

AFTER URBAN RESTRUCTURING: RELOCATIONS AND SEGREGATION IN DUTCH CITIES

GIDEON BOLT, RONALD VAN KEMPEN & JAN VAN WEESEP

Urban Geography at the Urban and Regional Research Centre Utrecht (URU), Faculty of Geosciences, Utrecht University, PO Box 80.115, 3508 TC Utrecht, The Netherlands, E-mails: G.Bolt@geo.uu.nl; R.vanKempen@geo.uu.nl; J.vanWeesep@geo.uu.nl

Received: October 2008; revised March 2009

ABSTRACT

Numerous studies have been devoted to documenting the shifting patterns of ethnic segregation in the cities of the Netherlands during the past few decades. But an analysis of residential mobility that would reveal the mechanisms of change has rarely been included. In this paper such household mobility is studied against the background of the current urban restructuring policy. This policy consists of the selective demolition of inexpensive rented housing and the construction of homeowner dwellings in its stead, leading to changes in the social make-up of neighbourhoods. The change is caused by the displacement of ethnic and other low-income households, the result of their decisions how to use the incentives to move offered by the policy. Thus, this paper deals with the question how urban restructuring affects segregation patterns. Ethnic and socio-economic variables are at the core of the analysis. The outcome is that while the social make-up of neighbourhoods is altered, and low-income households shift in space, the displacement does not contribute to desegregation.

Key words: Displacement, residential mobility, ethnic segregation, urban restructuring policy, Dutch cities

INTRODUCTION

Every city has neighbourhoods where low-income households are concentrated. A low income might result from unemployment or from having a low-paying job. In many cities, ethnic minority groups are overrepresented among low-income households. Many of the neighbourhoods with a poor population also suffer other social ills: high crime rates, loss of a sense of safety, poor quality of the (social rented) housing stock, derelict public spaces. Such areas are described as deprived, disadvantaged or distressed (Andersson & Musterd 2005; Dekker 2006; Van Kempen *et al.* 2006).

Concentration areas of low-income households also exist in the Netherlands; many of

these are known to house a high proportion of ethnic minorities, generally comprising Turks and Moroccans (often sharing the same neighbourhoods), or Surinamese. Within such areas, there are smaller representations of e.g. Antilleans, Cape Verdeans, or Chinese. Many studies have dealt with the pattern of segregation and with concentration areas in Dutch cities (e.g. Van Amersfoort 1992; Musterd *et al.* 1998; Bolt & Van Kempen 2000; Bolt *et al.* 2002; Musterd & Deurloo 2002; Aalbers & Deurloo 2003; Musterd 2005; Van Kempen 2005), resulting in good insights about the trends of segregation and concentration indices in the big cities between groups and over time. The overall outcome has been that segregation is hardly less now than twenty years ago (see also Musterd & Van Kempen 2009).

Our focus is on socio-economic as well as on ethnic variables. From previous research it has become clear that minority-ethnic groups (especially the ex-guestworker categories) often belong to lower-income groups, but there is not a complete match. Moreover, finding out which variable is more important for residential mobility, the socio-economic or the ethnic, can be seen as a fundamental question in urban and neighbourhood research (see e.g. Bolt *et al.* 2008).

Because of the low quality of their neighbourhoods, many of the ethnic minority groups and other low-income households in Dutch cities live in areas which have been slated by the national government for restructuring (Aalbers *et al.* 2004; Dekker & Van Kempen 2004). Only a few decades ago, the deprived areas were those built in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, but since then the main concentrations of low-income households have shifted to the neighbourhoods built from the 1950s to the 1970s (Bolt *et al.* 2002). In 1997, a policy was adopted to break up these concentrations of low-income households. It rested on the insight that such patterns are harmful for the residents and that their dispersal will help to improve their life. While this paper does not intend to discuss whether spatial concentrations of the poor are harmful (see e.g. Van der Klaauw & Van Ours 2003; Van der Laan Bouma-Doff 2005), it does aim to establish whether or not the policy has diminished the concentrations.

Many evaluation studies of this urban restructuring policy have already been carried out. Perhaps not surprisingly, most focused on its effects on the target areas themselves (e.g. Van Beckhoven & Van Kempen 2003; Dekker & Bolt 2005; Dekker 2006). The focus of this paper is different as it deals with the mobility of the households displaced by the urban restructuring process. To what kind of neighbourhoods did they move? And does that knowledge allow conclusions with respect to one of the most crucial targets of the policy of urban restructuring: the breaking down of segregation?

The question where displaced households have found alternative (affordable) housing has not received much attention, at least in the Netherlands. Yet, the answer is needed to give a fair account of the effect of the interventions on

segregation. Physical intervention does not lead to deconcentration if the displaced households who were concentrated in an exporting area end up in only one or two importing neighbourhoods: existing concentrations are then just merely relocated to another part of the city. Therefore, this paper discusses the characteristics (in terms of level of poverty and ethnic make-up) of the destination neighbourhoods. In addition, it presents a comparison of the choices made by the displaced households and those of other movers.

THE POLICY OF URBAN RESTRUCTURING IN THE NETHERLANDS

The policy of urban restructuring aims to diminish the spatial concentrations of low-income households in specific neighbourhoods. The emergence of such concentrations had been no surprise and moreover, they had partly arisen as the unintended effects of policy. In the 1970s and early 1980s, urban renewal was based on the principle of 'building for the neighbourhood residents'. They were given the right to be re-housed in the same area. Because the urban renewal areas already contained an over-representation of low-income households, the policy resulted in the stabilisation of the concentrations. Deep subsidies kept newly built and renovated dwellings inexpensive, which made it possible for low-income households to stay after reconstruction (Beaumont *et al.* 2003).

Many middle-class households had also kept on living in subsidised housing, contributing to a situation of misappropriation of subsidies – the so-called skewness in the housing stock: affluent households lived in affordable social rented housing, while subsidies allowed many poor households to live in more expensive dwellings. Replacing affordable rented housing by market-rate homeowner dwellings was meant to rectify both situations, as this was believed to entice the more affluent households to move. That said, the remaining social rented sector could accommodate more low-income households.

The policy did bring about a gradual shift in the tenure pattern. Analyses for the 1990s showed that the social rented sector had

gradually become the domain of low-income households, while more affluent households had increased their presence in more expensive segments, including the owner-occupied sector (Van Kempen *et al.* 2000; Schutjens *et al.* 2002; Van Ham *et al.* 2006). But there was also an unintended effect of the policy: because social rented dwellings are mainly concentrated in the parts of the city built between 1945 and 1975, these areas showed increasing concentrations of low-income households and a decreasing mix of income groups. In part this reflected that they had become the concentration areas for ethnic minority groups, especially those of Turkish and Moroccan descent (Bolt *et al.* 2002, 2008).

