėda. To be more precise, the analysis focuses on distrust of one's own power to change neighborhoods and influence local authority decisions. One of the assumptions of the argument is that distrust as an emotional orientation can signal a sociospatial transformation of different neighborhoods, their sociospatial differentiation or even segregation. Thus distrust of one's own power to influence social change in a neighborhood is conceptualized here as an emotional orientation that can impact sociospatial distributions and differentiations. Therefore a discussion of mechanisms effecting sociospatial differentiation and segregation in the socialist and post-socialist city is an important part of the argument.

The article is comprised of six chapters. Chapter one gives a concise discussion of the development of the socialist and post-socialist city as it relates to processes of sociospatial differentiation and segregation. Chapter two presents theoretical arguments for the link between emotions, emotional orientations and urban neighborhoods. Chapter three outlines the methodology of the research, while chapter four gives the analysis of how the sense of distrust relates to property ownership and income. In chapter five, we discuss emotional orientations of residents in different neighborhoods of Vilnius, Kaunas and Klaipėda. Chapter six focuses on emotional orientation dynamics in the Lithuanian city and how it depends on residence in a particular neighborhood. The last chapter summarizes the argument in the article.

2. Socialist and post-socialist city

The socialist city, unlike the Western city, developed under state control and state power to resettle, mobilize and exert total control over the distribution of different social groups in the city thanks to state ownership of the entire housing market and urban planning. This meant that ideological deployment of administrative measures was used for the policy of ensuring equality and equal access to standardized housing for all social classes. Class convergence was one of the crucial political (and/or ideological) goals in the socialist society, while housing policies or urban planning were used as instruments for that end (Harth et al. 1998). Szelényi (1983) argues that the Soviet system failed to stamp out social inequality, because it constructed a different kind of sociospatial segregation, one particular to the socialist bloc countries.

A typical socialist city was construed as a settlement of workers, therefore urban planning was approached via standardized construction of easy-to-assemble (concrete-paneled, monolith or based on other technology) multi-story blocks of identical apartments. Urban planning was geared to ensuring that the processes went smoothly, so that worker populations could be resettled close to industry as soon as possible. This was the political goal of the socialist system, since technology of prefabricated apartment blocks enabled rapid urbanization of previously predominantly rural societies and meeting demand for labor in urban-based heavy industries. At the same time, the pre-socialist parts of towns were seen, ideologically, as remnants of history and the capitalist system, which meant that the state would often leave these zones to desolation and neglect. Old residential areas would not be modernized – selective urban planning created preconditions to sociospatial segregation particular to the socialist system.

The socialist city underwent sociospatial segregation also because of state policies of assigning and segmenting housing. Unlike in industrialized Western countries, where access to higher-standard housing was decided by income or social status, in socialist societies it depended on age, skills, position in office hierarchy and, very often, membership in the *nomenklatura*. Sociospatial segregation therefore was predicated on the mechanism whereby new housing would be reserved to young people or families with higher skills or individuals loyal to the socialist system. Meanwhile lower-quality housing would go to elder and less skilled urban dwellers (Szelényi 1983). The most pronounced segregation under the socialist system befell the elderly, since new housing units would invariably be assigned to young workforce and, under state management, flats could not be exchanged or sold. As a result, there was very little mobility in the socialist city, since people were forcibly tied to their housing. Individuals would age alongside their flats and their neighborhoods.

One must note here that these segregation processes, linked by Szelényi and Pickvance (Szelényi 1983, Pickvance 1997) to socialist housing policies and forms of social stratification particular to the socialist city, or termed by Harth et al. (1998) social polarization due to pronounced segmentation of housing (old

neglected households in city centers vs. modern residential estates with high-quality infrastructure) could hardly be construed as segregation proper. In fact, there was little in the way of clear and pronounced separation between different social groups and even the best standardized Soviet housing estates were inhabited by rather heterogeneous populations.

The transition from the socialist centrally-planned economy and government to the free market was a decisive factor that shaped the contemporary post-socialist city. Social stratification based on age, skill level, education, party loyalty and family status gets supplemented by economic segregation as the post-socialist city transitions into market economy where financial and socioeconomic factors as well as social status play a prominent role. Still, according to Węcławowicz (1998), there is little basis to speak of segregation in the post-socialist city, even after the transition; rather, one should speak of polarization between the new elite and the impoverished social stratum.

During the transition to market economy, the socialist segregation turned into social polarization: the working class, which had been employed in low-skill industrial labor, had to switch to so-called dead-end jobs, like selling consumer goods in open-air markets or black market trade. As time went by, many people from this group got caught up in the new trap of urban poverty as the free market amplified marginalization and differentiation among people in proportion to the implosion of the welfare state. Although the extent and forms of social polarization in post-socialist countries are hardly comparable to those in Western cities, Węcławowicz (1998) argues that similar processes are in play here, effecting the emergence of the *dual city*; except that this dual city appears not only because of the shrinking and desolation of the middle class (characteristic of Western societies), but also because during the transition disproportional shares of middle-class populations in post-socialist cities found themselves at the bottom of social hierarchy (Pickvance 1997, Ruopilla and Kährik 2003, Ruopilla 2005, 2007).

In post-socialist cities, the biggest pressure befell the former working class that had to adapt to new economic conditions. The post-socialist transformation of the working class has spawned two related groups: the winners and the losers, the middle class and the underclass. Researchers pinpoint three emerging trends of sociospatial segregation in the post-socialist city. First, old city centers, where housing stock had been devalued and neglected under the socialist rule, will undergo gentrification. Second, socially heterogeneous populations of the apartment block estates will give way to more homogeneous lower-income and lower-education groups. At the same time, these parts of the city will lose their social status as high living standard neighborhoods. Third, higher-income and higher-social-status groups will be moving to suburbs at intensifying rates, stimulating the expansion of suburbia (Harth et al. 1998). To some degree, these processes can also be observed in the Lithuanian cities (Juškevičius 2006, Žilys 2013).

Let us turn now to short overviews of the three biggest Lithuanian cities that will be analyzed below. In 2014, Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania, had a population of 540,790, that of Kaunas was 302,720, and the population of Klaipėda stood

at 156,849 (Statistics Lithuania 2015). All three cities contain areas, neighborhoods and residential estates of mass-produced housing stock. Their design and construction technologies are identical to those in many other major socialist cities (Dijokienė and Džervus 2011:99).

Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania and its most populous city, located in the south-east of the country, was rapidly developed during the socialist period between 1945 and 1979, when as much as 60% of its housing was built. After regaining independence from the Soviet Union in 1990, however, not all residential areas built in that period kept their value, mostly due to unappealing design and low-quality housing stock (Daunora and Juškevičius 2006). During the post-socialist transition, these zones underwent least change, while reconstruction and redevelopment concentrated in central areas, mostly built prior to World War Two (Senamiestis, Naujamiestis, Šnipiškės, Žvėrynas) (Burneika 2003, Ceccato and Lukyte 2010).

