

# Minority Ethnic Groups in the Dutch Housing Market: Spatial Segregation, Relocation Dynamics and Housing Policy

Gideon Bolt, Ronald van Kempen and Maarten van Ham

[Paper first received, November 2006; in final form, July 2007]

## Abstract

Ethnic segregation is consolidated by differences between ethnic groups with regard to their moving decision. Using unique registration data on population flows between neighbourhoods, the paper shows that native Dutch living in neighbourhoods where ethnic minorities are overrepresented are more likely to move than minority ethnic residents. Moreover, they move much more often to 'White' neighbourhoods. Urban policies in the Netherlands focus on countering this tendency to segregation, but are based on simplified assumptions with regard to the causes of residential segregation. Relatedly, the optimism about the positive effects of social mix is hardly substantiated by empirical research.

## Introduction

Much of the academic research on residential segregation emphasises the negative effects of the disadvantageous influence of living in a spatial concentration of deprivation (Massey and Denton, 1993; Wilson, 1987). The general idea is that living in a deprived district can have negative consequences for the social position and social mobility of the residents, because they lack contacts with relevant people and

institutions or they have too many 'wrong' contacts (Massey and Fong, 1990; South and Crowder, 1998; South *et al.*, 2005). These negative consequences are mainly problematic for people who are not in a position to move away from disadvantageous neighbourhoods. Research has shown that deprivation in a neighbourhood can have many negative consequences, such as: the occurrence of teenage pregnancies (Anderson, 1999); low socioeconomic position (Galster *et al.*, 1999);

**Gideon Bolt** and **Ronald van Kempen** are in the Urban and Regional Research Centre Utrecht, Faculty of Geosciences, Utrecht University, PO Box 80.115, 3508 TC Utrecht, The Netherlands. Fax: 31 30 2532037. E-mails: g.bolt@geo.uu.nl and r.vankempen@geo.uu.nl.

**Maarten van Ham** is in the Centre for Housing Research, the University of St Andrews, School of Geography and Geosciences, Irvine Building, North Street, St Andrews, Fife, KY16 9AL, Scotland, UK. Fax: 1334 463949. E-mail: maarten.vanham@st-andrews.ac.uk.

school dropout (Overman, 2002); poor educational achievement; and retarded child development (Crane, 1991; Duncan *et al.*, 1994); limited transfer from unemployment to work (van der Klaauw and Ours, 2003); deviant behaviour (Friedrichs and Blasius, 2003); social exclusion (Buck, 2001); victimisation (Sampson *et al.*, 1997); and poor access to the labour market (Ihlanfeldt and Sjoquist, 1998).

In the literature on ethnic segregation, however, attention is also given to the possible positive effects of ethnic segregation. Spatial concentrations can have an important expressive function, assisting with the maintenance of a group's cultural traditions (Dunn, 1998). Relatedly, living in an ethnic enclave makes it easier to maintain ethnic networks, through which people are able to derive benefits from each other and offer support to one another (Bolt *et al.*, 1998). Moreover, ethnic neighbourhoods may function as a safe haven in a hostile environment (Boal, 1976) and they may provide alternative channels for social mobility (Portes and Zhou, 1993).

While attention is paid to the positive as well as negative effects of ethnic concentration in the literature, the focus in policy circles is almost exclusively negative. That is the reason why urban policies in the Netherlands are, like in an increasing number of other western European countries, directed at countering residential segregation and the spatial concentration of low-income households and minority ethnic groups (Kleinhans, 2004; Musterd, 2003; Veldboer *et al.*, 2002). The Dutch government believes that the concentration of ethnic minorities in certain urban neighbourhoods hampers their integration and participation in society. In the Yearly Memorandum on Integration Policy, it is stated that

Concentration is especially disadvantageous for integration because it results in an accumulation of social problems which

may eventuate in a state of affairs that is very hard to handle ... Concentration is also disadvantageous because it makes the ethnic dividing lines more visible in a more concentrated way. That harms the image of ethnic minorities ... Finally, concentration is particularly disadvantageous for the possibilities for meeting and contacts between persons from different origin groups ... the diminishing contacts with native Dutch indirectly influence the social chances of ethnic minorities (Ministerie van Justitie, 2005, p. 19; own translation).

The most important measure to counter segregation is to create more social mix by means of differentiation of the housing stock. The aim of this paper is to examine critically the foundations of the Dutch anti-segregation policy by answering two questions. First, to what extent are the supposed positive effects of social and ethnic mixing found in empirical research? This question will be answered on the basis of a literature review. Secondly, to what extent does urban restructuring really address the causes of ethnic segregation? The premise that underlies housing differentiation policy is that ethnic segregation is merely a reflection of socioeconomic segregation, which in turn is the outcome of the spatial dispersion of affordable housing. In order to obtain a better understanding of segregation, we consider relocation behaviour between neighbourhoods and districts. In practice, that is rarely done, because although researchers usually have data available on the composition of neighbourhoods, they do not have data on the relocation behaviour of individuals or households. We have used for our purpose unique data from Statistics Netherlands (CBS) for the Gemeentelijke Basis Administration [Municipal Basis Administration] (GBA). We have sought to verify whether immigrants mainly move to immigrant neighbourhoods and native Dutch to indigenous neighbourhoods. If that is the

case, then segregation in Dutch cities cannot be expected to diminish in the short term. On the basis of an analysis of two major surveys in the Netherlands (The Housing Demand Survey 2002 and the Housing Research Netherlands survey 2006), we try to establish to what extent differences in spatial behaviour between minority ethnic groups can be attributed to differences in socioeconomic and other factors.

Before answering these questions, we will give a brief overview of the academic literature on the causes of ethnic segregation. Subsequently, we will give a description of the level of segregation in Dutch cities. We concentrate on the four big cities (Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht), because that is still where relatively the most immigrants live.

### How Can Segregation Processes Be Explained?

The spatial segregation of ethnic groups has been an essential topic in urban geography and urban sociology for more than 80 years. In the 1920s, researchers in the Chicago School were pioneers in this field (see, for example, Burgess, 1925; Park, 1925). They described the spatial patterns of different immigrant groups in the city of Chicago and were particularly interested in the dynamics in these patterns. Their descriptions of the dynamics featured the terms invasion, succession, and dominance, derived from biology. The inflow of a new group of residents into a neighbourhood is, according to Park (1925), comparable to the invasion of an existing ecosystem by a new species. As a consequence of the invasion, other species no longer feel at ease and seek their refuge elsewhere. The same processes apply with *homo sapiens*: people leave their residential environment following an inflow of a new population group. As a result, more dwellings become vacant for the

members of the new group. There is then evidence of succession: one population group is succeeded by another. Eventually, dominance can be observed: one group replaces the other (for the most part) and comes to dominate the district. The processes of invasion–succession–dominance are also readily observable in Dutch cities. We return to this matter later.

The research of the Chicago School was for the most part just descriptive in nature so that it remained unclear what processes brought about the population dynamics in districts and the consequent segregation patterns. Nevertheless, the spatial assimilation model based on the ideas of the Chicago School has retained a dominant position in segregation research, particularly in the US. This theory was not developed in the time of the Chicago School, but was formulated later by Massey (1985) to some extent on the basis of the (frequently conflicting) publications of the social ecologists.

In brief, according to the spatial assimilation model, the segregation of ethnic groups declines as their length of residence increases (Lieberson, 1961). The mechanisms that bring about the dispersion of ethnic groups are acculturation and socioeconomic mobility (Charles, 2003; Logan and Alba, 1993; Massey, 1985). Acculturation is the gradual acquisition of the language, norms and values of the host community (Gordon, 1964). The greater the extent to which in the course of time immigrants integrate with the host community, the less is their need to live in proximity to their own group. In addition, in the course of time more immigrants will climb the social ladder and will also want to benefit from their newly acquired status by moving into a qualitatively better neighbourhood. That usually entails moving to a neighbourhood where more native Dutch live. In a geographical sense, spatial assimilation is accompanied by a process of decentralisation. Enclaves surrounding

the inner city are exchanged for more mixed neighbourhoods in the suburbs and at the edge of the city (Burgess, 1925).

Of the three determinants of segregation (length of residence, acculturation and socioeconomic status) the last named has been the most popular object of research. Many studies are centred on the question of the extent to which ethnic segregation can be accounted for by socioeconomic differences. Because the segregation of immigrants by no means invariably declines in the course of time and furthermore can only be explained to a limited extent by differences in socioeconomic position, two alternatives for the spatial assimilation model have been put forward. The cultural preference approach assumes that the preference for living in a neighbourhood where one's own ethnic group is strongly represented persists, even if socioeconomic and cultural differences decline. Research undertaken in Asian groups (see, for example, Bowes *et al.*, 2002; Robinson, 1981) shows that the preference for living in Asian districts is still very strong. In fact, it transpires from American research in particular that the preference for living in a district where one's own group dominates is by far the strongest among native Whites (Charles, 2003; Emerson *et al.*, 2001; Ilhanfeldt and Scafidi, 2004). The preference of ethnic groups extends much more often to mixed residential areas. In the event, relatively few people succeed in realising their preference for an ethnically mixed district. Schelling (1969) has shown that even relatively small differences in terms of preferences with respect to the population composition of a neighbourhood can lead to strongly segregated residential neighbourhoods (see also Clark, 1991). Suppose that, in a completely White neighbourhood, a number of Black people who have no problem with living in a White neighbourhood move in. For a few White people, that influx acts as the trigger for them to move to another neighbourhood.