The policy outlined in the 1997 White Paper on urban restructuring was meant to bring an end to such spatial concentrations of the poor. The policy focused on the neighbourhoods built between 1945 and 1965. In contrast with the earlier urban renewal efforts, its objective was to achieve a mixed population (Ministerie VROM 1997). Urban restructuring was at its core, that is, it aimed to shift the composition of the local housing stock away from social rented dwellings towards more expensive alternatives. By aiming to retain middle-class households, this part of the 'Big Cities Policy' intended to promote the social and economic vitality of the city by reducing the unemployment rate, increasing liveability, public safety, and entrepreneurship in the worst neighbourhoods (Van Beckhoven & Van Kempen 2003).

Concretely, the policy of urban restructuring aimed to diminish socio-economic spatial segregation and concentration of low-income groups through interventions in the housing stock: the upgrading and sale of social rented dwellings, selective demolition, and the construction of more expensive dwellings (Ministerie VROM 1997; Van Beckhoven & Van Kempen 2003). Segregation and concentration of minority groups were not specifically identified as urban problems in the 1997 White Paper. But they are widely believed to be problematic, and the government has repeatedly expressed the view that spatial concentration of ethnic minorities hampers their integration and participation in society. A recent Annual Memorandum on Integration Policy (Ministerie van Justitie 2005, p. 19, own translation)

stated that 'Concentration is a big hindrance for integration because it results in an accumulation of social problems which may lead to critical conditions [...]. Concentration is also problematic because it makes the ethnic dividing lines more visible. That harms the image of ethnic minorities [...]. Finally, concentration makes it particularly hard for persons from different origins to meet [...] and the diminished contacts with indigenous Dutch indirectly lower the social opportunities of ethnic minorities'.

The newest incarnation of Dutch urban policy is focused on the 40 most problematic neighbourhoods in the country. This plan also reveals the government's grim view of concentration of low-income and ethnic minority households (Ministerie VROM 2007, p. 3, own translation): 'Many districts show an over-representation of households who are clearly disadvantaged. Such districts mostly also display an over-representation of non-Western minority residents'.

The official documents make it abundantly clear that present urban policy is heavily orientated towards changing the social mix in neighbourhoods by promoting displacement. This forms the background for this paper's focus on the evaluation of household mobility and its contribution to the change of segregation patterns.

A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE ON DISPLACEMENT

Many American studies have identified the negative effects of living in a distressed neighbourhood. It has been shown to be related to an elevated level of teenage pregnancies (Andersson 1991), a brake on socio-economic advancement (Galster *et al.* 1999), educational attainment (Crane 1991), children's cognitive development (Brooks-Gunn *et al.* 1993), and a boost for juvenile delinquency (Peeples & Loeber 1994). So far, European studies have identified only minor effects – Musterd (2003) talks about thin empirical grounds for the assumed relationship – and sometimes the effects are entirely lacking. Yet, it is widely assumed that, like in American cities, being able to move from a distressed neighbourhood increases the quality of life of people.

From this perspective, displacement can form an opportunity for residents to better their living conditions. As urban restructuring areas are usually among the worst, displacement is likely to move people up into more prosperous neighbourhoods. In their comparison of urban restructuring projects in three Dutch cities, Slob *et al.* (2008) indeed found that displaced households moved on average to neighbourhoods with somewhat higher mean incomes. Evaluations of the Hope VI programme in the US showed an even more pronounced pattern (Buron *et al.* 2002). In an overview of projects in 48 cities, Kingsley *et al.* (2003) found that most relocated households ended up in neighbourhoods that were less poor; the average poverty rates dropped from 61 to 27 per cent. But it should be kept in mind that the programme targets the worst public housing areas in the US (Goetz 2003). And although the destination neighbourhoods differed markedly from the neighbourhoods of origin in terms of socio-economic and ethnic makeup, they were far from ideal with respect to their contribution to social integration (Kingsley *et al.* 2003).

These outcomes beg the question what factors affect where people move? In general, the relocation decision of a household is the outcome of an interplay between preferences, resources, opportunity and constraints. In the classic choice-oriented literature on residential mobility, much emphasis is put on preferences. The decision to move is made when a certain level of dissatisfaction with the present situation is reached (Brown & Moore 1970), but it may also stem from the aspiration to move up on the housing ladder (e.g. to move into homeownership or to a neighbourhood with a higher status). A trigger is needed to set off an intention to move (Mulder 1993); it may consist of a change in the household or labour career.

Displacement does not seem to fit this framework. When the decision to restructure an area is made, everyone is affected. The urban restructuring is area-based, which means that some parts of a district will be demolished or heavily refurbished and all the households in this target area will have to move, either temporarily or permanently (see also Popp 1976; Short 1978; Marcuse 1986; Mulder 1993). This might explain why the literature on mobility

rarely deals with displacement (but see Marcuse 1986; Kleinhans 2005). While less obvious, preferences do play a role in displacement. Some households may already have decided to move for other reasons before they were served their eviction notices; for them urban restructuring may present an opportunity (Kleinhans 2003). Moreover, even households that would have wanted to stay, are likely to have some preferences with regard to a new dwelling and neighbourhood. It may be assumed that young people are more inclined to move away from urban restructuring areas, as they would be more likely to move anyway. Older people are expected to prefer moving within the neighbourhood, and so do families which are also strongly locally embedded (Mulder 1993). On the other hand, households with children tend to find school quality and a safe and quiet environment important and may therefore move to a child-friendly residential environment (Clark & Dieleman 1996; Bootsma 1998). However, Clapham (2002) stresses that it is increasingly problematic to predict a households' preference from the stage in its life cycle or other objective characteristics. He advocates a housing pathway approach in which it is acknowledged that there is an increasing differentiation of lifestyles and that households do not have a universal set of preferences.

Housing choices are not based on preferences only. Households differ by the strength of their position in the housing market (Rex & Moore 1967), which reflects their resources. Five types of individual resources can be discerned: material, cognitive, political, social, and the present housing situation (Van Kempen & Özüekren 1998). The residential mobility literature emphasises material resources, as access to residential environments is largely determined by income. Therefore, socio-economic differences can be expected to show between residents who move up-market and those who move to another poor neighbourhood. High income and/or economic prospects, as indicated by a high level of educational attainment, are expected to increase the probability to leave a poor neighbourhood. Likewise a high socio-economic status makes it less likely for someone to move from an affluent area into a poor neighbourhood.

Also in urban restructuring programmes it may be expected that low-income households living in social rented dwellings move to other social rented dwellings, because alternatives are too expensive. Those with higher incomes who still live in the social rented sector have better options to move to other tenures, especially to the owner-occupied sector. Resources, especially income, may not be crucial to entice people to move, but they are important for the final housing choice: households with higher incomes usually end up in better dwellings and neighbourhoods than those with lower incomes. This also holds in case of displacement: households with a low income have little choice.