Kaunas is Lithuania's second city in size and importance. It is located almost in the middle between the country's western and eastern borders, a little closer to the southern than the northern edge. The city is situated at the confluence of the two biggest rivers in Lithuania, the Nemunas and the Neris, stretching across the terraced valleys of both. Kaunas has a uniform irregular concentric structure with the historic city center (Senamiestis and Naujamiestis), its urban nucleus, has developed in several main directions. These active development zones form a star-shaped structure, connecting the central business district to peripheral centers and suburban sprawls beyond. Two areas central to the city's visual identity – Senamiestis and Naujamiestis, with their distinctive pre-Soviet street plan, buildings and urban structure – dominate the landscape of the Nemunas and Neris confluence, surrounded by big different morphotypes in Vilijampolė, Aleksotas, Šančiai and Panemunė (Lukošius et al. 2003, Tatatiūnienė et al. 2011:18).

The city of Klaipėda was founded and successfully developed into a significant regional center using its marine potential. The compact city has a classic linear structure. The urban structure of Klaipėda is defined by three main parts: the central district (historic city), the middle part (Soviet-built city), and the periphery (low-rise suburban structures). Over the last decade, rapid urbanization of the city's outskirts has formed low-density housing zones around Klaipėda. These suburban residential estates have mostly pulled higher-income groups from the middle part of the city in search of safer environment and higher-quality housing (Klaipėdos miesto bendrojo plano stebėsena 2013).

3. Emotions, emotional orientations and sociospatial differentiation in cities

Emotions play an important part in organizing space since they offer a glance into ways that people erect spatial barriers, build links and communities. According to Nussbaum, the power of human emotions and their potentially terrifying character stem from complex thoughts that people form about what objects they

need and about their imperfect control over these object. She believes it is inevitable that any emotion has an intentional object which becomes a part of the person experiencing emotion (Nussbaum 2003:24). It means that emotions arise when individuals realize they cannot control the object they have heavily invested into. The lack of control over this object becomes an integral part of the emotion (Probyn 2005:121). We could infer that distrust in one's own power to change anything in one's neighborhood has something to do with disbelief that urban neighborhoods, as inseparable parts of one's emotions, can be controlled and managed. Neighborhoods, one believes, are simply out of one's control and, in their turn, arouse subjective feelings of helplessness and distrust.

In their conditions-cognitions-emotion theory, Mirowsky and Ross (2009) argue that poor living conditions in urban neighborhoods encourage feelings of impotence, alienation and distrust in both oneself and others. Subjective impotence means a lack of personal control. Individuals feel incapable of achieving their goals, because outcomes are governed by external forces that do not yield to individual actions and decisions (Ross and Mirowsky 1987, 2009, Pauwels and Svensson 2014). The sense of subjective impotence has to do with a conviction that one's actions will not affect outcomes and that these outcomes are determined by external factors such as luck, faith, and accident. Impotence, in turn, can evoke other negative emotions like fear, distress, or distrust (Pauwels and Svensson 2014:204). This means that both a neighborhood, as an object of emotion that one cannot control, and a lack of personal control can give one a sense of distrust in one's power to change anything in the neighborhood.

Bar-Tal (2001) uses the term collective emotional orientation to speak about emotions prevalent in a society. He believes that this orientation, which consists of emotion or belief that evokes certain emotion, is shared by the majority of people in a given society. It is readily exploited in the public discourse or cultural production. Other researchers favor the concept of emotional climate. It is defined as emotions which not only are shared within social groups, but also play a role in shaping and maintaining social and political identities, collective behavior (Barbalet 1998:159). Both collective emotions and emotional climate point out to the fact that emotions are an integral part of practice (Everts and Wagner 2012). They are inseparable from what they mean and what action they inspire. It is our view, therefore, that distrust in one's own ability to change a city and influence local government is an important factor that shapes emotional climate and common emotional orientations in different urban neighborhoods.

An important question we raise is whether distrust in one's power to change neighborhoods and influence local government can be seen as an emotional orientation or a general emotional climate in the Lithuanian cities. We can presume that distrust, which is based on the feeling of impotence, is a cognitive stance and a conscious expectation developed through practice. However, if we accept emotions to be "material-discursive processes that contextualize and construct embodied experience" (Hearn 2008:185), then we can claim that distrust is also something socially constructed in the site of clash between expectations and

experienced social reality. Second, much like emotions of anger, fear or frustration, distrust is an important strategic resource that helps sustain, consolidate or destabilize urban microsocial orders. For instance, emotions of belonging to a neighborhood and commonality unite people, whereas emotions like disgust and disappointment divide and distance individuals who live in one place. In this sense, the phenomenon of distrust is highly relevant to processes of communal solidarity, atomization, or sociospatial differentiation.

In urban sociology and geography, sociospatial segregation or differentiation is measured by looking at different social groups, their variety and distribution – either concentration or dispersal across urban space. The approach relies on notions of social inequality that, in the context of modern Western cities, is understood as a phenomenon determined by market and capitalist forces, in interaction with other important social characteristics like class stratification or differentiation of labor force and social status. Ethnicity and race also come into play, drawing from their historic relation to poverty, segregation and urban exclusion. We also argue that sociospatial differentiation can also affect emotional orientations or emotional climate prevalent in certain neighborhoods. Therefore distrust in one's own power to change neighborhoods or influence authority decisions could be treated not just as an effect of living in a particular neighborhood, but also as an indicator of sociospatial relations among people and distance between different neighborhoods in a city.

4. Notes on methodology and data collection

The survey data of Vilnius, Kaunas and Klaipėda respondents obtained from the research project "Social Exclusion in the Lithuanian Cities: Forms of Spatial Segregation and Polarization" were used in this article. The project sought to identify multi-dimensional sociospatial segregation or differentiation in Lithuanian cities by using a variety of survey question blocs including household and individual respondent's sociodemographic characteristics, the parameters of respondents' dwelling and living conditions, opinions about satisfaction with municipal public services, local cultural consumption, subjective evaluations of criminogenic situation in a neighborhood, neighborliness and social efficacy of respondents' residency, and their collective emotional orientations. Thus, in this article, we use only a fraction of the whole survey data that deals with sociodemographic and socioeconomic characteristics and the variables of neighborhood type and collective emotional orientations (such as respondents' assessment of their ability to affect positive changes in the neighborhood and their ability to influence local government decisions).

The typical sampling technique was not applied in the survey. In selecting the sample, we used one of the cluster sampling procedures based on geographic definition, area sampling, also known as geographic cluster (unit) selection. Geographic definition was the key selection element: the respondents had to be

residents of the urban areas of Vilnius, Kaunas, and Klaipėda or their outskirts (some localities, included as 'urban outskirts', were within the official limits of greater urban areas). Four *typical* geographic clusters were identified in Vilnius, Kaunas, and Klaipėda. In all, we have selected 12 clusters representing the three cities (see Appendix 1)[1]: (1) city center; (2) working class zone adjacent to the city center; (3) residential zone of Soviet mass-produced housing; and (4) suburban zone. The minimum sample size in each cluster was the quota of 150 respondents. Although we used the route sampling procedure to select the quota in each cluster, within each cluster a crucial criterion for selection was applied: in order to ensure greater geographic distribution, no more than five respondents could be chosen from the same building. The overall sample size was 1,890 respondents over the age of 18, and data was gathered by face-to-face interview method. Effort was made to make sure that the sociodemographic structure of the sample in terms of gender and age corresponded to the 2011 national population statistics provided by the Statistics Lithuania. The survey meets WAPOR (World Association for Public Opinion Research) standards and sociological research requirements.