The dwellings that become available are also attractive to Black people who would like to live in a predominantly White neighbourhood. If the number of Black residents then rises, more White people will feel that the limit of the maximum acceptable percentage of Black residents has been exceeded and they will also move out. The end result is then a neighbourhood which has completely changed in colour in a relatively short time.

An alternative to the spatial assimilation model is the ethnic stratification model (Logan and Alba, 1993; South and Crowder, 1998). This features the role of discrimination in the housing market, which makes it difficult even for immigrants with a good economic position to acquire a dwelling in a neighbourhood associated with high socioeconomic status. There have indeed been many studies in both the US and in western Europe that have revealed discriminatory practices by actors of all kinds in the housing market. We can think of mortgage providers (Aalbers, 2005; Galster, 1999), estate agents (Philips and Karn, 1992; Yinger, 1999), (social) landlords (Aelbers *et al.*, 1991; Philips, 1998), local (Musterd *et al.*, 1998) and national government institutions (Giffinger, 1998).

Apart from the barriers in the housing market that specifically confront immigrants, it is also important for the explanation of segregation and the underlying relocation behaviour to consider the restrictions that are imposed from the supply side on a household's freedom of choice. Two issues are of importance here: the accessibility and the availability of dwellings and neighbourhoods. By accessibility we refer to the question of whether households can afford a dwelling, for example. By availability, we assess whether particular types of dwelling are available or within reach in terms of size, price, owner-occupied or rented, or quality (Özüekren and van Kempen, 2003). Access to particular segments of the housing market for particular groups is determined by specific institutions

and the people who function within them. When a local authority decides that people whose income is below a certain limit are no longer entitled to look for a dwelling in the city, they are directed to other areas.

Policy that is aimed at the demolition or renovation of inexpensive dwellings and their replacement by dwellings in a higher price class leads to the restriction of the choice opportunities of low-income households. In various European countries, including the Netherlands, policy in the big cities is currently directed to the creation of more diversification in the housing stock and thereby also in the population (see, for example, van Kempen and Priemus, 2002). This policy is usually aimed at the creation of diversification with respect to income within a neighbourhood and not explicitly to a mixture with respect to ethnicity. However, the usual effect of creating more expensive dwellings in a district is that ethnic groups have to look elsewhere for a home, because they cannot afford the more expensive dwellings on their low incomes.

The direct and indirect influence of macro developments is increasingly acknowledged in the explanation of spatial segregation and concentration. These developments operate at spatial scales greater than those of the individual city. Economic developments on a world scale determine to an important extent the financial room for manoeuvre in a local context of individuals, market parties and the government authority. Increasing employment offers more households more perspectives on the housing market. Demographic developments at different spatial scales are of great importance in the competition between different groups in the housing market: more immigration in an area means in principle more competition. Social-cultural developments are of importance for the demands people put on their dwelling and residential environment (van Kempen and Özüekren, 1998).

It is evident that the spatial segregation and concentration of immigrants are determined by a large number of factors and developments. On the one hand are the variables which relate to the wishes of households and individuals, and on the other hand are their opportunities and limitations. The opportunities are determined by an interaction between the means of households and individuals and the supply-side factors. On the supply side, the availability and accessibility of dwellings have important roles. Developments in segregation and the concentration of ethnic groups can be explained to an important extent with the help of these factors and the developments within them.

### **Spatial Segregation of Immigrants in the Netherlands**

How can the current segregation of immigrants in Dutch cities be characterised? What developments can be identified? And how can these developments be explained? In this section, we first pay attention to the overrepresentation of immigrants in the big cities. We then consider the development of segregation within the four largest cities. Is segregation increasing or decreasing with respect to the rest of the country? Which neighbourhoods are affected by the strongest increase in the share of immigrants?

We restrict our description of segregation in the Netherlands to the four largest immigrant groups: Turks (358 000), Surinamese (328 000), Moroccans (315 000) and Antilleans (including Arubans: 130 000). Together with the remaining non-Western immigrants (431 000), they have a share of the total Dutch population of 10.4 per cent (SCP/WODC/CBS, 2005).

### **Overrepresentation in the Four Big Cities**

The four largest immigrant groups are strongly concentrated in the big cities. While

just 13 per cent of the Dutch population live in Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Utrecht or The Hague, more than half the Surinamese and almost half the Moroccans do so (Table 1). More than a third of the Turks and Antilleans live in one of the four big cities. Since the 1990s, the significance of the four big cities has increased for the Antilleans to a striking extent (Bolt and van Kempen, 2000). That comes about because relatively many recent immigrants settle in the big cities (Table 1). For the three largest groups of immigrants, the significance of the four big cities has in fact declined. That decrease applies most strongly to the Surinamese, 57 per cent of whom lived in 1997 in one of the four big cities. The decreasing significance for immigrants of the four big cities relates to the increase in migration out of the city on the one hand and on the other to the reduced power of attraction of the four big cities for immigrants. With respect to the last factor, it can be seen from Table 1 that Turkish, Moroccan and Surinamese immigrants are still (somewhat) more strongly attracted to the big cities than are the members of these ethnic communities already present. On the other hand, immigrants settle less frequently in the big cities than was previously the case.

In 1997, 45 per cent of the Turkish, 53 per cent of the Moroccan and 63 per cent of the Surinamese immigrants arrived and settled in one of the four big cities (van Huis and Nicolaas, 2000).

The decreasing importance of the four big cities for the accommodation of the three largest immigrant groups is mainly the result of the increase in suburbanisation. In Amsterdam, half the suburbanisation flow in 2003 consisted of immigrants, compared with a third in 1994 (de Groot, 2004). In Rotterdam, the percentage of non-Western migrants in the suburbanisation flow rose from 20 per cent in 1992 to 40 per cent in 2002 (Burgers and van der Lugt, 2005). Suburbanisation is particularly high among Surinamese, who in that respect scarcely differ from the native Dutch. The spatial assimilation model therefore seems to be appropriate to the Surinamese. The suburbanisation of Turks and Moroccans lags behind, although in the past few years the Turks in particular seem to have begun to catch up. In any event, the suburbanisation of immigrants is in the direction of the larger municipalities in the region (Almere, Zaandam, Purmerend, Schiedam), which are now less popular with the native Dutch.

**Table 1.** Ethnic minorities in the four big cities (Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Utrecht, The Hague) as a percentage of the national total, 2004; immigrants in the four big cities as a percentage of the national inflow of immigrants, 2002

	<i>Percentage living in 4 big cities per ethnic group, 2004</i>	<i>Percentage immigrants settling down in 4 big cities, 2002</i>
Turks	35.5	36.9
Moroccans	47.3	49.0
Surinamese	53.8	57.4
Antillians	34.2	40.2
Other non-Western immigrants	30.7	21.7
Western immigrants	17.1 <sup>a</sup>	27.3
Native Dutch	9.0 <sup>a</sup>	13.3
Total Dutch population	12.8	26.5

<sup>a</sup> Data 2002.

### Segregation in the Four Big Cities

Dozens of segregation indices have been developed in an attempt to put a figure on the extent of segregation (Massey and Denton, 1988). We focus on the segregation index (Table 2) because that is the most frequently used both nationally and internationally and so facilitates comparison with other cities. In any event, these comparisons must be treated with caution, however. The segregation index is influenced by the manner in which the neighbourhood boundaries are drawn and also by the average size of the neighbourhoods: the smaller the neighbourhood,

the higher the index turns out to be. Next to that, the index is limited to dichotomies and the expected value is greater than zero, as it is unlikely that the distributions of ethnic groups would be exactly identical even if ethnicity was irrelevant. Finally, the segregation index does not take account of the spatial relationships between neighbourhoods. In other words, the degree to which ethnic neighbourhoods adjoin one another does not have any influence on the magnitude of the segregation index (White, 1983).

The segregation index runs from 0 (proportionate distribution over the city) to 100

**Table 2.** Segregation index of minority ethnic groups in the four big cities

	<i>Turks</i>	<i>Moroccans</i>	<i>Surinamese</i>	<i>Antilleans</i>	<i>Non-Western minorities</i>
<i>Amsterdam</i>					
1980	37.3	38.6	27.8	26.2	
1986	38.8	36.9	33.7	33.0	
1995	40.7	39.1	34.8	34.9	
2000	41.2	39.5	33.3	37.1	34.9
2004	42.4	40.0	32.9	33.3	36.3
<i>Rotterdam</i>					
1995	51.7	46.8	28.6	28.5	
2000	47.8	42.6	24.1	30.2	40.8
2004	44.1	39.7	21.1	29.7	38.5
<i>The Hague</i>					
1980	66.4	64.7			
1986	65.1	57.3	46.4	26.9	
1995	54.6	49.9	40.2	25.5	
2000	51.3	48.6	37.0	27.3	45.7
2004	51.1	48.3	33.5	28.1	46.1
<i>Utrecht</i>					
1995	43.2	42.2	24.0	22.5	
2000	38.8	39.4	20.3	16.7	34.8
2004	42.3	43.6	22.4	16.4	37.4
Municipalities >100 000 inhabitants					
2003	39	38	23	24	
Municipalities 50 000–100 000 inhabitants					
2003	35	36	20	23	

Sources: Bestuursinformatie Gemeente Utrecht; Bolt and van Kempen (2000); COS Rotterdam; Gemeente Den Haag; van der Laan Bouma-Doff, 2005; O+S Amsterdam; SCP/WODC/CBS, 2005.

(complete segregation). The value of a segregation index can be interpreted as the percentage of a group that would have to move out to obtain an even distribution over the municipality proportionate to that of the rest of the population.