Cognitive resources refer to knowledge. Knowledge of housing market opportunities differs between categories of people. Highly educated people may have more information than those with a relatively low educational attainment level because they might be more capable in finding and using information. Ethnic minority groups tend to be disadvantaged also in this respect because of the lack of information on housing opportunities in their own language (Van Kempen & Özüekren 1998).

While preferences and resources refer to individuals and households, opportunities and constraints comprise factors at the macro level. Opportunities are the options that individuals and households have, determined by the availability and affordability of dwellings. In other words, opportunities refer to the 'choice set' of available alternatives (Mulder 1993). Constraints reduce the choice set of households. They can arise from shortages in the housing market or from fierce competition for the same type of housing (for example, inexpensive social rented dwellings). In the process of urban restructuring these constraints are essential. When households are not assisted with finding a new home, or when there is insufficient appropriate housing, it becomes hard to move people from the area. Urban restructuring and its concomitant emphasis on demolition, increases the demand for social rented dwellings, while the selective demolition decreases their number; hence, competition for social housing increases.

Constraints and opportunities are particularly stressed in the institutional approach. Its focus is not on individuals or households, but on the role

of organisations like national and local government (Herbert & Johnston 1976; Van Kempen 2002). National or local governments might decide to award moving subsidies to promote the restructuring. Austerity programmes, on the other hand, may lead to lower housing subsidies, which would have a negative influence on the housing options for low-income households. Political and social resources refer to the varying ability among households to link into such programmes and influence their outcomes. Such influence may enhance the options of low-income households. In the Netherlands, the emphasis on building social rented dwellings has indeed been abandoned since the beginning of the 1990s.

Within the institutional approach, much attention is paid to allocation procedures. The authorities may decide to allocate dwellings in a neighbourhood only to certain groups, such as non-immigrants or employed people (Van Kempen 2002). In the Netherlands, displaced households tend to have the highest priority rating of all potential movers. In reality, their choice is limited, because of their low income and the limited number of vacant affordable dwellings. Moreover, displacement tends to only yield priority over other house seekers when applying for a dwelling that is similar to the current one (Van Kempen *et al.* 2008; Kleinhans & Van der Laan Bouma-Doff 2008). In some cases, the options might even be curtailed by strict eligibility criteria for social housing. Among the households experiencing surprisingly severe problems with finding a new dwelling are those with a relatively high income: they are no longer eligible for social housing, but in some areas, market-rate housing remains scarce.

Notwithstanding the constraints displaced households are faced with, they should be seen as active agents who are able to exercise a wide variety of locational choices within the limitations of institutional arrangements (Clapham 2002). It is these locational choices which are the focus of our empirical analyses.

THE EFFECTS OF URBAN RESTRUCTURING: A FIRST VIEW

Before we say anything about the process and effects of urban restructuring, it may be important to explain some characteristics of the

housing allocation system in Dutch cities. Housing options within the social rented sector do not so much depend on people's income, but on their position within the allocation system. In almost all Dutch municipalities an advert model is used to match demand to (social) rented dwellings (Kullberg 2002). The system is based on a listing of all dwellings in the press or on the Internet. Once registered, interested households may apply for any dwelling. To be successful, they need to meet the qualifications specified for that specific dwelling, such as household size, level of income, and age. The final procedure is quite simple because the one who has been registered longest is selected. For displaced households the situation is somewhat different because housing associations offer them a 'certificate of urgency' which gives them priority over others seeking a dwelling. If a regular renter and a displaced household apply for the same dwelling, the dwelling is usually allocated to the latter.

However, having a priority rating does not lead to unlimited opportunities: displaced households often can only apply for a dwelling with roughly the same characteristics as the previous one in terms of number of rooms or type of dwelling. Thus, it is unlikely that they can obtain a very desirable dwelling in a more affluent neighbourhood, since their 'certificate of urgency' would not be valid and they cannot compete successfully on the basis of the waiting period. Other home seekers can afford to wait longer for a desirable vacant dwelling.

It is important to know that in the process of urban restructuring residents who are not able to find a new home on their own are assisted by the housing corporation. The residents' wishes (with respect to, e.g. type of dwelling, number of rooms or location of the dwelling) are identified and the housing association helps to find a suitable home in the social rented sector. Those who can afford a house in the owner-occupied sector are not assisted. They are seen as households who can take care of themselves. It should be stressed that this is a rather small group with only 13 per cent of displaced households in our dataset (see next section) moving into owner-occupation.

In their evaluation of urban restructuring in Dutch cities, Wittebrood and Van Dijk (2007)

assessed the effect of physical interventions on the population composition of neighbourhoods. They developed a data set that contains the changes in the housing stock (1998–2003) of all neighbourhoods in the 30 biggest cities in the Netherlands. The data revealed that substantial physical change had taken place in 70 neighbourhoods (from a total of 634). In 30 neighbourhoods urban restructuring had taken place with the specific intent to change the social composition of the population through replacing part of the social housing stock by owner-occupied dwellings. To obtain a valid estimate of the impact of the physical intervention, a quasi-experimental approach was chosen. For each of the 30 neighbourhoods ('experimental neighbourhoods') a similar one was sought where no intervention had taken place, but with otherwise similar characteristics ('control neighbourhoods'). In six cases, it was not possible to find a match ('unique neighbourhoods').

Table 1 shows that there has been a substantial decrease of low-income households in the experimental neighbourhoods, which could imply that urban restructuring had changed its social composition. However, due to the economic boom during 1998–2003, the proportion of low-income households also decreased in the control neighbourhoods, albeit at a somewhat lower rate. If all neighbourhoods where a physical intervention has taken place are compared with control neighbourhoods (not in the table), it becomes clear that there is no effect of urban restructuring on the income distribution of neighbourhoods. Out of the 70 neighbourhoods that changed substantially physically, 52 could be matched to areas without interventions; in both categories the proportion of low-income households decreased by the same amount.

In terms of ethnic composition, the proportion of minority households in the 24 experimental neighbourhoods rose by 5.1 per cent, slightly less than in the control neighbourhoods. Combined with the somewhat sharper decrease of low-income households in experimental neighbourhoods, this leads to the conclusion that urban restructuring was only a minor factor in the decrease of income and ethnic segregation.

Table 1. *Population changes in urban restructuring neighbourhoods.*

	Unique neighbourhoods (N = 6)	Experimental neighbourhoods (N = 24)	Control neighbourhoods (N = 24)
% low income households 1998	33.0	25.2	23.0
% low income households 2003	22.1	16.7	17.2
Difference 1998–2003	-10.9	-8.5	-5.8
% ethnic minorities 1998	51.0	28.0	26.4
% ethnic minorities 2003	56.6	33.1	32.8
Difference 1998–2003	5.6	5.1	6.4

Source: Wittebrood and Van Dijk (2007).