5. Distrust and its relation to home ownership and income

In order to analyze urban residents' emotional orientations as they relate to the area they live in and their perceptions about their own ability to improve local community life, different cities dealt with in this article are assigned binary regression models that include sociodemographic (gender, age, marital status, education), local area (city zone type), and household (family income source and home ownership variable) indicators. There is a logic and justification to using latter clusters.

Household variable cluster analysis method. For the purpose of statistical modeling, the *household cluster* variable has been constructed using the 2-step cluster analysis method out of several variables: three household income sources and one home tenure variable (see Appendix 2). A household could be the 'link' that ties a person's identification and emotional orientation to the neighborhood, especially when it comes to the structure of family income and home ownership. The latter factor can very well be the deciding factor in one's determination to improve the local environment, since home ownership limits opportunities for physical mobility across city areas (Ross et al. 2001, Andersen 2002, 2008) and often forces people to take responsibility for the environment in their neighborhood and even take up community activism (Kleinhans 2006, 2009). Andersen (2011) notes that indicators such as home ownership, life cycle stage (i. e., age),

[1] Individual consultations and three focus group interviews with the experts – municipal representatives, official urban planners, urbanists, sociologists, academics, representatives of social welfare and local educational institutions, etc. – helped the researchers identify concrete typical clusters according to particular sets of social, political and morphological charateristics in all three cities.

and income source do not only play a role in choosing a place to live, but also show what responsibilities a person or a household assumes when settling in a particular home. For this reason, our analysis has used the family income source in conjunction with the variable of home ownership, assuming that income sources as economic indicators are at the same time social indicators that characterize a household or a family. These indicators could be seen as more than just a socio-economic background; home ownership and income source can reveal motivation for building renovation, environment improvement, and concern for quality of life and neighborliness in one's neighborhood: the higher the rate of home ownership and affluence in the neighborhood, the greater the inclination to take care of the environment and the stronger the perception of one's ability to influence the situation (Andersen 2002). Therefore the economic factor of home ownership is by no means exclusively economic, it can have a bearing on different perceptions, norms, and emotional structures related to the place of residence. On the other hand, Charles (2005) notes, home ownership does not necessarily give an accurate picture of cohesion in a community or of positive motives to change that community and neighborhood: different estimations of neighborhood are often described as neighborhood effects that depend on the specificity of a particular neighborhood, or differences among neighborhoods, therefore home ownership and financial indicators do not always explain people's emotional orientations.

Two-step cluster analysis produced five household clusters defined in Table 1.

Table 1. The structure of household clusters

The name of household cluster	Characteristics of five household clusters	N	%
Comfortable homeowners	Household is a homeowner and its income source is salary (100% cases of cluster).	481	26.2
Aging homeowners	Household or its family member is a homeowner and its income sources are pensions (100% cases of cluster) or salary (46% cases of cluster).	402	21.9
Financially comfortable newcomers	Household lives either in a rented or mortgaged home and its income source is salary (100% cases of cluster).	395	21.5
Dwellers codependent on housing	Household family member is a homeowner and household income source is salary (100% cases of cluster).	340	18.5
Financially troubled urban dwellers	Household occupies a variety of housing tenure and its income sources are unemployment and other welfare benefits (37% cases of cluster), salary (24% cases of cluster) and pension (15% cases of cluster).	218	11.9
	Total	1836	100

The ratio of the biggest and the smallest clusters is 2.21; the Silhouette's measure of cohesion and separation for the five clusters is good enough (Silhouette >0.7). The cluster variable for the households was used to show how much one's emotional relation to a neighborhood depends not just on the local area variable (the area type in which a respondent resides[2]) or individual socio-economic characteristics, but also on the socioeconomic features of one's household. We constructed five household clusters – comfortable homeowners, aging homeowners, financially comfortable newcomers, urban dwellers codependent on housing and financially troubled urban dwellers – which correspond to the household's home tenure and income sources.

6. Distrust as an emotional orientation in the Lithuanian cities

The binary regression results presented below encompass respondents' socio-demographic characteristics – age, gender, education, and marital status – and mezzo-level variables like household clusters and city zone type. The following analysis does not take into account one crucial indicator, respondents' income, due to particularly low response rate for this question.[33]

Two questions from the questionnaire, categorized in Likert scale without neutral response, as two analytical dimensions, were chosen as dependent variables illustrating the respondents' emotional relation to their neighborhood or city area:

1. Evaluation of one's ability to change the neighborhood: "It is difficult for people like me to change anything in order to improve our area";
2. Evaluation of one's ability to influence local government decisions: "People like me do not have the right to influence local government decisions".

The following analysis only uses answers from respondents who *completely (dis)agreed* or *(dis)agreed* with these statements. The selected categories of variables were re-coded into binary categories: *disagree* and *agree*.

Binary regression results. In analyzing how sociodemographic characteristics of Vilnius city residents vary depending on how they see their abilities to contribute to positive change in their neighborhoods (Table 2), the binary regression model identified variables of gender, age, marital status and education as statistically significant. Meanwhile the regression model for one's power to be the cause of change in the local neighborhood revealed that city area type in Vilnius is another important and statistically significant factor. Pessimism about

---

[2] Typologization of urban districts corresponds to the typology of geographical clusters distinguished in the methodological chapter.

[3] In the research, the response rate to the question of respondents' income is less than 60%, therefore this indicator was not included in our statistical analysis. The variable of cluster comprised of home ownership and income source can be regarded as an attempt to adequatelly replace an important variable characterizing respondents' economic standing or structure.

one's ability to change anything in the local neighborhood (controlling for other sociodemographic characteristics of Vilnius residents) is more than 88 % likely among women than men. Besides the gender factor, those residents of Vilnius who live in cohabitation are 80% more likely to have a positive view on their abilities than those who live in marriage. Elder residents in Vilnius tend to be more pessimistic: an age increase of one year raises the likelihood of a pessimistic response by almost 4%. Meanwhile higher levels of education increase the likelyhood of positive take on one's own power about 30%. The logistic regression reveals the significance of one more locality indicator, namely, city area type. One can say that there is an 80 % likelihood that residents of working class zone are more positive about their power than residents of Vilnius city center.

Looking at how perceptions of one's power to improve an area vary alongside the same factors in Kaunas, the regression model (Table 2) singled out only three statistically significant variables. Of the sociodemographic variables only age and education are statistically significant factors, controlling for other sociodemographic factors, along with one interaction between city area type and household cluster. With the age increase of one year, respondents are 5% more likely to hold a negative view on their power to effect positive change in the neighborhood. It is noteworthy that the age factor is nearly identical in Kaunas and Vilnius. Respondents with any stage of official education are 17% more likely to assess positively their ability to influence change in the neighborhood. Therefore, one particular home ownership interaction with city area type makes for a good indicator which suggests that comfortable home owners living in the Kaunas center are 11 times more likely to hold optimistic views on their power to influence neighborhood than urban dwellers who are codependent on housing and living in Kaunas suburbs.