Comparison of the segregation indices between years and between cities (Table 2) reveals a completely consistent pattern with respect to the differences between the four ethnic groups. Turks and Moroccans invariably score much higher than do Surinamese and Antilleans. In most cases, there are no substantial differences between Turks and Moroccans or between Surinamese and Antilleans.

If the cities are compared, it is evident that up to the end of the 1990s a clear distinction could be drawn with respect to the segregation patterns in Rotterdam and The Hague on the one hand and in Amsterdam and Utrecht on the other. The segregation indices in The Hague and Rotterdam were higher than in the other cities (except for the Antilleans, who in Amsterdam have the most segregated living accommodation), largely because few immigrants have succeeded in moving to the (post-war) housing estates at the edge of the city, as there were fewer vacancies in these neighbourhoods, because they enjoyed considerable popularity among the Dutch residents. Many immigrants continued for a long time to be directed to urban renewal areas. There, many suitable dwellings for (large) families were to be found, because relatively many large dwellings were restored in the urban renewal process (Bolt and van Kempen, 2000).

In the course of the 1990s, the flow of immigrants into post-war districts became steady and that led to a decrease in segregation. In The Hague, the decrease in segregation more or less came to a halt, so that this is still the most segregated big city of the Netherlands. In Rotterdam, on the other hand, the segregation level hardly differed from that in Amsterdam

and Utrecht, where the segregation in the past few years has remained reasonably stable. In these two last-named cities, the shift from the old districts to the post-war districts took hold earlier than in The Hague and Rotterdam, so that immigrants were spread relatively more evenly over the city. That was brought about on the one hand through particular districts becoming at a given moment less popular with the native Dutch, so that relatively many large affordable dwellings became available; and, on the other hand, there was considerable competition in the old districts round the city centre, more than in Rotterdam or Den Haag, with young highly educated singles or couples (Bolt and van Kempen, 2000).

In comparison with the big cities, the segregation index in medium-sized cities (>100 000 inhabitants) is in general lower. In the smaller cities, the segregation is a little lower still. That is in line with the idea, dating from the time of the Chicago School, that the larger the city *and* the greater the share of immigrants, the greater is the segregation (Massey, 1985). This hypothesis was recently reconfirmed in a major study in the US (Wilkes and Iceland, 2004).

## Countering Segregation: Urban Policies in the Netherlands

The present Dutch urban policy aims to reduce the concentration of low-income households in urban neighbourhoods *and* to combat the negative effects of the concentration of minority ethnic groups on their integration (Ministerie van Justitie, 2005). The issue of countering segregation has already been (back) on the agenda since the second half of the 1990s, but the policy focus used to be mainly on income segregation. In line with changes in the Dutch political climate in the past few years, however, the concern with the concentration of poverty in certain neighbourhoods has given way to the anxiety about ethnic concentration. At the same time, the



measures that are taken to counter segregation are not explicitly focused on ethnicity, partly due to anti-discrimination legislation. There are three instruments that are brought into action to combat segregation (Ministerie van Justitie, 2005, p. 45)

- (1) Differentiation of the housing stock in 'concentration neighbourhoods'.
- (2) Regulation of the influx of low-income-groups into certain 'concentration neighbourhoods'.
- (3) Extension of the housing opportunities for low-income-groups outside the city.

Whereas the first two measures lead to the reduction of choice opportunities of low-income households, the third measure aims to enhance their choice (Bolt *et al.*, 2002). Unfortunately, this measure has not been given much priority by the national government. In fact, the ruling parties in parliament have voted against a bill that provided for binding regional agreements in which suburban municipalities are—if necessary—forced to play a larger role in providing housing for low-income-groups.

The regulation of the influx of low-income-groups is the most heavily debated anti-segregation measure in the Netherlands. Following the initiative of the city of Rotterdam, a national law has been passed which gives cities the opportunity to ask permission from the Ministry of Housing to implement a divergent allocation policy for certain deprived parts of the cities. Persons from outside the city without a paid job (except students and retired persons) are not granted a residence permit in these designated neighbourhoods. The realisation of this 'Rotterdam law' can be attributed to the electoral triumph in 2001 of anti-immigrant party *Leefbaar Rotterdam*. While the trigger for the Rotterdam law was the increasing ethnic concentration in Rotterdam, the law does not directly address the minority ethnic groups (Bolt, 2004).

Indirectly, however, they are affected disproportionately more than the established population (Kleinhans, 2004).

At first sight, it may seem striking that it was Rotterdam that initiated this anti-segregation law, while it is the only city of the big four where the level of segregation is declining. However, it should be taken into consideration that, despite the decline in segregation, the proportion of minority ethnic groups in the population of Rotterdam has risen. Also, the declining segregation was brought about by increasing numbers of minority ethnic households in post-war neighbourhoods, which meant that many native inhabitants of Rotterdam were confronted with a change in the ethnic composition in their neighbourhood. It was especially in these neighbourhoods where *Leefbaar Rotterdam* captured a lot of votes.

The actual effect of the 'Rotterdam law' on segregation has up to now been very limited. It has been estimated that it will only prevent a few hundred jobless people from outside Rotterdam from moving into the designated areas. Nevertheless, the law can be criticised for several reasons (Bolt, 2004). First of all, people without a job (of whom a high proportion are members of minority ethnic groups) are held responsible implicitly for the problems in concentration neighbourhoods. Instead of creating opportunities for social mobility, urban policy is aimed at excluding people without a job. Also, it should be questioned if the designated neighbourhoods will benefit from this policy. The fact that a neighbourhood is picked out as a 'hot spot' (in terms of the Rotterdam law) is most likely to harm its reputation.

By far, the most substantial measure to counter segregation is the differentiation of the housing stock in deprived neighbourhoods. In 1997, the Memorandum on Urban Renewal [*Nota Stedelijke Vernieuwing*] was published with the aim of helping to bring an end to the increasing concentrations of

low-income households in, especially, the post-WWII social housing estates. The objective of the Memorandum was clearly stated as achieving a mixed population

Although there are no extreme concentrations of vulnerable groups, there are certain neighbourhoods where problems prevail. There is a chance that this will lead to mutually reinforcing processes of dilapidation in parts of the cities. In several neighbourhoods liveability and safety are under pressure ... In some neighbourhoods where one-sidedness can occur or already dominates, increasing the diversity of the housing stock ... can facilitate physical, social and cultural improvement of living and working environments in these neighbourhoods.

Urban restructuring became the key word: a large number of social rented dwellings in areas that were dominated by this housing segment had to be demolished or upgraded, in order to make room for more expensive, often owner-occupied dwellings. In this way, concentrations of low-income households could be countered and a more mixed population could be strived for (Ministerie VROM, 1997).

While the 'one-sidedness' of a neighbourhood population was initially mainly defined in terms of income, the negative effects of ethnic segregation came more and more to the fore, partly as a consequence of the election campaign of the late politician Pim Fortuyn, who was murdered in May 2002 (Kleinhans, 2004).

As is the case with the Rotterdam law, urban restructuring is not directly aimed at reducing ethnic segregation, but the assumption is that socioeconomic segregation is the main determinant of ethnic segregation (see Andersson, 2006, for the Swedish case). Consequently, a reduction in socioeconomic segregation is expected to lead automatically to a reduction in ethnic segregation.

Most critics of urban restructuring comment on the assumption that housing differentiation

will bring about positive social effects in the neighbourhood. Low-income-groups (and the members of minority ethnic groups amongst them) are expected to benefit from social mix in several ways (Joseph *et al.*, 2007; Kleinhans, 2004; Uitermark, 2003): social interaction between residents of different background leads to social mobility; higher incomes and homeowners may act as positive role models for lower incomes; social mix leads to an increasing social control; and, the presence of affluent residents contributes to more collective action and will therefore have a positive effect on the quality of (public) services in the neighbourhood.

For the discussion on the effect of mixing on the integration of ethnic minorities, the first two benefits that are mentioned are the most relevant. There is, however, not much evidence for the claim that higher incomes act as a role model for lower incomes (and the members of minority ethnic groups amongst them). Asking residents whether owners or people with a higher social status act as role models is likely to be considered paternalistic or even insulting (Rosenbaum *et al.*, 1998). There is no evidence that lower-income-groups adhere less to 'mainstream' values (Joseph *et al.*, 2007) and Dekker and Bolt (2005) even found that members of minority ethnic groups in two mixed Dutch neighbourhoods are less tolerant towards deviant behaviour than the native population.

There is much more research on the claim that social mix provides opportunities for social interaction between residents of different income levels and ethnic backgrounds. In this way, residents may accumulate more social capital, which is expected to have a positive impact on their social mobility. However, several studies in the Netherlands (such as Dekker and Bolt, 2005; van Beckhoven and van Kempen, 2003), the UK (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2000; Bramley and Morgan, 2003) and the US (Gans, 1961; Brophy and Smith, 1997) have shown that social interactions between

different categories (in terms of tenure, socio-economic status or ethnicity) do not automatically occur in practice. The general picture is that different groups of people in the neighbourhoods live alongside each other, not together. There are, however, indications that social interactions between income-groups occur when there is a moderate degree of income heterogeneity (Brophy and Smith, 1997; Rosenbaum *et al.*, 1998).