DATA AND VARIABLES

The remainder of this paper focuses on the people who have been displaced because of urban restructuring. To what kind of neighbourhoods did they move, and what implications do the outcomes have for income and ethnic segregation?

The analyses of displacement are based on two samples: the Housing Demand Survey (HDS) of 2002 and the National Housing Survey (NHS) of 2006. These samples are person-based and representative of the Dutch population aged 18 and over, not living in institutions. The data set contains detailed information on individual and household characteristics, the present housing situation and on residential mobility during the two years preceding the interview. For those who moved during that time, the previous housing situation and location have been recorded.

The geographical identifiers in the data set are the four-digit postal code areas which roughly correspond to the level of a neighbourhood: on average they contain some 2,000 addresses. Population data for the same spatial units provided by Statistics Netherlands are used to compare the previous and the present neighbourhood in terms of ethnic and socio-economic composition.

The analyses were limited to persons who are principal occupiers¹ and who are living in one of the 30 big cities (G30); these cities are subject to the urban restructuring programme. In addition, respondents were selected from nine other middle-sized cities where relatively many dwellings have been demolished.²

On this basis, the data set contained 7,861 respondents for whom the characteristics of the previous and the present neighbourhood were established. For the analyses, displaced households have been defined as those movers who vacated a rented dwelling because of its demolition or renovation. Of the households meeting these criteria, 380 were identified. This is, obviously, only a small proportion of all movers but the number is large enough to allow for a reliable comparison of the locational choices between displaced household and other movers.

ANALYTICAL STRATEGY

In the analyses, the location choices of the displaced (380 respondents) were compared with those who moved out of other rented dwellings (4,884 respondents) and of movers from owner-occupied dwellings (2,597 respondents). It should be stressed that only the respondents in the displaced category are the households who had to move because of urban restructuring. In all cases the displaced households inhabited a social rented dwelling before they moved. With regard to the level of affluence of the neighbourhoods, three types of relocations were identified: (1) a move to a more affluent neighbourhood; (2) a move to a poorer neighbourhood; and (3) a move to a neighbourhood with a similar level of affluence. A relocation was assigned to this final category if the average monthly household income in the previous and the current neighbourhood did not differ by more than €100. Concerning the ethnic make-up of

Table 2. *Descriptive statistics disaggregated by type of movers.*

	Displaced households ¹ (n = 380; 4.8%)	Other movers out of rented dwelling ² (4,884; 62.1%)	Movers out of owner occupied dwellings ³ (n = 2,597; 33.0%)
Mean monthly income previous neighbourhood (standard deviation)	1,811.0 (343.7)	1,894.2 (385.9)	2,003.7 (394.6)
Mean % minorities previous neighbourhood (standard deviation)	24.4 (19.5)	19.7 (16.8)	14.8 (13.5)
Mean income (z-score) (standard deviation)	-0.32 (0.77)	-0.07 (0.88)	0.48 (1.19)
Mean age (standard deviation)	40.94 (16.49)	35.99 (14.63)	41.18 (13.58)
<i>Ethnic groups</i>			
% indigenous Dutch	66.8	73.4	83.4
% Turks/Moroccans	5.8	5.3	2.6
% Surinamese/Antilleans	8.7	5.7	3.2
% other non-Western minorities	6.3	5.7	2.2
% Western minorities	12.4	9.8	8.6
<i>Household composition</i>			
% singles	44.1	34.3	17.9
% more persons hh. with children	25.6	23.8	39.7
% more persons hh. without children	30.3	41.9	42.4
<i>Tenure</i>			
% renters (present dwelling)	86.5	64.7	27.6
% owners (present dwelling)	13.5	35.3	72.4
<i>Level of education</i>			
% primary/secondary	43.5	28.6	26.3
% upper secondary	23.5	24.5	31.9
% higher vocational/university	33.0	46.9	41.8

¹ Households who had to move because of urban restructuring/demolition.

² Households who moved from a rental dwelling but were not forced by demolition.

³ Households who moved from an owner-occupied dwelling but were not forced by demolition.

neighbourhoods also three types of relocations were distinguished: (1) moves to neighbourhoods with a higher share of non-Western residents; (2) moves to neighbourhoods with a lower share; and (3) moves to neighbourhoods with a similar share of minority population. A relocation was assigned to this final category when the average shares of minorities in the previous and the current neighbourhood did not differ by more than five percentage points.

A series of multinomial logistic regression models were run to estimate the impact of the independent variables on the log-odds of these types of relocation. First, the crude differences in mobility behaviour between displaced households and other movers are described. Then the explanatory variables that may account for these

differences are identified. Table 2 presents the summary statistics for these independent variables, disaggregated by the three types of movers (the displaced, the voluntary movers from rented dwellings and the voluntary movers from owner-occupied dwellings). In comparison with the movers from owner-occupied dwellings, the displaced households left poorer neighbourhoods characterised by a higher proportion of ethnic minorities. This is not surprising, as displaced households had to relocate because of urban restructuring activities, and these activities take place in areas with an over-representation of social rented dwellings and (thus) of low-income households. Usually these areas also show over-representations of ethnic minority groups.

Compared to the other two groups, the displaced households had on average a lower income³ and a lower level of educational attainment, they were more likely to be singles, and to move to a rented dwelling. With regard to most of these characteristics, other movers from rented dwellings occupied a midway position between the displaced and the movers from owner-occupied dwellings. The level of educational attainment formed an exception to this pattern, since movers from rented dwellings had, on average, a slightly higher educational attainment level than the movers from owner-occupied dwellings. With respect to age, the movers from rented dwellings stood apart by being on average substantially younger.

FINDINGS

As individuals who move often aim at attaining a more desirable dwelling and/or neighbourhood, it is no surprise that more people moved to richer neighbourhoods in terms of average income than to poorer neighbourhoods (Table 3). However, displaced households were less likely to move to richer neighbourhoods than might have been expected. At the same time, displaced movers were also less likely to move to poorer neighbourhoods. Displacement moves tend to be between similar neighbourhoods; such relocations can be characterised as 'horizontal' moves.

Two remarks need to be made with regard to this, perhaps surprising, outcome. First, one of the reasons that displaced households are not likely to move to poorer neighbourhoods is that many of them stay within the same neighbourhood. More than one-third of them did so, as against only one-fifth of the other movers out of rented dwellings and one-fourth of the movers out of homeowner dwellings. Second, so-called floor and ceiling effects may lead to a biased outcome. Displaced households are much more likely to move from a poor neighbourhood than other movers, as the average income in their neighbourhood of origin is lower (Table 2); they are not likely to move to even poorer neighbourhoods, since there are not so many of those. Likewise, there is a ceiling effect for movers from owner-occupied dwellings. Many of them move from prosperous neighbourhoods and have therefore a lower chance of finding a dwelling in a substantially richer neighbourhood than people who move from less affluent neighbourhoods.

