

IZA DP No. 8461

## **Ethnic Differences in Realising Desires to Leave the Neighbourhood**

Sanne Boschman  
Reinout Kleinhans  
Maarten van Ham

September 2014

# **Ethnic Differences in Realising Desires to Leave the Neighbourhood**

**Sanne Boschman**

*Delft University of Technology  
and PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency*

**Reinout Kleinhans**

*Delft University of Technology*

**Maarten van Ham**

*Delft University of Technology,  
University of St Andrews and IZA*

Discussion Paper No. 8461  
September 2014

IZA

P.O. Box 7240  
53072 Bonn  
Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0  
Fax: +49-228-3894-180  
E-mail: [iza@iza.org](mailto:iza@iza.org)

Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of IZA. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but the institute itself takes no institutional policy positions. The IZA research network is committed to the IZA Guiding Principles of Research Integrity.

The Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) in Bonn is a local and virtual international research center and a place of communication between science, politics and business. IZA is an independent nonprofit organization supported by Deutsche Post Foundation. The center is associated with the University of Bonn and offers a stimulating research environment through its international network, workshops and conferences, data service, project support, research visits and doctoral program. IZA engages in (i) original and internationally competitive research in all fields of labor economics, (ii) development of policy concepts, and (iii) dissemination of research results and concepts to the interested public.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

## ABSTRACT

### **Ethnic Differences in Realising Desires to Leave the Neighbourhood**

Selective mobility into and out of neighbourhoods is one of the driving forces of segregation. Empirical research has revealed who wants to leave certain types of neighbourhoods or who leaves certain neighbourhoods. A factor which has received little attention so far is that some residents will have a desire to leave their neighbourhood, but are unable to do so. The residential mobility literature shows that the discrepancy between moving desires and actual mobility is larger for ethnic minorities than for natives. This paper uses a unique combination of register data and survey data. We combine data from a large housing survey in the Netherlands (WoON) with longitudinal register data from the Netherlands (SSB), which contains individual level information on residential mobility histories. This allows us to study which households with a wish to leave their neighbourhood are actually successful, and to which neighbourhoods they move. A more thorough insight in who wants to leave which neighbourhoods but is unable to do so will contribute to a better understanding of the drivers of segregation, especially in the context of the debate on voluntary segregation versus segregation due to a lack of choice. We find that ethnic minority groups are less likely to realise a desire to leave their neighbourhood and that if they succeed in moving from an ethnic minority concentration or poverty neighbourhood, they are more likely to end up in another minority concentration or poverty neighbourhood than native residents.

JEL Classification: J15, R23

Keywords: ethnic minorities, selective mobility, segregation, neighbourhoods, moving desires

Corresponding author:

Sanne Boschman  
OTB - Research for the Built Environment  
Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment  
Delft University of Technology  
PO Box 5030  
2600 GA Delft  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: [S.E.Boschman@tudelft.nl](mailto:S.E.Boschman@tudelft.nl)

## Introduction

Selective mobility into and out of neighbourhoods is one of the driving forces of ethnic and socio-economic segregation. The segregation literature gives insight in the interrelatedness of neighbourhood characteristics and residential mobility. Selective residential mobility will affect neighbourhood characteristics and, in turn, neighbourhood characteristics can be a trigger to move. As Logan and Alba (1993) state, it is important to study (the causes of) ethnic or racial differences in residential outcomes, because of the strong effects residential location can have on social opportunities (Friedrichs et al. 2003; Wilson 1987).

Much research has focussed on features of residents who want to leave certain types of neighbourhoods or of residents actually leaving these neighbourhoods. These studies give insight in which neighbourhood characteristics are a reason to (want to) leave and how this differs between population groups. People who are different from the majority population of the neighbourhood are found to be more likely to leave the neighbourhood (Bolt and Van Kempen 2003; Schaake et al. 2010; South and Crowder 1998; Van Ham and Clark 2009), which may result in reproduction of segregation. Similarly, models are estimated on *who wants to leave* the neighbourhood (Feijten and Van Ham 2009; Kearns and Parkes 2003; Lee et al. 1994). Van Ham and Feijten (2008) find that people who are different from the neighbourhood population are more likely to *want to leave*.

However, we do neither know who actually succeed in leaving their neighbourhood if they express a desire to leave, nor what neighbourhoods they move to. More insight in this matter is important to better understand segregation, especially in the context of the scientific debate on voluntary and involuntary segregation. Not only the desire to leave the neighbourhood may be selective, but also the probability of success. If there are differences between ethnic or racial groups in the wish to leave certain neighbourhoods, segregation might be voluntary. However, if they want to leave, but are less successful than others in leaving, this may indicate that segregation is involuntary. So far, segregation literature has devoted little attention to the relationship between moving desires and actual mobility.