The same variables were tested with respondents in Klaipėda and their assessment of their own power to affect positive change in their neighborhoods (Table 2). Analyzing how sociodemographic characteristics relate to respondents' assessment of their own power to contribute to change in neighborhoods, three variable categories were identified as statistically significant in Klaipėda's case: age, marital status, and education. With an increase of one year in respondents' age, the likelihood of pessimistic take on one's abilities to change something in local community rises 1.04 times. It is noteworthy that age has proven to be a significant and near-identical factor in Klaipėda, Kaunas, and Vilnius. Respondents living in cohabitation are almost four times more likely to give pessimistic answers (unlike in Vilnius) than married respondents; single men and women are three times more likely to not think much of their power to affect change in local community and divorced respondents, 2.4 times. In Klaipėda, education shows the same trend as in other cities; it can therefore be taken to be a consistent indicator that acts on the dependent variable: Klaipėda respondents with higher levels of education are 41% less likely to distrust their power to influence community change. When it comes to the factor of city area types, suburban

Table 2. Logistic regression of pessimistic views on one's ability to affect change in the neighborhood

	Vilnius		*Kaunas*	
Variable	*Exp (B)*	95% C.I. for *Exp (B)*	*Exp (B)*	95% C.I. for *Exp (B)*
City area type				
City center	1.00		1.00	
Working class zone	**0.209***	**0.047–0.923**	2.073	0.442–9.723
Residential zone of Soviet mass-produced housing	0.656	0.205–2.098	1.702	0.403–7.196
Suburban zone	0.401	0.101–1.596	0.547	0.107–2.782
Household cluster				
Comfortable homeowners	1.00		1.00	
Aging homeowners	4.163	0.855–20.275	1.325	0.302–5.805
Comfortable newcomers	4.020	0.944–17.126	0.684	0.156–2.996
Dwellers codependent on housing	2.287	0.504–10.371	0.892	0.200–3.989
Financially troubled dwellers	1.722	0.512–5.786	1.237	0.266–5.751
Gender				
Male	1.00		1.00	
Female	**1.882***	**1.123–3.155**	0.880	0.511–1.514
Age	**1.037****	**1.014–1,060**	**1.049*****	**1.022–1.076**
Marital status				
Married	1.00		1.00	
Cohabiting	**0.197****	**0.067–0.579**	0.611	0.215–1.734
Divorced	1.007	0.406–2.496	1.374	0.573–3.291
Widower	0.904	0.349–2.342	1.730	0.560–5.343
Single	0.610	0.285–1.307	1.512	0.648–3.530
Education	**0.703*****	**0.580–0.853**	**0.826***	**0.683–0.999**
Interaction between zone type and household cluster				
Comfortable homeowners living in the city center	1.00		1.00	
Aging homeowners living in the suburban zone	0.618	0.018–1.607	0.858	0.097–7.621
Dwellers codependent on housing living in the suburban zone	3.233	0.348–30.023	**11.462***	**1.334–98.481**
Constant	0.559		0.222	
N	393		342	
Nagelkerke R^2	0.326		0.244	
-2LL	428.541		398.655	
Hosmer-Lemeshow test	P = 0.751		P = 0.350	
χ^2 (df)	109.635 (26)***		68.698 (26)***	
Model classifies correctly	73.8 %		68.7 %	

*** p=0,000; ** p<0,01; * p<0,05.

Binary logistic regressions were controlled for all interactions of zone types and household clusters. The table presents particular interactions of zone type and household cluster that indicated statistically significant results at least in one out of three regression models.

residents are 4.2 times more pessimistic than those who live in the city center. The insight could be supplemented by a statistically significant interaction between household cluster and city area type variables: comfortable homeowners living in the city center and respondents who live on the outskirts of Klaipėda in homes owned by themselves are 92 % less likely to distrust their possibilities compared to aging homeowners living in suburban area. Thus, although generally the suburban residency raises trust in one's ability to change neighborhood compared to city residency in Klaipėda, this tendency is reversed with regard to specific household clusters, as suburban aging homeowners tend to be more pessimistic than homeowners in city center.

To some up the results of all three logistic regressions, we can conclude that higher education levels have a positive effect on people's views on their ability to affect positive change in their urban neighborhoods, whereas older age and absence of home ownership (compared to respondents who live in homes owned by themselves or their families) could produce a negative effect. We should note that mixed results of trusting one's ability to affect change in relation to the factors of marital status and city area type could be attributed to local specifics of the urban settings of Vilnius, Kaunas and Klaipėda.

Three other regression models (Table 3) for each city with the same variables were used to see what effect these variables have on how people see their ability to influence local government decisions. Looking at how residents of Vilnius assess their abilities to change local government decisions one can see that only two factors of education and marital status are important: more educated are 16% less likely to be pessimistic; also, divorced respondents are 2.4 times more likely to be more pessimistic about their own abilities to change local government decisions than married urban dwellers. In the case of Kaunas, the results of binary logistic regression analysis are much more mixed and diverse than in the case of Vilnius, because sociodemographic characteristics (education and age), city area type and the interaction of area types and household clusters are significant factors. Looking at the sociodemographics of Kaunas respondents we see that more educated people are 27% less likely to be pessimistic, and older urbanites tend to possess more distrust than younger ones (the likelihood of distrust goes up 3.6% with each additional year). There are statistical differences among residents of the different zones in Kaunas: those in working-class zone (Vilijampolė) tend to be 7.7 times more pessimistic about their chances to influence local government decisions than those living in Kaunas city center. There is also a statistically significant factor of interaction between city zone types and household cluster variables: comfortable homeowners living in Kaunas city center are 93% more likely to be optimistic about their ability to influence local government decisions than urban dwellers codependent on housing who live in the working class area, 91% – than aging homeowners living in the suburban zone, and 87% – than aging homeowners living in the Soviet mass-produced housing. In Klaipėda, besides education (34% less likelihood of pessimism among more educated respondents), another

Table 3. Logistic regression of pessimistic views on one's ability to change local government decisions