In order to control for these floor and ceiling effects, the average income of the previous neighbourhood was included in the multinomial regression model of the three types of moves (Table 4, model 1). With respect to this average income, very clear differences between the three types of movers show up. The displaced were much less likely to move to more affluent neighbourhoods than others who moved from a rented dwelling; homeowners

Table 3. Residential mobility pattern of displaced households and other movers, percentages.

	Displaced households	Other movers from rented dwellings	Movers from owner-occupied dwellings
<i>Neighbourhood level of affluence</i>			
Moved to a richer neighbourhood	28.0	36.1	35.4
Moved to a similar neighbourhood	50.9	37.4	39.2
Moved to a poorer neighbourhood	21.1	26.5	25.4
<i>Ethnic make-up</i>			
Moved to a neighbourhood with a lower percentage of minorities	25.3	31.1	28.3
Moved to a similar neighbourhood	57.9	47.7	56.1
Moved to a neighbourhood with a higher percentage of minorities	16.8	21.2	15.6
Number	380	2,597	4,884

Table 4. Multinomial logistic regression analysis of mobility category, by level of affluence (reference category = moving to a neighbourhood with a higher average income).

	Model 1		Model 2	
	Moved to a poorer neighbourhood	Moved to a similar neighbourhood	Moved to a poorer neighbourhood	Moved to a similar neighbourhood
<i>Moving category (ref = voluntary move out of rented dwelling)</i>				
Forced move	B 0.393***	B 0.687***	B 0.361*	B 0.636***
Voluntary move out of owner occupied dwelling	-0.553***	-0.141**	-0.012	0.023
Average income neighbourhood of origin	0.005***	0.002***	0.005***	0.003***
<i>Ethnic group (ref = indigenous Dutch)</i>				
Turks/Moroccans			0.785***	0.698***
Surinamese/Antilleans			0.374**	-0.133
Other non-Western residents			0.285*	0.105
Western residents			-0.251**	-0.264***
<i>Household composition (ref = single)</i>				
Multiple person hh with children			-0.1162	-0.029
Multiple person hh without children			0.229**	0.046
Age			-0.019***	0.003
Moved to owner occupied dwelling			-0.516***	-0.227***
<i>Level of education (ref = low level of education)</i>				
Medium level			-0.289***	-0.286***
High level			-0.525***	-0.597***
Annual household income (z-score)			-0.367***	-0.348***
<i>Interaction hh income × mobility category</i>				
Forced move × income			0.266	0.373*
Voluntary move out of owner occupied dwelling × income			-0.190**	0.111*
Constant	-8.965***	-3.473***	-9.456***	-4.267***
Nagelkerke R-square	0.261		0.326	

* p < 0.10; ** p < 0.05; *** p < 0.01.

were much more likely than the others to move to more affluent neighbourhoods.

The second model of Table 4 includes the other explanatory variables. It turns out that Turks and Moroccans were more likely than indigenous Dutch to move to a less affluent or similar neighbourhood, while the reverse is true for migrants originating in Western countries. This does not necessarily mean that discrimination plays a role. It may be that Turks and Moroccans prefer low-income neighbourhoods to be close to kin or friends (who already lived there or moved because of displacement) and possibly facilities and other attractions such as ethnic shops or a mosque. However, it is also possible that they end up there because of limited information on housing alternatives (Slob *et al.* 2008).

The likelihood of moving to a poorer neighbourhood decreases with age, but age does not have an effect on the likelihood of moving to a similar neighbourhood. Furthermore, moving to an owner-occupied dwelling increases the chance of moving to a more affluent neighbourhood. Apparently, it is not easy for those who stay or move into the rented sector to move up in terms of neighbourhood prosperity. The evidence that the level of educational attainment and of income increase the likelihood of moving up is in line with the literature. For people with a low income or educational attainment, it is much more difficult to step up in the neighbourhood hierarchy.

As income was expected to have a different effect for homeowners than for renters, an interaction effect of income and mobility category was also included in the model. It shows that a higher income decreases the likelihood of moving to a poorer neighbourhood even stronger for those who move from an owner-occupied dwelling than for renters. Interestingly, a higher income among the displaced does not lead to a lower probability of moving to a less affluent neighbourhood. Apparently, even for people with relatively high earnings, displacement does not form an opportunity to move up in the neighbourhood hierarchy. The lack of the impact of income on the direction of mobility is probably not due to a low variance in the income distribution, since the standard deviation of income among other movers from rented dwellings is only slightly higher. The fact

that the overwhelming majority of displaced households stayed in the social rented sector is likely to have played an important role. Within this sector, people with moderate incomes do not have a better housing market position than people with low incomes. When they move to a better quality dwelling within the social rented sector, they will have to pay a higher rent. For people with a low income, an increase of rent is (partly) compensated by a housing allowance. Since residents with moderate incomes are not eligible for a housing allowance, it is more difficult for them to attain a favourable price-quality ratio (Kleinhans & Van der Laan Bouma-Doff 2008).

Most relevant with regard to the aim of this paper is to compare the choices of displaced households with those of other movers when all other explanatory variables are taken into account. It turns out that movers from owner-occupied dwellings no longer differ significantly from renters. In other words, the tendency of homeowners to move to more affluent neighbourhoods is due to other characteristics than tenure. Especially, their high average scores on age, income, and level of educational attainment play a role. Strikingly, however, the difference between displaced households and other movers from rented dwellings cannot be explained by the variables listed above. They rarely move up; in fact, compared to similar renters and homeowners, they are much more likely to end up in poorer neighbourhoods or in areas that are similar to those that they have to vacate. Relocation moves people in a 'horizontal' process between poor neighbourhoods, casting serious doubts on the effectiveness of the urban restructuring process. The policy does move poor households from relatively poor areas (an important policy goal!), but in the end most displaced end up in other poor areas.

Residential mobility and ethnic make-up – At first glance, the displaced seem to move to similar neighbourhoods in terms of their ethnic make-up as the other two categories of movers. For each type of mover, the number of households moving to an area with a higher proportion of ethnic minority groups is exceeded by the number of that move to a neighbourhood with a lower proportion (cf.,

Table 3). Displaced households are slightly less likely than the others to move to a neighbourhood with a lower proportion of minorities. Other renters are least likely to move to an area with a similar ethnic make-up, but more to areas with a higher proportion of minorities.

Again, a completely different picture emerges when floor and ceiling effects are taken into account. Controlling for the percentage of minorities in the previous neighbourhood, the displaced turn out to have a much greater tendency than other renters to move to a neighbourhood with a higher or similar share of minorities (Table 5, model 1). Owner-occupiers are the least likely to move to neighbourhoods with a higher proportion of minorities.