While social mix is not likely to engender more bridging capital for minority ethnic groups, there is possibly a negative effect on bonding capital. Those who have to move because of the restructuring process might end up in different kinds of areas in the city, which may prohibit daily social contacts between people who used to have good contacts within the neighbourhood. Those who can stay run the serious risk of a declining number of social contacts—on the one hand, because some neighbours, friends and acquaintances have to move and, on the other hand, because the people that are entering are probably ‘different kinds of people’. Seen in this way, urban restructuring is not very helpful for sustaining ethnic communities (Crump, 2002).

Apart from the academic scepticism with regard to the positive social effects of social mix that are claimed by policy-makers, they are also serious doubts whether urban restructuring is an effective means to combat segregation. Of course, demolition and up-grading of the housing stock will bring about a decrease in low-income (minority ethnic) households in certain neighbourhoods, but these households have to move to other places in the city, especially towards neighbourhoods where affordable housing is still available. There is a large ‘risk’, therefore, that the idea of creating more socioeconomically mixed communities in one area engenders socio-cultural concentrations in another area, because only in those areas unaffected by the policy of urban restructuring is affordable housing still available (Crump, 2002; van

Kempen and Priemus, 2002). Musterd (2003) adds to that criticism that urban restructuring does not address the causes of segregation. Differentiation of the housing stock cannot change the tendency that people choose to associate themselves with like-minded people (Musterd, 2003). In the next section, we will look further into the role of group-specific neighbourhood choices.

### **Segregation and Relocations: Who Moves Where?**

Uunk and Dominguez Martinez (2002) have analysed relocation flows of native Dutch and ethnic groups between different types of district in 1999. Using more recent data, we have repeated their calculations and refined them on two points. First, we distinguish six different sub-groups within the group of immigrants. In contrast with Uunk and Dominguez Martinez, this distinction makes it possible to differentiate between Western and non-Western immigrants and focus on the non-Western immigrants. Secondly, we look specifically at the inflow, outflow and through-flow of residents in districts of the four big cities and we have investigated who leaves the city and where people coming from outside the city settle. Through this refinement, we can obtain more insight into the extent to which different groups move between, into or out of concentration neighbourhoods.

For the purposes of the analysis, we obtained from Statistics Netherlands (CBS) a matrix with all the relocation activity between the almost 4000 Dutch four-unit postcode areas. The matrix, originating from the Gemeentelijke Basis Administratie [Municipal Basic Administration] (GBA), covers all 1 595 926 individuals who relocated in 2002, classified according to their place of origin. Seven areas of origin are distinguished (CBS definitions): the Netherlands (native Dutch); Surinam; Dutch Antilles/Aruba; Turkey; Morocco; Western countries; other

non-Western countries. For the analysis, we selected and classified all households moving within, between, from and to districts in Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht. We classified the city districts on the basis of the percentage of non-Western residents living there (see also Latten *et al.*, 2005). We distinguished the following categories: 0–5 per cent, 5–10 per cent, 10–25 per cent, 25–50 per cent and 50–100 per cent of non-Western residents.

Table 3 shows the distribution of the urban population according to the five separate district categories and the seven areas of origin. In total, on 1 January 2002, more than 2 million people lived in the four big cities. Just 3 per cent of these people (60 834) lived in districts with less than 5 per cent non-Western residents, while in the whole of the Netherlands almost 48 per cent of the total population live in districts with 0–5 per cent non-Western residents. In the table, it can be seen that native Dutch and Western immigrants are approximately equally distributed over the urban districts. The other groups are found to a substantial extent in concentration neighbourhoods. That applies most strongly to the Turks and Moroccans.

### **Inflow into the City from the Rest of the Netherlands and from Abroad**

Native Dutch who come from outside the four big cities (but still from the Netherlands) settle mostly in districts with between 5 and 50 per cent non-Western residents (Table 4). Surinamese, Antilleans, Turks and Moroccans settle mostly in districts with between 10 and 100 per cent non-Western residents. In the terms of the Chicago School, there seems to be evidence here of succession: immigrants settling predominantly in districts where their compatriots are already represented to a reasonable extent.

Next, we have also put into the frame whereabouts in the cities the immigrants from outside the Netherlands settled in 2002. The postcode area in which they settled immediately after their arrival is known for all the 32 165 immigrants arriving in one of the four big cities in 2002.

Table 4 shows big differences among people from different origin categories in terms of the district into which they settle on arrival from abroad. Native Dutch arriving from abroad go mainly to districts with 5–25 per cent non-Western residents and to a lesser extent to districts with 25–50 per cent non-Western residents. Western-origin

**Table 3.** Population of the four big cities (Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Utrecht, The Hague) by ethnicity and neighbourhood type

	<i>Percentage non-Western ethnic minorities in the neighbourhood</i>					<i>Total</i>
	<i>0–5</i>	<i>5–10</i>	<i>10–25</i>	<i>25–50</i>	<i>50–100</i>	
Native Dutch	4.4	19.1	36.7	32.5	7.4	1 186 703
Surinamese	0.4	3.3	19.2	42.6	34.6	173 710
Antillians	0.7	5.1	20.8	40.1	33.3	42 893
Turks	0.2	1.4	11.3	44.2	42.9	117 663
Moroccans	0.2	1.7	13.9	51.1	33.2	135 004
Western immigrants	2.6	20.9	33.2	32.9	10.3	240 704
Other non-Western immigrants	0.7	6.6	20.4	40.7	31.7	155 210
Total	3.0	14.5	30.3	36.1	16.2	2 051 887

Sources: GBA data 2002; CBS (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek); authors' processing.

**Table 4.** Inflow of migrants into the four big cities from the rest of the Netherlands and from abroad by ethnicity and neighbourhood type

	Neighbourhoods of destination, percentage of non-Western minorities:					Total number
	0-5	5-10	10-25	25-50	50-100	
<i>Inflow from the rest of the Netherlands</i>						
Native Dutch	3.4	18.7	41.9	27.5	8.5	45 302
Surinamese	0.9	4.7	28.4	37.6	28.4	4 233
Antillians	0.6	7.5	22.3	37.2	32.4	2 476
Turks	1.5	4.0	23.1	37.1	34.3	1 717
Moroccans	0.8	6.3	21.6	44.8	26.4	1 869
Western immigrants	2.1	18.2	38.0	30.6	11.2	8 353
Other non-Western immigrants	0.7	8.4	27.0	38.1	25.8	8 421
Total	2.6	15.6	37.3	30.7	13.9	72 371
<i>Inflow from abroad</i>						
Native Dutch	3.3	31.5	35.5	23.0	6.6	2 410
Surinamese	0.5	3.3	13.9	41.8	40.6	2 130
Antillians	0.8	4.8	18.2	39.2	37.0	2 500
Turks	0.0	2.0	11.3	46.8	39.9	2 445
Moroccans	0.3	2.4	13.2	52.8	31.3	2 700
Western immigrants	2.8	29.5	30.9	25.8	11.1	11 425
Other non-Western immigrants	1.0	12.6	26.1	33.3	27.0	8 555
Total	1.6	17.1	24.8	33.6	22.9	32 165

Sources: GBA data 2002; CBS (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek); authors' processing.

immigrants strongly resemble the native Dutch in their behaviour. Almost 80 per cent of all the Surinamese, Antilleans, Turks and Moroccans arriving in the country settle in the four big cities in districts with 25–100 per cent non-Western residents. This finding is a strong indication that most immigrants go on arrival to districts where there are people of the same origin whom they already know (succession in terms of the Chicago School). A comparison of the neighbourhoods receiving immigrants from abroad with those receiving immigrants who come to the city from the rest of the Netherlands reveals some interesting differences. Native Dutch coming from the rest of the Netherlands to settle in one of the four big cities (Table 4) settle in concentration neighbourhoods more often than do native Dutch immigrants. That probably comes about because among the inland migrants there are more young, start-up households. For the non-Western groups, the pattern is the converse. The homeland migrants settle more frequently in the more White districts than do the migrants from abroad. This is an indication that there is a certain extent of spatial assimilation of immigrants the longer they remain in the Netherlands.

### **Relocation Flows within and between Districts in the Four Big Cities**

Table 5 shows, for all those moving house in the four big cities and from the five most important categories of origin, the percentage of non-Western residents in the district *from* which they move and the percentage of non-Western residents in the district *to* which they move. On the diagonal (in light grey) are the percentages of house moves within the same district, between districts in the same category in the same city or between two districts in the same category in two different cities (through-flow percentages). It can also be seen in the table the share of movers that leave the city (column 'To the rest of NL'). The

extreme right column shows the percentage of the residents of the neighbourhood type and origin category concerned who moved house in 2002. To save space, in Table 5, data for 'Other Western immigrants' and 'Other non-Western immigrants' have been omitted.

The table shows that native Dutch moving out of districts with 0–5 per cent non-Western immigrants for the most part move to districts with between 0 and 25 per cent non-Western immigrants. People moving out of concentration neighbourhoods (50–100 per cent) are spread over districts with between 10 and 100 per cent non-Western immigrants. This pattern is very similar to the relocation pattern of Western immigrants (not included in the table), but deviates markedly from the moving patterns of the other groups.

The other groups show a much larger outflow from districts with a low percentage of non-Western residents to concentration neighbourhoods. Furthermore, the other groups show much less outflow from concentration neighbourhoods and more through-flow. One-fifth of all the native Dutch moving out of concentration neighbourhoods remained in the same type of district. The comparable figure for the Surinamese and Antilleans is almost two-fifths and the shares are even larger for the Turks (54 per cent) and Moroccans (47 per cent). In the districts with 25–50 per cent non-Western residents, these groups also show a much higher percentage through-flow, with as much as 58 per cent through-flow for Turks.