	Vilnius		*Kaunas*	
Variable	*Exp (B)*	95%C.I. for *Exp (B)*	*Exp (B)*	95%C.I. for *Exp (B)*
City area type				
City center	1.00		1.00	
Working class zone	0.235	0.045–1.230	**7.778****	**1.639–36.903**
Residential zone of Soviet mass-produced housing	2.826	0.979–8.156	3.185	0.658–15.429
Suburban zone	0.731	0.206–2.587	2.632	0.545–12.709
Household cluster				
Comfortable homeowners	1.00		1.00	
Aging homeowners	1.266	0.381–4.206	3.035	0.663–13.905
Comfortable newcomers	1.504	0.348–6.507	2.222	0.448–11.010
Dwellers codependent on housing	2.635	0.757–9.167	4.434	0.914–21.514
Financially troubled dwellers	1.351	0.446–4.091	3.176	0.623–16.192
Gender				
Male	1.00		1.00	
Female	1.536	0.970–2.432	1.166	0.696–1.954
Age	1.015	0.995–1.035	**1.037****	**1.012–1.063**
Marital status				
Married	1.00		1.00	
Cohabiting	0.995	0.459–2.157	1.344	0.521–3.473
Divorced	**2.364***	**1.016–5.499**	0.961	0.399–2.310
Widower	1.167	0.490–2.777	0.696	0.232–2.086
Single	0.874	0.443–1.725	0.843	0.365–1.943
Education	**0.835***	**0.708–0.985**	**0.733****	**0.609–0.882**
Interaction between zone type and household cluster				
Comfortable homeowners living in the city center	1.00		1.00	
Dwellers codependent on housing living in the working class zone	4.024	0.317–51.002	**0.070***	**0.008–0.653**
Aging homeowners living in the residential zone of Soviet mass-produced housing	0.883	0.178–4.394	**0.130***	**0.019–0.903**
Aging homeowners living in the sub-urban zone	3.065	0.436–21.544	**0.087***	**0.011–0.689**
Constant	0.249		0.152	
N	418		376	
Nagelkerke R^2	0.172		0.249	
-2LL	514.701		426.810	
Hosmer-Lemeshow test	p=0.367		p=0.132	
χ^2 (df)	57.245 (26)***		76.408 (26)***	
Model classifies correctly	65.3 %		73.7%	

*** p=0,000; ** p<0,01; * p<0,05.

Binary logistic regressions were controlled for all interactions of zone types and household clusters. The table presents particular interactions of zone type and household cluster that indicated statistically significant results at least in one out of three regression models.

statistically significant indicator is marital status: divorced respondents are 2.4 times more likely to distrust their abilities to influence local government compared to married men and women. Looking at results from different zones of Klaipėda, one can say that suburban residents regard their chances of influencing local government decisions 3.7 times more pessimistically than residents of Klaipėda city center.

To sum up, education clearly has a positive effect on respondents' self-perceived abilities to influence local government, whereas effects of city zone types, in Kaunas among working class zone residents and in Klaipėda among sub-urban residents, vary significantly. This variance suggests that people's attitudes do not depend solely on the type of area they live in; they might also be influenced by liveliness of local communities, neighbors, or local government institutions as well as the networks of social capital among neighbors (Kleinhans 2006, 2009).

7. How much distrust varies across Lithuanian urban neighborhoods

The prevailing moods of resignation and distrust can be signals that people living in certain areas of a city might be cut from access to specific (economic, social, and political) resources. They can also point to a wider context of social exclusion which manifests itself not just in social, but in spatial exclusion as well. Emotional constellations in a city are not just signs of social inequalities, but also an indication that urban spaces themselves create aspects of social exclusion based on spatial differentiation (Blokland 2003).

Although we used the city zone type variable in conjunction with the household cluster variable in all of our logistic regressions, not all of them revealed links between the type of area in which people reside and how they assess their capabilities to improve their neighborhood or influence local government decisions. Therefore, in order to see whether there is a more uniform dependence of people's moods on the type of area they live in (the city area type variable) across the three biggest cities in Lithuania, we took the probabilities derived from the logistic regressions of two models (showcased previously) and classified them into two categories: low probability of an event (scores < 0.5) and high probability of an event (scores $>= 0.5$).

The most probable event is that, of all the surveyed areas in Vilnius, residents in the city center will see their chances of improving local community life limited in comparison with residents of other Vilnius areas (Table 4); Cramer's V ($V = 0.154$, $p < 0.01$) coefficient showcases statistically significant weak association between higher probability of hopelessness about changing neighborhood and residency in a particular area of Vilnius. In Kaunas, meanwhile, the most critical of their chances to influence change will be residents of a working class area in comparison with other neighborhoods of Kaunas; Cramer's V ($V = 0.174$, $p = 0.000$) coefficient showcases a statistically significant weak association between higher probability of residents' abilities to improve neighborhood and residency in

a particular area of Kaunas. In Klaipėda, the probability is almost evenly distributed across different city areas, and Cramer's V coefficient does not indicate any statistically significant association between residency in a particular city area and residents' self-assessment of their power to be a part of local community change.

Table 4. Association between people's subjective assessment of their abilities to improve life in their neighborhoods and city area types

City	City area type	*Agreeing with the statement that "it is difficult for people like me to change anything in order to improve our area"*
		Small probability of agreeing with the statement
Vilnius[1]	*City center*	18.8%
	Working class zone	27.6%
	Residential zone of Soviet mass-produced housing	27.2%
	Suburban zone	26.4%
	N	261 (100%)
Kaunas[2]	*City center*	31.8%
	Working class zone	19.7%
	Residential zone of Soviet mass-produced housing	27.2%
	Suburban zone	21.4%
	N	412 (100%)
Klaipėda[3]	*City center*	25.8%
	Working class zone	23.2%
	Residential zone of Soviet mass-produced housing	28.5%
	Suburban zone	22.5%
	N	396 (100%)

1: χ^2=14.219, df=3, p<0.01; Cramer's V=0.154, p<0.01;
2: χ^2=17.960, df=3, p=0.000; Cramer's V=0.174, p=0.000;
3: χ^2=2.160, df=3, p>0.05; Cramer's V=0.06, p>0.05.

Looking at people's take on their ability to influence local government decisions, the most probable event is that residents of Soviet mass-produced housing and suburban areas in Vilnius will see their chances as limited (Table 5). In Kaunas, those with the most pessimistic outlooks will most likely be residents of working class areas and in Klaipėda, of working class areas and Soviet mass-produced housing. Cramer's V coefficients for each city indicate that there is a relatively strong statistically significant correlation between city area type and perceptions of one's ability to influence local government decisions in Vilnius and Kaunas (Cramer's V = 0.406, p = 0.000 in Vilnius, Cramer's V = 0.599, p = 0.000) and a markedly weaker one in Klaipėda (Cramer's V = 0.207, p = 0.00). Another tendency must be underlined out of the analysis of the measures of associations and Cramer's V coefficients that demonstrates that there exist greater

ecological differences among the Lithuanian cities in residents' self-assessed abilities to influence the local government decisions than in their abilities to influence the local community. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that manifestations of hopelessness in certain areas of Lithuanian cities are more related to the local government rather than local community.

Table 5. Association between people's subjective assessment of their abilities to influence local government decisions and city area types

City	City area type	*Agreeing with the statement that "people like me do not have the right to influence local government decisions"*
		Small probability of agreeing with the statement
Vilnius[1]	*City center*	35.7%
	Working class zone	32.3%
	Residential zone of Soviet mass-produced housing	12.9%
	Suburban zone	19.1%
	N	356 (100%)
Kaunas[2]	*City center*	34.4%
	Working class zone	6.7%
	Residential zone of Soviet mass-produced housing	34.2%
	Suburban zone	24.7%
	N	401 (100%)
Klaipėda[3]	*City center*	29.3%
	Working class zone	19.1%
	Residential zone of Soviet mass-produced housing	28.1%
	Suburban zone	23.5%
	N	396 (100%)

1: χ^2=98.913, df=3, p=0.000; Cramer's V=0.406, p=0.000;
2: χ^2=213.380, df=3, p=0.00; Cramer's V=0.599, p=0.000;
3: χ^2=25.400, df=3, p=0.000; Cramer's V=0.207, p=0.000.