The second model of Table 5 includes the other explanatory variables. Analogous to model 4, a higher income and a higher level of educational attainment increase the likelihood to move to a neighbourhood with a smaller share of minorities. Movers to rented dwellings and singles show a tendency to move to neighbourhoods with a higher or similar share of ethnic minorities. Families, on the contrary, are more likely to move to a neighbourhood with a lower proportion of minorities. This may reflect their preference for safe and quiet neighbourhoods, as other research has revealed that the proportion of ethnic minorities in the neighbourhood is negatively associated with its perceived quality (Harris 2001; Sampson & Raudenbusch 2004).

The differences between ethnic groups are even more pronounced than in Table 4.⁴ Ethnic minorities are much more likely than the indigenous Dutch to move to a neighbourhood with a higher proportion of minorities. Additionally, Turks and Moroccans are also more inclined than indigenous Dutch to move to a similar neighbourhood. The interaction effect between ethnicity and proportion of ethnic minority groups shows that the ethnic differences in mobility behaviour are even more pronounced when the previous neighbourhood contains a relatively large proportion of minorities. In other words, indigenous Dutch and Western migrants in neighbourhoods with a high proportion of minorities are much more likely than non-Western minorities to move to neighbourhoods with a lower pro-

portion of minorities. This ethnic specificity in mobility behaviour is in line with previous research; it should also be clear that this increases segregation in cities (Bolt *et al.* 2008).

Controlling for the above-mentioned variables reduces the effect of moving category somewhat. In contrast to model 1, homeowners are not less inclined than renters to move to a similar neighbourhood and only slightly less to move to a neighbourhood with a higher proportion of minorities. In other words, differences between both categories of movers can be explained to a large extent by differences in background characteristics. However, the specific mobility behaviour of displaced households cannot be explained by controlling for socio-economic and demographic differences. That means that displaced households are much less likely to move to neighbourhoods with a lower proportion of minorities than other movers with similar characteristics. Again, this raises serious questions with regard to the effectiveness of the present policy of urban restructuring.

CONCLUSION

Evaluations of urban restructuring in the Netherlands usually deal only with developments within the urban restructuring neighbourhoods themselves. These studies show that physical interventions do have some effect on residential segregation. The proportion of ethnic minorities increases at a slower pace than elsewhere, while the number of low-income households decreases faster. Since urban restructuring areas are characterised by an overrepresentation of ethnic minorities and low-income households, this implies that physical interventions reduce the level of segregation, albeit the effect is quite modest. Two comments need to be made, however. First, urban restructuring only leads to a decrease in segregation when a substantial number of social rented dwellings is replaced by owner occupied dwellings. Second, and most importantly, looking only at developments within the restructuring neighbourhoods themselves does not yield a complete picture of the effects of urban restructuring. To assess the impact on

Table 5. Multinomial logistic regression analysis of mobility category, by ethnic make-up (reference category = moving to a neighbourhood with a lower proportion of minorities).

	Model 1		Model 2	
	higher % of minorities	similar % of minorities	higher % of minorities	similar % of minorities
<i>Moving category (ref = voluntary move out of rented dwelling)</i>				
Forced move	B 0.590***	B 0.962***	B 0.437**	B 0.834***
Voluntary move out of owner occupied dwelling	-0.651***	-0.141**	-0.220**	0.008
% ethnic minorities in previous neighbourhood (Z-score)	-1.430***	-1.189***	-2.197***	-1.758***
<i>Ethnic Group (ref = indigenous Dutch)</i>				
Turks/Moroccans			1.323***	0.598***
Surinamese/Antilleans			0.963***	-0.177
Other non-Western residents			0.914***	0.276*
Western residents			0.239*	0.035
<i>Household composition (ref = single)</i>				
Multiple person hh with children			-0.437***	-0.183**
Multiple person hh without children			-0.217**	-0.262***
Age			-0.005*	0.005**
Moved to owner occupied dwelling			-0.680***	-0.376***
<i>Level of education (ref = low level of education)</i>				
Medium level			-0.279***	-0.409***
High level			-0.326***	-0.427***
Annual household income (z-score)			-0.129**	-0.042
<i>Interaction ethnicity × proportion. ethnic minorities previous neighbourhood</i>				
Turks/Moroccans v % minorities previous neighbourhood			0.978***	1.099***
Surinamese/Antilleans v % minorities previous neighbourhood			1.408***	1.310***
Other non-Western residents v % minorities previous neighbourhood			0.950***	0.797***
Western residents v % minorities previous neighbourhood			0.306	0.204
Constant	-0.236***	0.644***	0.264	0.953***
Nagelkerke R-square	0.248		0.322	

* p < 0.10; ** p < 0.05; *** p < 0.01.

segregation, it is crucial to understand the mobility behaviour of displaced households.

The analyses in this study show that displacement generally does not lead to desegregation. In the first place, no substantial effect should be expected since displaced households account for less than five per cent of all movers. Second, displaced households do not move to less segregated neighbourhoods. Compared with other movers with otherwise similar characteristics, they are less likely to move to neighbourhoods with a lower share of low-income households or minority ethnic groups. The reasons vary: the choice for a new dwelling often has to be made under duress, affordable vacant dwellings cannot be found everywhere, and adequate knowledge of housing opportunities in and around the city is not available. Moreover, the priority status of displaced households only applies when they opt for a similar dwelling as their current one; this implies that the most desirable dwellings in the most popular neighbourhoods are beyond their reach, also because their income is too low to afford the generally more expensive dwellings in such neighbourhoods.

In sum, the windows of opportunity are narrow for those who are being displaced. Certain institutional arrangements may broaden their options somewhat. In The Hague region, for instance, families have a wider range of options, since their priority status is not restricted to dwellings that are similar to their current dwelling. Consequently, families are more likely than other displaced households to move to more desirable neighbourhoods (Slob *et al.* 2008) and to evaluate their new dwelling more positively (Kleinhans & Van der Laan Bouma-Doff 2008).

For the policy of urban restructuring, the findings of this study are mixed. Its main objective is to break spatial concentrations of low-income households and ethnic minorities. From other studies it has already become clear that the combination of demolition and building more expensive dwellings indeed leads to a partly new population in the targeted districts. Part of this new population indeed has higher incomes than the original inhabitants of the area (Van Kempen *et al.* 2009). However, it is also clear that part of the inhabitants of the demolished social rented dwellings had just

moved within the area, creating no change in the income profile of the area.

In this paper we focused on those who were affected by demolition and who were displaced. The results have indicated that these people tend to move to neighbourhoods with a similar population composition as the areas they are leaving behind. In other words; maybe concentrations of low-income households are broken in the targeted areas, but there is a strong suggestion that new concentrations emerge elsewhere.