In the *residential mobility* literature, several studies analyse the relationship between moving wishes and moving behaviour. These studies reveal a large discrepancy between a desire to move and actual moving behaviour. The majority of people with a desire to move, do not move within one or two years (Crowder 2001; De Groot *et al.* 2011; Kan 1999; Lu 1999).

In Europe, ethnic minority groups are found to be especially unsuccessful in realising their desires to move (Boschman and De Groot 2011) and in the United States, Blacks are found to be less successful than Whites (Crowder 2001; Kan 1999).

In this paper we create a link between the segregation literature and the residential mobility literature. We study who is successful in realising their desire to leave the neighbourhood and thereby focus on differences between ethnic groups. Hence, the focus in this paper is on individuals who expressed a desire to leave their neighbourhood. Firstly, we analyse who is successful in realising their desire to leave. In earlier research ethnic minorities have been found to be less successful in realising moving wishes. Does this also imply that they are less successful in realising a wish to leave the neighbourhood?

Secondly we study who are successful in *leaving which neighbourhoods*. Ethnic minorities (in Europe) as well as Blacks, Hispanics and Asians (in the American literature), have been found to be less likely than the native majority to leave poverty neighbourhoods (Bolt and Van Kempen 2003; Quillian 2003; South et al. 2005) or minority concentration neighbourhoods (Bolt and Van Kempen 2010; Pais et al. 2009). An important question is whether ethnic minorities are less successful than others in leaving these neighbourhoods, also *if they have expressed a wish to leave*.

Thirdly, we will examine the extent to which respondents manage to escape poverty or concentration neighbourhoods. For individuals with a desire to leave their neighbourhood and

who live in poverty or ethnic minority concentration neighbourhoods, we analyse if they succeed in realising their wish to leave and whether they manage to move to a more affluent or less concentrated neighbourhood.

In sum, our aim is twofold: 1) to reveal differences between population groups in realising desires to leave their neighbourhood, and 2) to reveal differences in escaping from poverty neighbourhoods or ethnic minority concentration neighbourhoods among people who state they want to leave their neighbourhood. The segregation literature will benefit from more insights in the characteristics of people who are (un)able to leave undesired neighbourhoods.

This paper uses an innovative combination of register data and survey data. We use data from a large housing survey in the Netherlands (WoON) on the wish to leave the neighbourhood, and we combine these data with longitudinal register data from the Netherlands (SSB), which contains individual level information on residential mobility histories. This unique combination of complementary datasets allows us to study which households with a desire to leave their neighbourhood subsequently realise their desire and to which neighbourhoods they move. Knowledge about who does not realise their desire to leave particular neighbourhoods provides insight in the role of choice in the process of segregation.

## **Theory**

Segregation refers to the unequal distribution of population groups over space. Residential mobility patterns are crucial drivers behind the process of segregation. Starting with the Chicago School (Park et al. 1925) many researchers have described the nature of segregation and the role of selective mobility patterns in (re)producing segregation (Clark 1991; Schelling 1971). To understand selective mobility patterns, researchers have tried to gain insight in individual differences in mobility behaviour.

Many researchers have found ethnic or racial differences in residential mobility behaviour and outcomes. Blacks are found to be less likely than Whites to move to suburbs (Logan and Alba 1993) and are more likely to move to poverty neighbourhoods (Clark et al. 2006) or Black concentration neighbourhoods (Clark and Ledwith 2007; South and Crowder 1998). Also in Europe, ethnic minorities are found to be less likely to move to poverty neighbourhoods (Bolt and Van Kempen 2003) or minority concentration neighbourhoods (Brama 2006; Doff 2010). Similarly, ethnic minority groups, or Blacks, Hispanics and Asians, are found to be less likely to leave minority neighbourhoods (Bolt and Van Kempen 2010; Pais et al. 2009; South and Crowder 1998) or poverty neighbourhoods (Bolt and Van Kempen 2003; Quillian 2003; South et al. 2005; South and Crowder 1997). To understand individual mobility behaviour and the relation between moving desires and their realisation, insight is needed in the residential mobility theory.

### ***Residential Mobility***

Researchers from Rossi (1955) onwards have attempted to describe and explain residential mobility processes. Early theorists assumed that a discrepancy between the preferred and the actual housing situation leads to residential stress or dissatisfaction (Speare et al. 1975; Wolpert 1966) and if residential stress reaches a threshold level, it will trigger a desire to move (Brown and Moore 1970). Households with a desire to move will search for housing opportunities that better fulfil their residential needs (Brown and Moore 1970). However, moving desires will not always be fulfilled. Some groups will be more successful than others in realising their desire to move (Lu 1999). Many factors compound the relation between satisfaction, moving intentions and actual moves, and thus result in behavioural inconsistencies in residential mobility (De Groot et al. 2011; Lu 1999). Whether households will be able to translate mobility desires into an actual move depends on their personal preferences, resources and restrictions, as well as the

opportunities and limitations imposed by the local housing market (Mulder and Hooimeijer 1999).