These emotional constellations and manifestations of helplessness can construct more profound and complex social ruptures between different neighborhoods in a city. The analysis shows that different dynamics at play in people's perceptions about their own abilities can be local and particular to each city, since there is little to suggest an overall urban *ecological* trend that could be discerned in all three cities. We could perhaps propose a more ambitious generalization that what fits the Lithuanian city is the hypothesis by Massey (2007) that emotional experiences and cognitive assessments are rooted in particular communities and are essentially local – very specific and internalized through constellations of existing (or non-existing) social networks in a particular place. Researchers should therefore look for and propose explanations for these differences by examining historic contexts of each city zone or even neighborhood they research rather than

applying *general* categories of central business district, working class area, etc. According to Blokland (2003), Massey discusses life in *modern* city, which contrasts with the postmodern city hypothesis put forward by Castells (1976) who describes urban communities as a collective discourse of urban practices where feelings of impotence, despair, and other emotional 'sediments' are conditioned by global economic and social processes like labor market restructuring.

Ross et al. (2001) propose another argument that more or less fits the survey results. According to them, places of successful life, exceptional residence, and consumption like the city center and suburbs have the capacity to structure more positive perceptions; by contrast, more pessimistic assessment of one's opportunities presupposes more 'disadvantaged', poorer city areas of standardized housing, like old working class zones and neighborhoods of Soviet mass-produced housing. Blokland (2003) believes that the working class has failed to adapt to the postmodern society whose pleasures are accessible to other sections of the urban population that have had more success in the new economy. In the times of industrialization, mass production, and modern society, the residences of workers and employees were the seat of the backbone of the economy. As the economy turns global, depreciation affects not just labor itself, but also city areas inhabited by labor. Massey (2007) notes that in order to explain woeful emotional charge and emotional orientations of hopelessness or even helplessness dominant in a city area, one must relate them to more general processes of stratification in modern societies. According to her, if people feel their *categorical inequality* with other residents of the city in terms of both their objective socioeconomic standing and subjectively perceived opportunities to change anything, such moods can not only accentuate social exclusion processes, but also create common emotional orientations for entire neighborhoods or areas. The latter can also turn into practices of sociospatial differentiation.

8. Conclusions

In the article, we have been looking at sociospatial segregation or differentiation processes 'from below', i.e. from the perspective of people living in different areas of Vilnius, Kaunas, and Klaipėda on their opportunities to effect change in their neighborhoods and influence decisions of local government. The question we asked was how the emotional orientation of distrust in one's own power and the authorities to change one's living environment is linked to more general processes of sociospatial segregation or differentiation in Lithuanian post-socialist cities.

The emotional dimensions of city life have many functions: first, they highlight the more general aspects of urban experience and help reveal embryos of spatial segregation and differentiation processes. One can argue that certain emotions either unite people living in the same area or separate them. In this case, we can suppose that distrust in one's power to change anything and distrust in their power

to influence local authorities in the area are a separating factor that impedes the emergence of a strong and self-sustaining community.

In Vilnius, it is residents of the city center that are most critical about their opportunities to directly change their living environment. There is also a big probability that people from residential zones dominated by the Soviet mass-produced apartment blocks will be the most skeptical about possibilities to influence local government decisions. In Kaunas, the trend is much more consistent: chances are that working-class area residents will be least confident about their ability to both directly effect change and influence local government, while people from the Soviet mass-produced apartment blocks will be the most self-confident. In Klaipėda, the probability that people will believe in their power to change anything is rather equally distributed across different zones, though just like in Kaunas, it is the working-class area respondents who are less confident about being able to influence local government than the others. This self-confidence/distrust and passivity/activity dynamic might well be grounded in concrete forms of everyday life, experiences and local problems faced by residents of particular urban neighborhoods – and they require separate research (Dangschat 2009).

Looking at emotional orientations informed by people's perceived abilities to change something in their local community ("It is difficult for people like me to change anything in order to improve our area"), the most important factors are gender, age, and education. In Vilnius, women (twice) and elderly people (1.04 times with each additional year) take more pessimistic view on their power. Meanwhile respondents with higher education levels are about twice more likely to view their opportunities positively. The age factor in respondents' emotional orientations is near identical in Kaunas and Klaipėda, too. Higher-level education in Klaipėda reduces the probability of pessimistic views on one's own abilities to influence change in the neighborhood.

To sum up the results of the logistic regressions, we could say that education has a positive impact on how city residents perceive their opportunities to participate in transforming their neighborhoods, whereas older age or the absence of home ownership (compared to respondents who live in homes owned by themselves or their families) are negative factors.

Looking at the respondent's self-confidence/distrust about influencing local government decisions ("People like me do not have the right to influence local government decisions"), we can see that education has a positive effect on how people assess their opportunities in that respect. Meanwhile negative assessments vary rather markedly across different city zone types: in Vilnius, pessimism is more common among Soviet apartment block zone residents; in Kaunas, among people in working-class areas; and in Klaipėda, among suburban residents. The self-confidence/distrust dynamic points to the fact that people's perceptions depend on more than just the type of urban area they live in; they can be influenced by activities of neighborhood communities, neighbors, or local self-government institutions. It should be also noted that a person's sociodemographic

background or their family's socioeconomic status and residence in certain loci are not the only factors that can steer a person's orientation vis-à-vis local government and how they perceive their abilities to influence its decisions.

Researchers from other countries suggest that we should be speaking about a new post-urban era characterized by a sense of insecurity permeating the entire urban space. They believe, however, that insecurity is much more difficult to measure than emotions whose diffusion has little to do with elevated threats to personal and collective security (Pattaroni and Pedrazzini 2010, Pedrazzini and Desrosiers-Lauzon 2011). The same is true of distrust in one's opportunities to influence both change in the neighborhood and local government decisions – it could point not just to the post-urban syndrome, but also to post-socialist fatigue and the deficit of social cohesion in Lithuania. Distrust in one's own and the government's power to change anything inhibits the creation of positive, socially connecting practices. The culture of distrust erects very real and symbolic walls between people living in different areas and amplifies mutual suspicions.

Our analysis has revealed that distrust people in Lithuanian cities feel about their abilities to change neighborhoods and influence local government decisions is spatially driven, although there is little evidence to suggest consistent processes of sociospatial differentiation between city areas thought to be prestigious (city centers and suburbs) and low-end zones (working-class neighborhoods and Soviet-era apartment block areas). Still, dominant distrust in one's power turns neighborhoods into sites of conflict and competition, where one fights for survival and concentrates exclusively on private life. The neighborhoods are no longer spaces of ordinary everyday lives kept together by shared culture and meanings of selfhood. The decay of territory-based community bonds, in turn, drives people to focus exclusively on the sphere of personal consumption and, at the same time, propagates atomization and empties out local solidarity. On the other hand, distrust in one's power to change the neighborhood is also informed by dissatisfaction with oneself, one's life, and the ever-present feeling of unfulfillment. Drawing on international research (Davidson and Milligan 2004), we can hypothesize that this is also a feeling of not belonging in the neighborhood or bigger area, something which segregates people and spaces, taking away their security, identity, and comfort. Our research shows that we must not focus solely on associations between collective emotional orientations and social segregation or differentiation; we must continue looking into how historical legacies are employed in manufacturing emotional orientations and practices of urban inhabitants in post-socialist countries.