However, this may not be a problem from a societal point of view. Studies have shown that most displaced households believe that they improved their situation with regard to their dwelling and their neighbourhood, despite the fact that they did not move voluntarily (Kleinhans & Van der Laan Bouma-Doff 2008; Slob *et al.* 2008). Apparently people do benefit from their move, notwithstanding the tendency to move to similar neighbourhoods. This finding underlines the need for more research on the effects of the neighbourhood on the well-being of its residents. The policy philosophy that concentrations of low-income households and ethnic minorities are harmful for the people living in such concentrations is based on thin empirical grounds. Qualitative studies on ethnic communities have shown that spatial segregation can have many advantages (Miyares 1997; Dunn 1998). The positive effects of residential concentration accrue from the presence of specific facilities and institutions that are geared to the needs of the ethnic community. Moreover, an ethnic neighbourhood provides the basis for a strong social network, which gives people access to all kinds of resources (ranging from emotional support to information about employment and housing).

We think that the literature on displacement will also profit from more qualitative studies. In this paper we used a modelling approach, but more indepth knowledge is needed on the motivations of the displaced to choose a dwelling in one and not in another neighbourhood. This will give more insight into the constraints people meet in the process of relocation, as well as in the reasons for choosing a neighbourhood with a concentration of low-income households and/or ethnic minorities.

Notes

1. That means that we excluded persons living in shared accommodations and children (18+) who (still) live in the parental home.
2. These cities are Delft, Ridderkerk, Vlaardingen, Hilversum, Delfzijl, Apeldoorn, Harderwijk, Katwijk and Leidschendam-Voorburg. From the G30-list Almere was dropped, since there has been no urban renewal policy in this relatively new city.
3. Since there was a difference in measurement of household income between HDS 2002 and NHS 2006, household income was standardised to make the income data of both surveys similar.
4. We considered including an interaction effect of ethnicity and moving category, analogous to the interaction effect in model 4. But due to the small numbers in some combined categories, that was not feasible.

REFERENCES

- AALBERS, M.B. & R. DEURLOO (2003), Concentrated and Condemned? Residential Patterns of Immigrants from Industrial and Non-industrial Countries in Amsterdam. *Housing, Theory and Society* 20, pp. 197–208.
- AALBERS, M.B., E. VAN BECKHOVEN, R. VAN KEMPEN, S. MUSTERD & W. OSTENDORF (2004), *Large Housing Estates in the Netherlands. Policies and Practices*. Utrecht: Urban and Regional Research Centre Utrecht.
- ANDERSSON, E. (1991), *Streetwise: Race, Class, and Change in an Urban Community*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- ANDERSSON, R. & S. MUSTERD (2005), Area-based Policies: A Critical Appraisal. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 96, pp. 377–389.
- BEAUMONT, J., J. BURGERS, K. DEKKER, T. DUKES, S. MUSTERD, R. STARING & R. VAN KEMPEN (2003), Urban Policy in the Netherlands. In: J. VRANKEN, J. BEAUMONT & I. VAN NIEUWENHUYZE, eds., *On the Origins of Urban Development Programmes in Nine European Countries*, pp. 119–137. Antwerp: Garant.
- BOLT, G. & R. VAN KEMPEN (2000), Concentratie en Segregatie in Nederlandse Steden. In: R. VAN KEMPEN, P. HOOIMEIJER, G. BOLT, J. BURGERS, S. MUSTERD, W. OSTENDORF & E. SNEL, eds., *Segregatie en Concentratie in Nederlandse Steden: Mogelijke Effecten en Mogelijk Beleid*, pp. 13–34. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- BOLT, G., P. HOOIMEIJER & R. VAN KEMPEN (2002), Ethnic Segregation in the Netherlands: New Patterns, New Policies? *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 93, pp. 214–220.
- BOLT, G., R. VAN KEMPEN & M. VAN HAM (2008), Minority Ethnic Groups in the Dutch Housing Market: Spatial Segregation, Relocation Dynamics and Housing Policy. *Urban Studies* 45, pp. 1359–1384.
- BOOTSMA, H.G. (1998), *The Myth of Reurbanization*. Amsterdam: Thesis.
- BROOKS-GUNN, J., G.J. DUNCAN, P.K. KLEBANOV & N. SEALAND (1993), Do Neighborhoods Influence Child and Adolescent Development? *American Journal of Sociology* 99, pp. 353–395.
- BROWN, L.A. & E.G. MOORE (1970), The Intra-urban Migration Process: A Perspective, *Geografiska Annaler* 52B, pp. 1–13.
- BURON, L., S. POPKIN, D. LEVY, L. HARRIS & J. KHADDURI (2002), *The HOPE VI Resident Tracking Study. A Snapshot of the Current Living Situation of Original Residents from Eight Sites*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- CLAPHAM, D. (2002) Housing Pathways. A Post Modern Analytical Framework. *Housing, Theory and Society* 19, pp. 57–68.
- CLARK, W.A.V. & F.M. DIELEMAN (1996), *Households and Housing: Choice and Outcomes in the Housing Market*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.
- CRANE, J. (1991), The Epidemic Theory of Ghettos and Neighborhood Effects on Dropping Out and Teenage Childbearing. *American Journal of Sociology* 96, pp. 1226–1259.
- DEKKER, K. (2006), Governance as Glue. Urban Governance and Social Cohesion in Post-WWII Neighbourhoods in the Netherlands (Ph.D. thesis, University of Utrecht).
- DEKKER, K. & G. BOLT (2005), Social Cohesion in Post-war estates in the Netherlands: Differences Between Socio-economic and Ethnic Groups, *Urban Studies* 42, pp. 2447–2470.
- DEKKER, K. & R. VAN KEMPEN (2004) Urban Governance within the Big Cities Policy. Ideals and Practice in Den Haag, The Netherlands. *Cities*, 21, pp. 109–117.
- DUNN, K.M. (1998), Rethinking Ethnic Concentration: The Case of Cabramatta, Sydney. *Urban Studies* 35, pp. 503–24.
- GALSTER, G.C., K. METZGER & R. WAITE (1999), Neighborhood Opportunity Structures and