A high income increases the opportunities to improve the housing situation, while renters can more easily move because their transaction costs related to the move are much lower than for owner-occupiers (Mulder and Hooimeijer 1999; Murie 1974; Priemus 1984). Larger households have higher moving costs and have to take into account accessibility of jobs, schools and facilities for all household members when searching a new dwelling (Schwartz 1973). Large households will thus be less successful in realising their moving wishes, also because they are more constrained in terms of the size of the dwelling. Furthermore, social ties within the neighbourhood may prevent residential mobility (Dawkins 2006; Parkes et al. 2002). A social network within the neighbourhood can provide cheap alternatives to costly services such as day-care for children, transportation and recreation (Connerly 1986; DaVanzo 1981). This type of social capital is location specific and difficult to redevelop after moving (DaVanzo 1981). Especially low-income and minority households are found to rely on this type of social capital (Portes 1998). These groups thus have higher costs of leaving the neighbourhood and will therefore be less likely to leave. Possibly, they are also less successful in leaving their neighbourhood even if they do have a desire to leave. Finally, local housing market opportunities and the macro-level economic situation affect opportunities of individuals to find a better housing situation and thus to realise their desire to move (De Groot et al. 2008; Lu 1998).

Many studies test whether individuals actually *realise* their desire to move. These studies often find a large discrepancy between desires, expectations or intentions to move<sup>1</sup> and actual moving behaviour (Crowder 2001; De Groot et al. 2011; Kan 1999; Landale and Guest 1985; Lee et al. 1994; Lu 1999; Moore 1986). The majority of people who stated they want to move, do not realise their moving desire within one or two years (Crowder 2001; De Groot et al. 2011; Kan 1999, Lu 1999). High income households are more likely to realise their desires (Boschman and De Groot 2011; Crowder 2001; Moore 1986). Blacks or ethnic minorities are less successful in realising their desire to move (Boschman and De Groot 2011; Crowder 2001; De Groot et al 2011; Kan 1999; Moore 1986). The same often applies to larger households (De Groot et al 2008; Kan 1999). For some characteristics, findings are mixed. Older people are less likely to realise their desire to move (De Groot et al. 2008; Moore 1986), but Kan (1999) finds no significant effect of age. Owners are found to be more successful by some researchers (De Groot et al 2008) and less successful by others (Kan 1999; Moore 1986).

### ***Linking Segregation and Residential Mobility; the Role of the Neighbourhood***

According to residential mobility theory, households reveal a desire to move if they are dissatisfied with their current housing situation. In the households' evaluation of their housing situation, both dwelling and neighbourhood characteristics are important (Clark et al. 2006). Neighbourhood change can create a discrepancy between the preferred and the actual housing situation and therefore trigger a desire to move (Wolpert 1966). Moreover, impending or planned events in life course trajectories, such as changes in household composition (starting a family) or socioeconomic situation (income increase) will result in a changing evaluation of both the

---

<sup>1</sup> In residential mobility literature many studies have been done on the realisation of mobility desires, intentions or expectations. Most papers do not pay attention to the differences between these concepts, however, Coulter and colleagues (2011) show that that desires and expectations are different and have a different impact on subsequent behaviour. In our research we use the terms desires or wishes, because in our data, people are asked about their moving desires and their desires to leave the neighbourhood. We are, however, aware that other researchers have used other concepts which make their outcomes less comparable.

dwelling and the neighbourhood (Lee et al. 1994). A neighbourhood that was in line with the residential preferences of a couple might not meet their needs and standards anymore once they are planning to start a family. Hence, neighbourhood characteristics such as low school quality or nuisance, that were not considered problematic previously, can suddenly fuel a desire to leave the neighbourhood.

Much research has been done on which neighbourhood characteristics are a reason to want to leave the neighbourhood, especially on the role of the ethnic or racial composition of the neighbourhood. In the United States, Schelling (1971) hypothesizes that individuals do not want to be a minority in their neighbourhood and thus move out if the share of 'others' is higher than the share of their own group. Farley and colleagues (1978) confronted White individuals with hypothetical neighbourhoods with various shares of Black households and no information on other neighbourhood characteristics. Following Farley and colleagues (1978), various researchers have shown that increasing shares of Whites describe the neighbourhood as undesirable or state they would try to move out, if the share of Black households increases (Farley et al. 1978; Krysan 2002; Krysan et al. 2009).