If we consider the movement of people from the origin categories out of the city (Table 5: column 'To the rest of NL') we can observe some large differences. About 35 per cent of all the native Dutch moving out of urban neighbourhoods go to the rest of the Netherlands. For people from all other origin categories, the percentage of those moving away is much lower. It is striking that, for Surinamese, Turks and Moroccans, the percentage of house movers who leave the city

**Table 5.** Relocation to, from and between neighbourhoods with different concentrations of non-Western immigrants by ethnicity of the movers (outflow percentages) for the four big cities

	Neighbourhoods of destination, percentage of non-Western minorities:					To the rest of NL	Percentage of movers
Neighbourhood of origin	0–5	5–10	10–25	25–50	50–100		
Native Dutch (140 689 native Dutch in the four big cities moved in 2002)							
0–5 per cent	21.8	16.4	17.2	6.7	1.8	36.2	8.5
5–10 per cent	3.3	32.3	21.2	11.2	2.1	29.8	12.2
10–25 per cent	1.6	9.5	35.4	14.8	3.1	35.7	11.2
25–50 per cent	0.9	6.9	20.3	31.2	4.5	36.2	12.2
50–100 per cent	0.9	5.7	19.1	19.9	20.2	34.1	14.6
Total	2.3	12.9	25.5	19.8	4.9	34.6	11.9
Surinamese (N = 29 286)							
0–5 per cent	6.7	11.2	23.6	19.1	9.0	30.3	14.4
5–10 per cent	1.5	15.9	26.7	24.4	11.9	19.6	18.4
10–25 per cent	0.4	5.1	30.2	25.6	15.9	22.7	15.3
25–50 per cent	0.1	2.5	15.4	40.2	19.7	22.0	16.2
50–100 per cent	0.1	1.9	13.2	28.9	38.7	17.2	18.4
Total	0.2	3.2	17.6	32.8	25.9	20.2	16.9
Antillians (N = 10 999)							
0–5 per cent	17.3	7.7	21.2	17.3	15.4	21.2	17.4
5–10 per cent	1.8	22.1	19.9	20.4	9.9	25.8	27.2
10–25 per cent	0.2	5.0	29.8	25.6	16.5	22.9	22.5
25–50 per cent	0.1	2.9	12.5	36.5	22.5	25.5	23.5
50–100 per cent	0.2	1.5	10.9	26.0	38.4	23.1	30.1
Total	0.3	3.8	15.5	29.4	26.9	24.1	25.6
Turks (N= 18 245)							
0–5 per cent	9.3	5.6	16.7	18.5	7.4	42.6	27.0
5–10 per cent	1.3	17.5	19.9	25.6	16.8	19.0	20.1
10–25 per cent	0.4	3.5	29.1	37.8	13.5	15.6	16.0
25–50 per cent	0.1	1.5	10.6	57.6	17.1	13.1	15.9
50–100 per cent	0.2	0.9	8.6	25.2	54.4	10.7	14.8
Total	0.2	1.8	12.1	41.4	31.9	12.6	15.5
Moroccans (N = 18 931)							
0–5 per cent	11.1	25.0	2.7	25.0	16.7	19.4	15.5
5–10 per cent	1.1	16.9	21.9	28.7	14.3	17.2	24.8
10–25 per cent	0.4	4.9	24.3	39.6	14.1	16.7	15.2
25–50 per cent	0.2	1.8	13.5	56.4	16.1	12.0	14.0
50–100 per cent	0.1	1.3	10.7	29.4	46.7	11.8	13.0
Total	0.2	2.6	14.5	44.7	25.2	12.8	14.0

Sources: GBA data 2002; CBS (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek); authors' processing.

strongly decreases with the percentage of non-Western residents in the neighbourhood. Apparently, the people in these groups who live in districts with a low percentage of non-Western residents strongly resemble the native Dutch in their relocation behaviour, while those living in districts with a high percentage of non-Western residents rarely succeed in leaving the city. It seems therefore that few immigrants make the step in one go from a concentration neighbourhood to a location outside the city. The urban neighbourhoods with a lower percentage of ethnic groups may well serve as an intermediate step towards the suburbs, which would conform with the spatial assimilation model (see also Burgess, 1925).

### **Relocation Percentages According to Land of Origin and Type of District**

Table 5 shows, for each origin category, what percentage of the urban population in this group moved house in 2002. Of all the native Dutch, 11.9 per cent relocated. In comparison, in the whole of the Netherlands every year about 10 per cent of the population moves house. Turks and Moroccans show higher relocation percentages. In 2002, of all the Surinamese in the four big cities, 16.9 per cent moved house, as did as many as 25.6 per cent of the Antilleans. The differences between the groups can partly be explained by the differences in their age distribution. Bearing in mind that the Antillean group consists of many young people, it is logical that the percentage of immigrants relocating is high, because young people move more often than do older people. The poorer housing conditions of Antilleans could also contribute to the high residential mobility.

The last column of Table 5 shows for each origin category, by type of neighbourhood out of which people are moving, the percentage of the group that has relocated. For the native Dutch, this percentage runs from 8.5 per cent in districts with less than 5 per cent

of residents of non-Western origin to 14.6 per cent in districts where more than 50 per cent of the residents are of non-Western origin. This result seems to indicate a White flight of native residents from districts accommodating inhabitants of non-Western origin. The percentage of house movers also increases for Surinamese and Antilleans as the percentage of non-Western immigrants in their district increases. For Turks and Moroccans, the converse is the case. The greater the percentage of non-Western immigrants in the district, the smaller is the percentage of Turks and Moroccans who move out. This can indicate that Turks and Moroccans feel more comfortable in immigrant districts, but also that they are less successful than other groups in leaving these districts.

In order to get more insight into the explanations for the differences in spatial behaviour between minority ethnic groups, it would be instructive to examine differences in socio-economic background and life-cycle characteristics. The question is how much is left of the ethnic specificity in the moving behaviour of households if we control for these kinds of background variables. To answer this question, the next section presents an analysis based on two large surveys in the Netherlands: The Housing Demand Survey (HDS) 2002 and the Housing Research Netherlands (HRN) 2006 survey.

### **Neighbourhood Choice and Ethnic Specificity**

The HDS and HRN data are large samples that are person-based and representative of the Dutch population aged 18 and over but not living in institutions. The dataset contains not only information about the present housing situation, but also about residential mobility since two years before the interview. For those who moved in the past two years, the previous housing situation and the previous postal code are known.



The dataset contains geographical identifiers in the form of the postal code area. Four-digit postal code areas roughly correspond to the level of a neighbourhood. To make a distinction between concentration and non-concentration neighbourhoods, population data at the level of the postal code area, provided by Statistics Netherlands, are used.

We restricted our analyses to those who were heads of independent households and were living in one of four largest cities of the Netherlands. When we break down the figures by ethnic group, the numbers of respondents in the Housing Demand Survey 2002 and the Housing Research Netherlands (HRN) 2006 survey are fairly modest. Therefore, we have merged the four biggest ethnic minority groups to form two categories. Turks and Moroccans are combined to form one category. Secondly, Surinamese and Antilleans have been merged to form one category.

We consider a neighbourhood to be a concentration neighbourhood when the share of non-Western minority-group residents is

at least 40 per cent,<sup>1</sup> which is 10 per cent more than the average in the four big cities. In our analyses of the residential mobility between concentration neighbourhoods and other neighbourhoods, we have to distinguish between two groups: those who have lived in a concentration neighbourhood two years before the interview or have moved out of a dwelling in such a neighbourhood since then; and, those who have lived in a non-concentration neighbourhood or have moved out of a dwelling in such a neighbourhood since then. Not surprisingly, the majority (around three-quarters) of the Native Dutch and Western immigrants fall into the latter category, while the majority of the other groups (ranging from 53 per cent of the other non-Western immigrants to 65 per cent of the Turks and Moroccans) fit into the former category.

Not only are the non-Western categories strongly overrepresented in concentration neighbourhoods, but they do not move away from those areas very often (Table 6).<sup>2</sup> Only

**Table 6.** Residential mobility pattern of households by ethnicity and type of neighbourhood (percentages)

	Native Dutch	Surinamese and Antilleans	Turks and Moroccans	Other non-Western immigrants	Western immigrants
<i>Concentration neighbourhoods</i>					
Did not move	77.7	78.0	82.1	77.3	73.4
Moved to a concentration neighbourhood	6.4	13.1	10.8	13.8	7.8
Moved to a non-concentration neighbourhood	15.8	9.0	7.1	8.9	18.8
Number	2083	781	694	449	399
<i>Non-concentration neighbourhoods</i>					
Did not move	77.9	75.9	76.3	71.8	76.6
Moved to a non-concentration neighbourhood	20.4	17.8	14.5	21.9	20.5
Moved to a concentration neighbourhood	1.7	6.3	9.2	6.3	2.9
Number (unweighted)	6930	602	393	411	1060

Sources: Housing Demand Survey 2002; CBS/VROM; Housing Research Netherlands 2006, VROM.

seven per cent of the Turks and Moroccans in the concentration neighbourhoods had moved into a non-concentration neighbourhood and that percentage is only slightly higher for Surinamese and Antilleans, and other non-Western immigrants. Turks and Moroccans in non-concentration areas move relatively often to a concentration neighbourhood (almost 40 per cent of the Turkish and Moroccans movers), even compared with the other non-Western categories. Consistent with the picture drawn in the previous section, the pattern for native Dutch and Western immigrants is completely different. The proportion in these categories that moved into a concentration neighbourhood is very small, especially for those who already lived in a non-concentration neighbourhood.