- Immigrants' Socio-economic Advancement. *Journal of Housing Research* 10, pp. 95–127.
- GOETZ, E.G. (2003), *Clearing the Way: Deconcentrating the Poor in Urban America*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- HARRIS, D.R. (2001), Why are Whites and Blacks Averse to Black Neighbours. *Social Science Research* 30, pp. 100–116.
- HERBERT, D.T. & R.J. JOHNSTON (1976), General Introduction Social Areas in Cities. In: D.T. HERBERT & R.J. JOHNSTON, eds., *Social Areas in Cities, Volume 1: Spatial Processes and Form*, pp. 1–4. London: John Wiley.
- KINGSLEY, G.T., J. JOHNSON & K.L.S. PETTIT (2003), Patterns of Section 8 in the Hope VI Program. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 25, pp. 427–447.
- KLEINHANS, R. (2003), Displaced But Still Moving Upwards in the Housing Career? Implications of Forced Residential Relocation in the Netherlands. *Housing Studies* 18, pp. 473–499.
- KLEINHANS, R.J. (2005), *Sociale Implicaties van Herstructureren en Herhuisvesting*. Delft: Delft University Press.
- KLEINHANS, R. & W. VAN DER LAAN BOUMA-DOFF (2008), On Priority and Progress: Forced Residential Relocation and Housing Chances in Haaglanden, The Netherlands. *Housing Studies* 23, pp. 565–587.
- KULLBERG, J. (2002), Consumers' Responses to Choice-based Letting Mechanisms. *Housing Studies* 17, pp. 549–579.
- MARCUSE, P. (1986) Abandonment, Gentrification and Displacement; The Linkages in New York. In: N. SMITH & P. WILLIAMS, eds., *Gentrification of the City*, pp. 152–177. London: Unwin Hyman.
- MINISTERIE VROM (VOLKSHUISVESTING, RUIMTELIJKE ORDENING EN MILIEUBEHEER) (1997), *Nota Stedelijke Vernieuwing (White Paper on Urban Renewal)*. Den Haag: Ministerie VROM.
- MINISTERIE VROM (VOLKSHUISVESTING, RUIMTELIJKE ORDENING EN MILIEUBEHEER) (2007), *Actieplan Krachtwijken (Action Plan Strong Neighbourhoods)*. Den Haag: Ministerie VROM.
- MINISTERIE VAN JUSTITIE (2005), *Jaarnota Integratiebeleid 2005 (Annual Memorandum on Integration Policy 2005)*. Den Haag: Ministerie van Justitie.
- MIYARES, I.M. (1997), Changing Perceptions of Space and Place as Measures of Hmong Acculturation. *Professional Geographer* 49, pp. 214–224.
- MULDER, C.H. (1993), *Migration Dynamics: A Life Course Approach* (Ph.D. thesis, University of Amsterdam).
- MUSTERD, S. (2003), Segregation and Integration: A Contested Relationship. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 29, pp. 623–641.
- MUSTERD, S. (2005), Social and Ethnic Segregation in Europe: Levels, Causes, and Effects. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 27, pp. 331–348.
- MUSTERD, S. & R. DEURLOO (2002), Unstable Immigrant Concentrations in Amsterdam: Spatial Segregation and Integration of Newcomers. *Housing Studies* 17, pp. 487–503.
- MUSTERD, S., W. OSTENDORF & M. BREEBAART (1998), *Multi-ethnic Metropolis: Patterns and Policies*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- MUSTERD, S. & R. VAN KEMPEN (2009), Segregation and Housing of Minority Ethnic Groups in Western European Cities. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 100, pp. 549–556.
- PEEPLES, F. & R. LOEBER (1994), Do Individual Factors and Neighborhood Context Explain Ethnic Differences in Juvenile Delinquency? *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 10, pp. 141–157.
- POPP, H. (1976), The Residential Location Process. Some Theoretical and Empirical Considerations. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 67, pp. 300–305.
- REX, J. & R. MOORE (1967), *Race, Community and Conflict*. London: Oxford University Press.
- SAMPSON, R.J. & S.W. RAUDENBUSCH (2004), Seeing Disorder: Neighborhood Stigma and the Social Construction of 'Broken Windows'. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 67, pp. 319–342.
- SCHUTJENS, V.A.J.M., R. VAN KEMPEN & J. VAN WESEP (2002), The Changing Tenant Profile of Dutch Social Rented Housing. *Urban Studies* 39, pp. 643–664.
- SHORT, J.R. (1978) Residential Mobility, *Progress in Human Geography* 2, pp. 419–447.
- SLOB, A., G. BOLT & R. VAN KEMPEN (2008), *Na de Sloop: Waterbedeffecten van Gebiedsgericht Stedelijk Beleid*. Den Haag/Utrecht: Nicis Institute/Faculteit Geowetenschappen, Universiteit Utrecht.
- VAN AMERSFOORT, H. (1992), Ethnic Residential Patterns in a Welfare State: Lessons from Amsterdam. *New Community* 18, pp. 439–456.
- VAN BECKHOVEN, E. & R. VAN KEMPEN (2003), Social Effects of Urban Restructuring: A Case Study in Amsterdam and Utrecht, The Netherlands. *Housing Studies* 18, pp. 853–875.
- VAN DER KLAUW, B. & J.C. VAN OURS (2003), From Welfare to Work: Does the Neighborhood Matter? *Journal of Public Economics* 87, pp. 957–985.

- VAN DER LAAN BOUMA-DOFF, W. (2005), *De Buurt als Belemmering?* Assen: Van Gorcum.
- VAN HAM, M., R. VAN KEMPEN & J. VAN WEESEP (2006), The Changing Role of the Dutch Social Rented Sector. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 21, pp. 315–335.
- VAN KEMPEN, R. (2002), The Academic Formulations: Explanations for the Partitioned City. In: P. MARCUSE & R. VAN KEMPEN (eds.), *Of States and Cities: The Partitioning of Urban Space*, pp. 35–56. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- VAN KEMPEN, R. (2005), Segregation and Housing Conditions of Immigrants in Western European Cities. In: Y. KAZEPOV, ed., *Cities of Europe, Changing Contexts, Local Arrangements, and the Challenge to Urban Cohesion*, pp. 190–209. Oxford: Blackwell.
- VAN KEMPEN, R., G. BOLT, E. VAN BERGEIJK & A. KOKX (2009), Does Urban Restructuring Work? Effects of Urban Policies in Deprived Neighborhoods in Dutch Cities. Paper for the Urban Affairs Association Conference in Chicago, 4–8 March 2009.
- VAN KEMPEN, R., G. BOLT & A. SLOB (2008), Displacement Effects of Urban Restructuring: A Case Study of Three Dutch Cities. Paper prepared for the UAA-conference in Baltimore, 23–26 April 2008.
- VAN KEMPEN, R., A. MURIE, I. TOSICS & T. KNORR-SIEDOW (2006), *Regenerating Large Housing Estates in Europe: A Guide to Better Practice*. Utrecht: Urban and Regional Research Centre Utrecht.
- VAN KEMPEN, R. & A.Ş. ÖZÜEKREN (1998), Ethnic Segregation in Cities: New Forms and Explanations in a Dynamic World. *Urban Studies* 35, pp. 1631–1656.
- VAN KEMPEN, R., V.A.J.M. SCHUTJENS & J. VAN WEESEP (2000), Housing and Social Fragmentation in the Netherlands. *Housing Studies* 15, pp. 505–531.
- WITTEBROOD, K. & T. VAN DIJK (2007), *Aandacht voor de Wijk – Effecten van Herstructurering op de Leefbaarheid en de Veiligheid*. Den Haag: SCP.