Acknowledgments

The article presents findings of the research project "Social Exclusion in the Lithuanian Cities: Forms of Spatial Segregation and Polarization" (No. MIP-112/2011) funded by the Research Council of Lithuania.

Addresses:
Artūras Tereškinas
Department of Sociology
Vytautas Magnus University
Jonavos str. 66,
Kaunas, LT-44248, Lithuania
E-mail: a.tereskinas@smf.vdu.lt
Tel.: +370 37 327822
Fax: +370 37 327823

Apolonijus Žilys
Department of Sociology
Vytautas Magnus University
Jonavos str. 66
Kaunas, LT-44248, Lithuania
E-mail: a.zilys@smf.vdu.lt
Tel.: +370 37 327822
Fax: +370 37 327823

References

Acus, Arūnas (2011) "Nusikalstamumo raida Klaipėdoje 1990–2000 metais: kultūros ir nusižengimų santykis". *Tiltai* 57, 4, 13–28.

Aidukaitė, Jolanta (2013) "Būsto politika skirtinguose gerovės modeliuose". *Sociologija: mintis ir veiksmas* 33, 2, 304–320.

Aidukaitė, Jolanta, Anna Lipnevič, Saulius Nefas, Alvita Narkevičiūtė and Fausta Anulytė (2014) *Būsto politika ir visuomenės iniciatyvos mieste*. Vilnius: LSTC.

Andersen, Hans Skifter (2002) "Can deprived housing areas be revitalised? Efforts against segregation and neighbourhood decay in Denmark and Europe". *Urban Studies* 39, 4, 767–790.

Andersen, Hans Skifter (2008) "Is the private rented sector an efficient producer of housing service? Private landlords in Denmark and their economic strategies". *European Journal of Housing Policy* 8, 3, 263–286.

Andersen, Hans Skifter (2011) "Motives for tenure choice during the life cycle: the importance of non-economic factors and other housing preferences". *Housing, Theory and Society* 28, 2, 183–207.

Anderson, Kay and Susan Smith (2001) "Editorial: emotional geographies". *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 26, 1, 7–10.

Andruzs, Gregory, Michael Harloe, and Iván Szelényi, eds. (1996) *Cities after Socialism: urban and regional change and conflict in post-Socialist societies.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Atkinson, Rowland and Keith Kintrea (2001) "Disentangling area effects: evidence from deprived and non-deprived neighbourhoods". *Urban Studies* 38, 12, 2277–2298.

Bar-Tal, Daniel (2001) "Why does fear override hope in societies engulfed by intractable conflict, as it does in the israeli society?" *Political Psychology* 22, 601–627.

Barbalet, Jack (1998) *Emotion, social theory, and social structure: a macrosociological approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blokland, Talja (2003) *Urban bonds: social relationships in an inner city neighbourhood.* Cambridge: Polity.

Burneika, Donatas (2003) "Urbanizuotos aplinkos kaitos konfliktiškumas: tyrimo ir prognozavimo prielaidos". *Geografijos metraštis* 36, 165–173.

Burneika, Donatas, Edis Kriaučiūnas and Rūta Ubarevičienė (2010) "The problem of research of actors of urban change in post-Soviet cities – Vilnius case". *Annales Geographicae* 43–44, 42–53.

Castells, Manuel (1976) "The theory and ideology in urban sociology". In Chris G. Pickvance, ed. *Urban sociology: critical essays,* 147–174. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Charles, Camille Z. (2005) "Can we live together? Racial preferences and neighbourhood outcomes". In Xavier de Sousa Briggs, ed. *The geography of opportunity: race and housing choice in metropolitan America,* 45–81. Washington, D.C.: Brooking Institution Press.

Ceccato, Vania and Nijole Lukyte (2010) "Safety and sustainability in a city in transition: the case of Vilnius, Lithuania". *Cities* 28, 83–94.

Dangschat, Jens S. (2009) "Space matters – marginalization and its places". *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 33, 3, 835–840.

Daunora, Zigmas J. and Pranciškus Juškevičius (2006) "Regional planning in Lithuania – experiences and challenges". In Uwe Altrock, Simon Güntner, Sandra Huning, and Deike Peters, eds. *Spatial planning and urban development in the New EU member states: from adjustment to reinvention,* 77–94. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Davidson, Joyce and Christine Milligan (2004) "Embodying emotion, sensing space: introducing emotional geographies". *Social and Cultural Geography* 5, 523–532.

Dijokienė, Dalia and Petras Džervus (2011) "XX a. masinės statybos gyvenamųjų kompleksų fenomenas Lietuvoje Europiniame industrinės statybos kontekste". *Urbanistika ir architektūra* 35, 2, 92–103.

Dillabough, Jo-Anne and Jacqueline Kennelly (2010) *Lost youth in the global city: class, culture, and the urban imaginary.* New York: Routledge.

Everts, Jonathan and Lauren Wagner (2012) "Guest editorial: practising emotions". *Emotion, Space and Society* 5, 3, 174–176.

Grunskis, Tomas (2005) "Vietos tapatumo krizė Vilniaus centro raidoje (erdvės morfologijos diskurse)". *Urbanistika ir architektūra* 29, 1, 13–18.

Harth, Annette, Ulfert Herlyn and Gitta Scheller (1998) "Segregation in eastern German cities: gentrification, downgrading of large estates, and suburbatnization". *Journal of Housing and the Built Enviroment* 13, 4, 421–437.

Hearn, Jeff (2008) "Feeling out of Place? Towards the transnationalizations of emotions". In Stephen Fineman, ed. *The Emotional Organization: Passions and Power*, 184–201. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Juškevicius, Pranciškus (2006) "Vilniaus miesto socialinės erdvės ir deviacijos". *Urbanistika ir architektūra* 2, 69–77.

Klaipėdos miesto bendrojo plano stebėsena (2013) Report. Available online at <http://www.monitoringas.tk/ataskaitos/2007-2013-m/10-ataskaitos/2013-m-ataskaita/21-a13-3>. Accessed on September, 12, 2016.

Kleinhans, Reinout (2006) "Residents' social capital after neighbourhood transformation". InVincent Gruis, Henk Visscher, and Reinout Kleinhans, eds. *Sustainable Neighbourhood Transformation*, 67–93. Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Kleinhans, Reinout (2009) "Does social capital affect respondents' propensity to move out from restructured neighborhoods". *Housing Studies* 24, 370–384.

Kraniauskas, Liutauras (2012a) "Miesto erdvė ir subkultūrų dinamika Klaipėdoje 1991–2010 m. (1)". *Sociologija: mintis ir veiksmas* 30, 1, 165–209.