The question is to what extent the differences in neighbourhood choices can be explained by differences in background characteristics. To answer this question, we performed a multinomial logistic regression analysis for households in the concentration neighbourhoods (Table 7) as well as for households in the non-concentration neighbourhoods (Table 8). In both tables, the dependent variable consists of three categories: not moving; moving to a concentration neighbourhood; and moving to a non-concentration neighbourhood. Of these categories, not moving is included as the reference category.

In each table, we present two models. The first model includes only ethnicity as independent variable. Model 2 is a full model in which the effect of ethnicity is controlled for all relevant variables that are available in the dataset—i.e. life-cycle characteristics (age and household composition), socioeconomic characteristics (income and level of education) and tenure. Further, we control for a period and a geographical variable. As the average proportion of non-Western minorities in the neighbourhood has risen in the course of the four years between HDS 2002 and HNR 2006 (from 28.9 to 32.5 per cent),

we included a dummy to distinguish between these two surveys. Furthermore, we added a dummy to distinguish between Utrecht and Amsterdam on the one hand and The Hague and Rotterdam on the other hand, as the housing market of the former cities is much tighter than the housing market of the latter cities.

For the purpose of this article, it is mainly important to look at what happens with the effects of ethnicity when the other variables are controlled for. Looking at the analysis of residential mobility out of concentration neighbourhoods, it can be concluded that the non-Western categories are much less likely to move into a non-concentration neighbourhood than are the Western immigrants and the native Dutch, even when differences in the control variables are taken into account. With respect to the moves out of non-concentration neighbourhoods (Table 8), the picture does not change in essence when we take background variables into account. Only for Turks and Moroccans and other non-Western immigrants can we conclude that their inclination to move to concentration neighbourhoods can to a limited extent be attributed to their background characteristics.<sup>3</sup>

We may conclude that there is an ethnic specificity in the moving behaviour of households. Even when we take all kinds of individual variables into account, minority groups still end up much more often in a concentration neighbourhood when they move than do the indigenous groups. One of the possible explanations for this ethnic specificity is that there are differences in neighbourhood preferences between the ethnic groups. It might be that native Dutch do prefer to live in a neighbourhood where they form the large majority and therefore try to avoid concentration neighbourhoods. On the basis of the HDS/HNR surveys, several indications can be found that would support this explanation.

**Table 7.** Multinomial logistic regression analysis of residential mobility out of concentration neighbourhoods

	<i>Model 1</i>		<i>Model 2</i>	
	<i>Moved to a concentration neighbourhood</i> B	<i>Moved to a non-concentration neighbourhood</i> B	<i>Moved to a concentration neighbourhood</i> B	<i>Moved to a non-concentration neighbourhood</i> B
<i>Group (ref = native Dutch)</i>				
Turks/Moroccans	0.469***	-0.868***	0.015	-1.208***
Surinamese/Antilleans	0.710***	-0.573***	0.539***	-0.615***
Other non-Western immigrants	0.772***	-0.563***	0.417**	-0.765***
Western immigrants	0.237***	0.221	0.112	0.068
<i>Urban housing market (ref = Rotterdam/The Hague)</i>				
Amsterdam/Utrecht			-0.034	-0.063
Age			-0.167***	-0.140***
Age squared (*10 <sup>-3</sup> )			1.246***	0.933***
<i>Household composition (ref = single)</i>				
Couple			-0.044	0.463***
Couple with children			-0.176	-0.334**
One-parent household			-0.169	-0.296
Other			0.245	0.117
Annual income (z-score)			0.062	0.147
<i>Level of education (ref = maximum primary school)</i>				
Lower vocational			-0.034	0.477**
Higher vocational			-0.211	0.801***
University			-0.203	0.864***
<i>Tenure (ref = rented)</i>				
Owner occupied			0.077	-0.192
<i>Period (ref = 2000–02)</i>				
2004–06			0.293***	0.028
Constant	-2.491***	-1.590***	2.199***	1.817***
	Initial -2 LL = 3712.6		Initial -2 LL = 3712.6	
	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 106.5; df=8;		Chi <sup>2</sup> = 551.7; df = 22;	
	Sig. = 0.000;		Sig. = 0.000;	
	Nagelkerke's R <sup>2</sup> = 0.032		Nagelkerke's R <sup>2</sup> = 0.197	

\* =  $p < 0.10$ ; \*\* =  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* =  $p < 0.01$ .

Sources: Housing Demand Survey 2002, CBS/VROM; Housing Research Netherlands 2006, VROM.

Respondents in the survey were asked whether they agreed or not with several statements on their neighbourhood. For every ethnic category, there is a negative association between the proportion of non-Western

minorities in the neighbourhood and the satisfaction with the population composition (Table 9). This association is strongest for the native Dutch and weakest for Turks and Moroccans. Except for Turks/Moroccans and

**Table 8.** Multinomial logistic regression analysis of residential mobility out of non-concentration neighbourhoods

	<i>Model 1</i>		<i>Model 2</i>	
	<i>Moved to a concentration neighbourhood</i> <i>B</i>	<i>Moved to a non-concentration neighbourhood</i> <i>B</i>	<i>Moved to a concentration neighbourhood</i> <i>B</i>	<i>Moved to a non-concentration neighbourhood</i> <i>B</i>
<i>Group (ref=native Dutch)</i>				
Turks/Moroccans	−0.342**	1.706***	−0.679***	1.134***
Surinamese/Antilleans	−0.110	1.351***	−0.133	1.138***
Other non-Western immigrants	0.150	1.414***	−0.110	0.892***
Western immigrants	0.018	0.547***	−0.031	0.498**
<i>Urban housing market (ref= Rotterdam/The Hague)</i>				
Amsterdam/Utrecht			0.055	−0.147
Age			−0.185***	−0.145***
Age squared (* 10 <sup>3</sup> )			1.363***	0.726**
<i>Household composition (ref=single)</i>				
Couple			0.562***	0.629***
Couple with children			0.342***	−0.217
One-parent-household			0.230**	−0.688**
Other			0.143	0.167
Annual income (z-score)			0.107***	−0.117
<i>Level of education (ref= maximum primary school)</i>				
Lower vocational			−0.286**	0.330
Higher vocational			−0.040	0.223
University			0.056	−0.148
<i>Tenure (ref=rented)</i>				
Owner occupied			−0.380***	−1.046***
<i>Period (ref= 2000–02)</i>				
2004–06			0.019	0.596***
Constant			3.658***	0.794
	Initial −2 LL = 11603.5; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 116.5; df=8; Sig. = 0.000; Nagelkerke's R <sup>2</sup> = 0.017		Initial −2 LL = 11603.5; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1630.7; df = 34; Sig. = 0.000; Nagelkerke's R <sup>2</sup> = 0.225	

\* =  $p < 0.10$ ; \*\* =  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* =  $p < 0.01$ .*Sources:* Housing Demand Survey 2002, CBS/VROM; Housing Research Netherlands 2006, VROM.

Surinamese/Antilleans, there is also a negative relation between living in a concentration neighbourhood and social ties with people in the neighbourhood. For none of the groups

is a positive association found, although the availability of social ties within the own ethnic group is often seen as an advantage of a concentration neighbourhood (Bolt *et al.*, 1998).

Of course, we might have found a relation if we had information on the percentage of one's own ethnic group in the neighbourhood.

On the basis of Table 9, it can also be concluded that the ethnic composition of the neighbourhood has an influence on the moving wishes of households. For every category, a higher proportion of ethnic minorities in the neighbourhood increases the chance that one wants to leave the neighbourhood. Again, this association is substantially stronger for the native Dutch and the Western immigrants than for the other groups. This difference also holds when differences in background variables are controlled for (van Ham and Feijten, 2008). This supports the idea that ethnic differences in neighbourhood choices are at least partly explained by differences in neighbourhood preferences.

## Conclusions

Although the level of ethnic segregation in the biggest Dutch cities is fairly stable or even declining (in the case of Rotterdam), there is an increasing concern among politicians about the (supposedly) detrimental effects of segregation on the integration of minority ethnic groups. Undoubtedly, this concern is partly brought about by the increasing share of ethnic groups in the cities. As a consequence, the average member of a minority ethnic group now lives in a district with a lower share of native Dutch than a few years ago, despite the fact that the level of ethnic segregation did not increase.

To combat the negative effects of socioeconomic and ethnic concentration, the Dutch government has implemented an ambitious social mixing policy, mainly leaning on urban renewal. This urban renewal policy is based on a number of assumptions which are questionable

- (1) The residential concentration of minority ethnic groups hampers their integration into Dutch society.

- (2) Mixing of ethnic groups leads to social interaction between different groups. Moreover, people with a higher social status may act as positive role models for the other residents.
- (3) Ethnic segregation is the result of socioeconomic segregation and socioeconomic segregation is the consequence of the spatial distribution of affordable housing.

The first assumption disregards the possibility that concentrations may have a positive effect. Even proponents of the spatial assimilation model see ethnic concentration as a haven for integration and adaptation (Dunn, 1998). Moreover, little research has been done in the Netherlands into the effects of ethnic concentration. In one study, it is found that living in concentration neighbourhoods has a negative effect on the number of contacts with native Dutch (Gijssberts and Dagevos, 2005), but is not clear how this relates to social mobility or acculturation.