Kraniauskas, Liutauras (2012b) "Miesto erdvė ir subkultūrų dinamika Klaipėdoje 1991–2010 m. (2)". *Sociologija: mintis ir veiksmas* 31, 2, 153–186.

Lavrinec, Jekaterina (2011) "Revitalization of public space: from 'non-places' to creative playgrounds". *Santalka* 19, 2, 70–75.

Lukošius, Saulius et al. (2003) *Kauno miesto savivladybės teritorijos bendrasis planas*. Kaunas: Kauno SĮ "Kauno planas".

Maniukaitė, Gražina, Arvydas Virgilijus Matulionis, Vida Kasparavičienė, Eugenija Krukauskienė, Lilija Kublickienė, Eduardas Kęstutis Sviklas, Inija Trinkūnienė, and Viktorija Žilinskaitė-Vytienė (2014) *Vilniečių kultūrinis tapatumas: 1993-2013 metai.* Vilnius: LSTC.

Massey, Doreen (2005) *For space.* London: Sage.

Massey, Doreen (2007) *Categorically unequal: the American stratification system*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

Massey, Douglas S. and Nancy A. Denton (1988) "The dimensions of residential segregation". *Social Forces* 67, 281–315.
Mirowsky, John and Catherine E. Ross (2009) "Neighborhood disorder, subjective alienation, and distress". *Journal of Health and Social Disorder* 50, 1, 49–64.
Nussbaum, Martha (2003) *Upheavals of thought: the intelligence of emotions.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Pattaroni, Luca and Yves Pedrazzini (2010) "Insecurity and segregation: rejecting an urbanism of fear". In Pierre Jacquet, R. K. Pachauri, and Laurence Tubiana, eds. *Cities steering towards sustainability*, 177–187. Delhi: TERI Press.
Pauwels, Lieve J. R. and Robert Svensson (2014) "Micro-place disorder, subjective powerlessness and violent youth group involvement: testing an integrative control theory". *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology* 3, 200–221.
Pedrazzini, Yves and Godefroy Desrosiers-Lauzon (2011) "Asphalt bandits: fear, insecurity, and uncertainty in the Latin American city". *Emotion, Space and Society* 4, 95–103.
Petrušonis, Vytautas (2005) "Vietovės kultūrinio tapatumo ontologija". *Urbanistika ir architektūra* 29, 2, 55–62.
Pickvance, Chris G. (1997) "Inequality and conflict in the post-Socialist city: some analytical issues concerning the transition from state Socialism". In Ove Källtorp et al., eds. *Cities in transformation – transformation in cities: social and symbolic change of urban space*, 98–116. Aldershot: Ashgate.
Probyn, Elspeth (2005) *Blush: faces of shame.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Ross, Catherine E., John Mirowski, and Shana Pribesh (2001) "Powerlessness and the amplifications of threat: neighbourhood disadvantage, disorder, and mistrust". *American Sociological Review* 66, 568–591.
Ross, Catherine E. and John Mirowsky (1987) "Normlessness, powerlessness, and trouble with the law". *Criminology* 25, 257–278.
Ruopilla, Sampo (2005) "Housing policy and residential differentiation in post-Socialist Tallinn". *European Journal of Housing Policy* 5, 3, 279–300.
Ruopilla, Sampo (2007) "Establishing a market-orientated urban planning system after state socialism: the case of Tallinn". *European Planning Studies* 15, 3, 405–427.
Ruopilla, Sampo and Anneli Kährik (2003) "Socio-economic residential differentiation in post-Socialist Tallinn". *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 18, 49–73.
Samalavičius, Almantas (2009) "Vartojantis ar kūrybingas miestas?" *Logos* 61, 170–178.
Samalavičius, Almantas (2005) "Miestas: erdvė ir vieta". *Urbanistika ir architektūra* 29, 1, 18–21.
Samalavičius, Almantas (2010) "Vilnius City: urbanism driven by consumption". *Lituanus* 56, 2, 43–52.
Stanilov, Kiril (2007) "Taking stock of post-Socialist urban development: a recapitulation". In K. Stanilov, ed. *The post-Socialist city urban form and space transformations in Central and Eastern Europe after Socialism*, 3–20. The Netherlands: Springer.
Statistics Lithuania 2015 (2015) Statistical database. Available online at <http://osp.stat.gov.lt/>. Accessed on September, 15, 2016.
Sykora, Ludek (2009) "New socio-spatial formations: places of residential segregation and separation in Czechia". *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 100, 4, 417–435.
Szelényi, Iván (1983) *Urban inequalities under state Socialism.* New York: Oxford University Press.
Tamutienė, Ilona (2013) "Sąsajos tarp alkoholio pardavimo vietų tankio, jo vartojimo viešose vietose ir socialinės žalos Vilniaus, Kauno ir Klaipėdos skirtingo tipo mikrorajonuose". *Kultūra ir visuomenė* 4, 2, 37–42.
Tatatiūnienė, Aldona et al. (2011) *Kauno miesto bendrasis planas esamos būklės analizė.* Kaunas: Kauno SĮ "Kauno planas".
Tereškinas, Artūras and Apolonijus Žilys (2014) "Kultūrinis vartojimas ir socioerdvinė diferenciacija Lietuvos didmiesčiuose". *Filosofija. Sociologija* 25, 4, 272–281.
Thrift, Nigel (2004) "Intensities of feeling: towards a spatial politics of affect". *Geografiska Annaler, Series* B: *Human Geography* 86, 1, 57–78.

Wacquant, Loïc (2008) *Urban outcasts: a comparative sociology of advanced marginality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Węcławowicz, Grzegorz (1998) "Social polarization in Postsocialist cities: Budapest, Prague and Warsaw". In Gyorgy Enyedi, ed. *Social change and urban restructuring in Central Europe,* 55–67. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
Žilys, Apolonijus (2013) "Rezidencinė diferenciacija ir skirtumai Lietuvos moderniajame mieste: (po)sovietinis ar Vakarų miestas?" *Kultūra ir visuomenė* 4, 2, 67–102.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Sample structure according to the structure of geographic clusters

City area types / geographic clusters	Names of localities and administrative units of geographic clusters	
	VILNIUS	KAUNAS
(1) City center	Senamiestis eldership Naujamiestis eldership	Centras eldership
(2) Working-class zone (adjacent to the city center)	Naujininkai eldership	Vilijampolė eldership
(3) Residential zone of Soviet mass-produced housing	Žirmūnai eldership	Dainava eldership
(4) Suburban zone	Riešė eldership Avižieniai eldership Zujūnai eldership	Domeikava eldership and the surrounding urban areas such as Vytėnai, Kleboniškis, etc,

Appendix 2. Variables used in household variable clusterization

The dimensions of variables	Variables	Categories of variables
The variable which identifies the home tenure and home ownership	What is the home tenure of respondent	Respondent's and/or his/her partner's home ownership; Respondent's and/or his/her partner's home mortgage; Rent or lease; Respondent's family home ownership;
Three variables of household income sources	Wage and salary	Yes-No
	Pension	Yes-No
	Unemployment and other welfare benefits	Yes-No