With regard to the second assumption, existing studies on mixed developments do not justify the optimism concerning the social interaction between (ethnic) groups, let alone the possibilities for social mobility that should arise from that. Moreover, the idea that people with a higher social status might act as positive role models is patronising and based on unfounded assumptions with regard to differences in values between ethnic and socioeconomic categories.

Finally, the idea that differentiation is an effective means of combating segregation disregards the fact that spatial segregation is determined by a large number of factors, many of which are unrelated to the housing stock characteristics of neighbourhoods (Musterd, 2003; van Kempen and Özüekren, 1998). In this paper, we have specifically looked at ethnic-specific differences with regard to neighbourhood choice. We have found that native Dutch and Western immigrants are much more likely than non-Western groups to

**Table 9.** Reaction to statements about the neighbourhood by ethnicity and neighbourhood type

	Percentage of non-Western minorities				Kendall's Tau-c
	0–10	10–25	25–50	50–100	
<i>Percentage that is satisfied with the population composition</i>					
Native Dutch	87.1	78.6	61.4	48.0	– 0.220**
Surinamese/Antillians	94.6	79.7	74.0	60.5	– 0.151**
Turks/Moroccans	73.9	79.0	70.5	64.3	– 0.084**
Other non-Western immigrants	75.4	82.2	69.8	61.4	– 0.124**
Western immigrants	85.2	78.3	67.1	52.4	– 0.183**
<i>Percentage that states having a lot of social contacts with other people in the neighbourhood</i>					
Native Dutch	40.3	38.0	33.2	33.3	– 0.063**
Surinamese/Antillians	37.5	40.5	36.3	35.7	– 0.029
Turks/Moroccans	43.5	46.3	42.0	44.5	0.016
Other non-Western immigrants	37.7	38.1	29.0	29.2	– 0.076*
Western immigrants	41.3	35.3	32.7	32.6	– 0.051*
<i>Percentage that wants to move out of the neighbourhood</i>					
Native Dutch	13.6	19.8	26.8	30.9	0.117**
Surinamese/Antillians	23.2	22.9	28.4	33.8	0.079*
Turks/Moroccans	39.1	28.4	33.0	37.3	0.034
Other non-Western immigrants	31.9	30.2	32.4	33.6	0.065*
Western immigrants	16.8	24.4	28.4	32.6	0.118 **

\*\* =  $p < 0.01$ ; \* =  $p < 0.05$ .

Sources: Housing Demand Survey 2002, CBS/VROM; Housing Research Netherlands 2006, VROM.

move out of concentration neighbourhoods and to opt more often for neighbourhoods with a low proportion of minorities. The other groups succeed in leaving the concentration neighbourhoods to a much lesser extent. There is less outflow and much more through-flow within concentration neighbourhoods. The inflow into concentration neighbourhoods from the rest of the Netherlands and from abroad is greater. This inflow strengthens the segregation in cities and conforms with the findings of Latten and colleagues (2005) that the concentration of immigrants in the Netherlands is increasing. The Turks and Moroccans in the four big cities are noteworthy in two important ways. First, there is much more through-flow within concentration neighbourhoods. Secondly, the percentage of house movers who leave the city is lower,

as the percentage of non-Western residents in the district is higher. This seems to suggest that Turks and Moroccans are particularly unsuccessful in moving out of concentration neighbourhoods.

The ethnic differences in neighbourhood choices can only to a very limited extent be attributed to differences in socioeconomic status. The reluctance of many native Dutch to live in a neighbourhood with a substantial proportion of members of minority ethnic groups forms a major obstacle for urban policy aimed at countering segregation. While the policy discourse focuses on the need to combat the concentration of minority ethnic groups, it is hardly possible to deal with one of its main causes—i.e. the self-segregation tendencies among the native majority.

An important challenge for researchers is to search more deeply for the reasons for these ethnic differences in neighbourhood choices (Emerson *et al.*, 2001; Harris, 2001). Do native Dutch avoid concentration neighbourhoods because they are averse to living amongst minority ethnic groups (consistent with the pure 'race' hypothesis) or is it that the presence of a (substantial number of) members of minority ethnic groups stands for other characteristics of the neighbourhood (consistent with the 'racial' proxy hypothesis). Future quantitative research on neighbourhood choice should take into account relevant neighbourhood amenities that are associated with the ethnic composition of the neighbourhood, while qualitative research may shed more light into the motivations that underlie the neighbourhood choice of households.

## Notes

1. Of course, the choice to define a concentration neighbourhood as an area where the share of minority-group residents is at least 40 per cent is somewhat arbitrarily. Therefore, we also used two other dividing lines (35 per cent and 45 per cent) to distinguish between concentration neighbourhoods and other neighbourhoods. These different dividing lines turned out not to yield noticeably different regression models from the ones that are presented in this paper.
2. The percentages in Table 6 are weighted percentages. The reason is that about 12 per cent of the respondents who had moved in the previous two years could not recall their previous postal code. In those instances, we could not determine whether they had come from a concentration neighbourhood or a non-concentration neighbourhood. In order to compensate for the underrepresentation of those who had moved away, we gave extra weight in the analyses to the answers of those who did remember the postal code of their previous dwelling.
3. This is concluded on the basis of the differences between the two regression coefficients. For Turks and Moroccans and other non-Western immigrants, this difference is somewhat smaller in model 2 than in model 1 (Table 8).

## References

- Aalbers, M. B. (2005) Who's afraid of red, yellow and green? Redlining in Rotterdam, *Geoforum*, 36, pp. 562–580.
- Aelbers, O., Smeets, J. and Ven, H. van der (1991) *Op hun plaats? Allochtonen en moeilijk verhuurbare woningcomplexen*. Ministerie van VROM, Den Haag.
- Amersfoort, H. van (1992) Ethnic residential patterns in a welfare state: lessons from Amsterdam, *New Community*, 18, pp. 439–456.
- Anderson, E. (1999) *Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Andersson, R. (2006) 'Breaking segregation': rhetorical construct or effective policy?, *Urban Studies*, 43, pp. 787–799.
- Atkinson, R. and Kintrea, K. (2000) Owner-occupation, social mix and neighbourhood impacts, *Policy & Politics*, 28, pp. 93–108.
- Beckhoven, E. van and Kempen, R. van (2003) Social effects of urban restructuring: a case study in Amsterdam and Utrecht, the Netherlands, *Housing Studies*, 18, pp. 853–875.
- Boal, F. W. (1976) Ethnic residential segregation, in: D. T. Herbert and R. J. Johnston (Eds) *Social Areas in Cities*, pp. 41–79. London: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bolt, G. (2001) *Wooncarrières van Turken en Marokkanen in ruimtelijk perspectief*. Utrecht: Faculteit Ruimtelijke Wetenschappen.
- Bolt, G. (2004) Over spreidingsbeleid en drijfzand, *Migrantenstudies*, 20, pp. 60–73.
- Bolt, G. and Kempen, R. van (2000) Concentratie en segregatie in Nederlandse steden, in: R. van Kempen, P. Hooimeijer, G. Bolt *et al.* (Eds) *Segregatie en Concentratie in Nederlandse Steden: Mogelijke Effecten en Mogelijk Beleid*, pp. 13–34. Assen: van Gorcum.
- Bolt, G. and Kempen, R. van (2002) *Wonen in multiculturele steden*. Ministerie van VROM, Den Haag.

- Bolt, G., Burgers, J. and Kempen, R. van (1998) On the social significance of spatial location: spatial segregation and social inclusion, *Netherlands Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 13, pp. 83–95.
- Bolt, G., Hooimeijer, P. and Kempen, R. van (2002) Ethnic segregation in the Netherlands: new patterns, new policies?, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 93, pp. 214–220.
- Bowes, A. M., Dar, N. S. and Sim, D. F. (2002) Differentiation in housing careers: the case of Pakistanis in the UK, *Housing Studies*, 17, pp. 381–399.
- Bramley, G. and Morgan, J. (2003) Building competitiveness and cohesion: the role of new housebuilding in central Scotland's cities, *Housing Studies*, 18, pp. 447–471.
- Brophy, P. C. and Smith, R. N. (1997) Mixed-income housing: factors for success, *Cityscape*, 3, pp. 3–31.
- Buck, N. (2001) Identifying neighbourhood effects on social exclusion, *Urban Studies*, 38, pp. 2251–2275.
- Burgers, J. and Lugt, H. van der (2005) 'Zwarte vlucht': the suburbanisation of Surinamers from Rotterdam, *Sociologie*, 1, pp. 126–142.
- Burgess, E. W. (1925) The growth of the city: an introduction to a research project, in: R. E. Park, E. W. Burgess and R. D. McKenzie (Eds) *The City*, pp. 47–62. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Charles, C. Z. (2003) Dynamics of residential segregation, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29, pp. 167–207.
- Clark, W. A. V. (1991) Residential preferences and neighborhood racial segregation: a test of the Schelling segregation model, *Demography*, 28, pp. 1–19.
- 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.
- Crump, J. (2002) Deconcentration by demolition: public housing, poverty, and urban policy, *Environment and Planning D*, 20, pp. 581–596.
- Dekker, K. and Bolt, G. (2005) Social cohesion in post-war estates in the Netherlands: differences between socioeconomic and ethnic groups, *Urban Studies*, 42, pp. 2447–2770.
- Duncan, G., Brooks-Gunn, J. and Klebanov, P. (1994) Economic deprivation and early childhood development, *Child Development*, 65, pp. 296–318.
- Dunn, K. M. (1998) Rethinking ethnic concentration: the case of Cabramatta, Sydney, *Urban Studies*, 35, pp. 503–524.
- Emerson, M. O., Yancey, G. and Chai, K. J. (2001) Does race matter in residential segregation? Exploring the preferences of White Americans, *American Sociological Review*, 66, pp. 922–935.
- Friedrichs, J. and Blasius, J. (2003) Social norms in distressed neighbourhoods: testing the Wilson hypothesis, *Housing Studies*, 18, pp. 807–826.
- Galster, G. C. (1999) The evolving challenges of fair housing since 1968: open housing, integration, and the reduction of ghettoization, *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 4, pp. 123–138.
- Galster, G. C. (2005) *Neighbourhood mix, social opportunities, and the policy challenges of an increasingly diverse Amsterdam*. Wibaut Lecture, Institute for Metropolitan and International Development, Amsterdam.
- Galster, G. C., Metzger, K. and Waite, R. (1999) Neighborhood opportunity structures and immigrants' socioeconomic advancement, *Journal of Housing Research*, 10, pp. 95–127.
- Gans, H. J. (1961) The balanced community: homogeneity or heterogeneity in residential areas?, *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 27, pp. 176–184.
- Giffinger, R. (1998) Segregation in Vienna: impacts of market barriers and rent regulations, *Urban Studies*, 35, pp. 1791–1812.
- Gijsberts, M. and Dagevos, J. (2005) *Uit elkaars buurt: de invloed van etnische concentratie op integratie en beeldvorming*. Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, Den Haag.
- Glebe, G. (1997) Urban economic restructuring and ethnic segregation in Düsseldorf, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 8, pp. 147–157.
- Gordon, M. M. (1964) *Assimilation in American Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Groot, C. de (2004) 'Zwarte vlucht': de sub(urbane) locatiekeuze van klassieke allochtonen in Amsterdam. Ministerie van VROM, Den Haag.
- Ham, M. van and Feijten, P. (2008) Who wants to leave the neighbourhood? The effect on



- moving wishes of being different from the neighbourhood population, *Environment and Planning A*, 40 (forthcoming).
- Harris, D. R. (2001) Why are Whites and Blacks averse to black neighbors?, *Social Science Research*, 30, pp. 100–116.
- Huis, L. T. van and Nicolaas, J. M. M. (2000) Allochtonen en hun verhuisgedrag, *Allochtonen in Nederland 2000*, pp. 15–19. CBS, Voorburg.
- Ihlanfeldt, K. R. and Scafidi, B. (2004) Whites' neighbourhood racial preferences and neighbourhood racial composition in the United States: evidence from the multi-city study of urban inequality, *Housing Studies*, 19, pp. 325–359.
- Ihlanfeldt, K. R. and Sjoquist, D. L. (1998) The spatial mismatch hypothesis: a review of recent studies and their publications for welfare reform, *Housing Policy Debate*, 9, pp. 849–892.
- Joseph, M. L., Chaskin, R. J. and Webber, H. S. (2007) The theoretical basis for addressing poverty through mixed-income development, *Urban Affairs Review*, 42, pp. 369–409.
- Kempen, R. van (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.
- Kempen, R. van and Bolt, G. (2002) Is falend grotestedenbeleid oorzaak LPF-winst?, *Geografie*, 11, pp. 21–25.
- Kempen, R. van and Özüekren, A. S. (1998) Ethnic segregation in cities: new forms and explanations in a dynamic world, *Urban Studies*, 35, pp. 1631–1656.
- Kempen, R. van and Priemus, H. (1999) Undivided cities in the Netherlands: present situation and political rhetoric, *Housing Studies*, 14, pp. 641–657.
- Kempen, R. van and Priemus, H. (2002) Revolution in social housing in the Netherlands: possible effects of new housing policies, *Urban Studies*, 39, pp. 237–253.
- Klaauw, B. van der and Ours, J. C. van (2003) From welfare to work: does the neighborhood matter?, *Journal of Public Economics*, 87, pp. 957–985.
- Kleinhans, R. (2004) Social implications of housing diversification in urban renewal: a review of recent literature, *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 19, pp. 367–390.
- Laan Bouma-Doff, W. van der (2005) *Een gekleurd beeld van wonen - De woonsituatie van niet-westerse allochtonen*. Den Haag: Ministerie van VROM.
- Latten, J., Nicolaas, H. and Wittebrood, K. (2005) Concentratie allochtonen toegenomen, *Bevolkingstrends*, 53(3), pp. 90–95.
- Liebersohn, S. (1961) The impact of residential segregation on ethnic assimilation, *Social Forces*, 40, pp. 52–57.
- Logan, J. R. and Alba, R. D. (1993) Locational returns to human capital: minority access to suburban community resources, *Demography*, 30, pp. 243–267.
- Massey, D. S. (1985) Ethnic residential segregation: a theoretical synthesis and empirical review, *Sociology and Social Research*, 69, pp. 315–350.
- Massey, D. S. and Denton, N. A. (1988) The dimensions of residential segregation, *Social Forces*, 67, pp. 281–315.
- Massey, D. S. and Denton, N. A. (1993) *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Massey, D. S. and Fong, E. (1990) Segregation and neighborhood quality: Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians in the San Francisco metropolitan area, *Social Forces*, 69, pp. 15–32.
- Ministerie van Justitie (2004) *Kabinetsreactie op het rapport 'Bruggen Bouwen' van de tijdelijke commissie onderzoek integratiebeleid*. s-Gravenhage: SDU.
- Ministerie van Justitie (2005) *Jaarnota integratiebeleid 2005*. Ministerie van Justitie, Den Haag.
- Ministerie VROM (1997) *Nota stedelijke vernieuwing*. Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer, Den Haag.
- 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., Ostendorf, W. and Breebaart, M. (1998) *Multi-ethnic Metropolis: Patterns and Policies*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Musterd, S., Ostendorf, W. and Vos, S. de (2003) Neighbourhood effects and social mobility: a longitudinal analysis, *Housing Studies*, 18, pp. 877–892.
- Musterd, S., Priemus, H. and Kempen, R. van (1999) Towards undivided cities: the potential of economic revitalisation and housing redifferentiation, *Housing Studies*, 14, pp. 573–584.
- Overman, H. G. (2002) Neighbourhood effects in large and small neighbourhoods, *Urban Studies*, 39, pp. 117–130.
- Özüekren, A. S. and Kempen, R. van (2003) Dynamics and diversity: housing careers and segregation of minority ethnic groups, *Housing, Theory and Society*, 20, pp. 162–171.
- Park, R. E. (1925) The city: suggestions for the investigation of human behavior in the urban environment, in: R. E. Park, E. W. Burgess and R. D. McKenzie (Eds) *The City*, pp. 1–46. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Phillips, D. (1998) Black minority ethnic concentration and dispersal in Britain, *Urban Studies*, 35, pp. 1681–1702.
- Phillips, D. and Karn, V. (1992) Race and housing in a property owning democracy, *New Community*, 18, pp. 355–369.
- Portes, A. and Zhou, M. (1993) The new second generation: segmented assimilation and its variants, *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530, pp. 74–96.
- Robinson, V. (1981) The development of South Asian settlement in Britain and the myth of return, in: C. Peach, V. Robinson and S. Smith (Eds) *Ethnic Segregation in Cities*, pp. 149–169. London: Croom Helm.
- Rosenbaum, J. E., Stroh, L. K. and Flynn, C. A. (1998) Lake Parc Place: a study of mixed-income housing, *Housing Policy Debate*, 9, pp. 703–740.
- Sampson, R., Raudenbush, S. and Earls, F. (1997) Neighbourhoods and violent crime: a multilevel study of collective efficacy, *Science*, 277, pp. 918–924.
- Schelling, T. C. (1969) Models of segregation, *The American Economic Review*, 59, pp. 488–493.
- SCP (Sociaal en Cultureel Plan Bureau), WODC (Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek- en Documentatiecentrum) and CBS (Central Bureau for Statistics) (2005) *Jaarrapport integratie 2005*. SCP/WODC/CBS, Den Haag.
- South, S. J. and Crowder, K. D. (1998) Leaving the 'hood': residential mobility between Black, White and integrated neighborhoods, *American Sociological Review*, 63, pp. 17–26.
- South, S. J., Crowder, K. and Chavez, E. (2005) Migration and spatial assimilation among US Latinos: classical versus segmented trajectories, *Demography*, 42, pp. 497–521.
- Uitermark, J. (2003) 'Social mixing' and the management of disadvantaged neighbourhoods: the Dutch policy of urban restructuring revisited, *Urban Studies*, 40, pp. 531–549.
- Uunk, W. (2002) *Concentratie en Achterstand: Over de Samenhang Tussen Etnische Concentratie en de Sociaal-economische Positie onder Allochtonen en Autochtonen*. Assen: van Gorcum.
- Uunk, W. and Dominguez Martinez, S. (2002) *Wijken in Beweging: Migratie in en Uit Concentratiewijken*. Assen: Koninklijke van Gorcum.
- Veldboer, L., Kleinhans, R. and Duyvendak, J. W. (2002) The diversified neighbourhood in Western Europe and the United States: how do countries deal with the spatial distribution of economic and cultural differences?, *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 3, pp. 41–64.
- White, M. J. (1983) The measurement of spatial segregation, *American Journal of Sociology*, 88, pp. 1008–1019.
- Wilkes, R. and Iceland, J. (2004) Hypersegregation in the twenty-first century, *Demography*, 41, pp. 23–36.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987) *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass and Public Policy*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Yinger, J. (1999) Sustaining the Fair Housing Act, *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 4, pp. 93–106.