Both researchers in the US and Europe have tested the effect of various neighbourhood characteristics on the desire to leave the neighbourhood (Van Ham and Feijten 2008), neighbourhood outflow (Ellen 2000; Van Ham and Clark 2009), neighbourhood satisfaction (Dekker 2013; Harris 2001; Swaroop and Krysan 2011) or dwelling prices (Harris 1999). They find that in neighbourhoods with higher shares of ethnic or racial minorities, more people (want to) leave the neighbourhood and neighbourhood satisfaction is lower. However, critics state that this is not directly caused by the racial composition; they claim that race is a proxy for other unwanted neighbourhood characteristics correlated with the racial composition (Ellen 2000; Harris 2001).

The effect of the neighbourhood ethnic or racial composition on moving desires or outward mobility is less strong for ethnic or racial minorities than for the native majority (Pais et al. 2005; Van Ham and Clark 2009; Van Ham and Feijten 2008). Black households are found to have a preference for mixed neighbourhoods and to be more tolerant than whites to neighbourhoods with different racial compositions (Farley et al. 1978; Krysan et al. 2009).

Apart from neighbourhood ethnic or racial composition, other neighbourhood characteristics may be related with neighbourhood satisfaction or (desired) mobility out of the neighbourhood. Harris (2001) finds a negative effect on neighbourhood satisfaction of poverty, crime, deterioration and bad schools. Dekker (2013) finds lower neighbourhood satisfaction in neighbourhoods with low incomes and low dwelling values. However, Ellen (2000) and Van Ham and Clark (2009) find no significant effect of neighbourhood income on mobility out of the neighbourhood. Possibly, households in poverty neighbourhoods are less satisfied and more often want to leave the neighbourhood, but do not succeed in realising their desire to leave.

### ***Ethnic Minority Groups in the Netherlands***

The four largest minority groups in the Netherlands are Turks (2.4%), Moroccans (2.2%), Surinamese (2.1%) and Antilleans (0.9%). Besides these four groups we include other non-western minorities (4.2%) and western minorities (9.4%) (Percentages over 2013, source: Netherlands Statistics). The immigration of Turks and Moroccans started in the 1960 when they were recruited as guest workers. Especially unskilled labourers from the poorest rural areas were recruited, to solve the shortages of low-paid unskilled workers on the labour market (Castles 2006). In the 1970s and 1980s the immigrant population increased further because of family reunification and family formation. This migration history explains the in general low educational level of Turks and Moroccans in the Netherlands.

Surinamese and Antilleans are immigrants from former Dutch colonies. Most Surinamese came to the Netherlands after the declaration of independence of Surinam in 1975. Until the 1990s Antilleans came mainly to the Netherlands to acquire higher education. More recently more

underprivileged Antilleans came to the Netherlands to find a job. Surinamese and Antilleans in the Netherlands have a higher language proficiency because of the colonial history, are higher educated and more often have a job and a high income than Turks and Moroccans (Dagevos 2007).

While Turks, Moroccans and Surinamese generally have been in the Netherlands for a long time, among Antilleans and especially among the category of other non-western minorities there are also many more recent immigrants. Because of their short duration of stay in the Netherlands, these groups might not have established a good position on the housing market yet, and therefore might more often (want to) move (Aslund 2004; Bolt 2001). Antilleans are known to live in the worst quality housing (Kullberg et al. 2009) and therefore to more often (want to) move (Boschman and De Groot 2011). Western minorities are most comparable to the native majority in their socio-economic status and their position on the housing market.

### ***Hypotheses***

Non-western ethnic minorities have been found to be less successful in realising their desires to move and to have higher costs of leaving the neighbourhood. Our first hypothesis therefore is that *non-western ethnic minorities are less successful in realising their wish to leave the neighbourhood* (hypothesis 1).

Secondly, we will test which groups are successful in leaving which neighbourhoods. Ethnic minorities are found to leave minority concentration neighbourhoods less often than native residents. Hence, we hypothesize that *ethnic minorities are less successful in leaving minority concentration neighbourhoods, even if they expressed a desire to do so* (hypothesis 2). Discrimination on the housing market or the strength of networks might prevent ethnic minorities to leave minority concentration neighbourhoods. However, for the same reasons, they might also be less likely to have a desire to leave these neighbourhood; and might be equally successful if they do have a desire to leave.

Even those who succeed in leaving their neighbourhood might not be able to escape poverty neighbourhoods or minority concentration neighbourhoods. We expect that *ethnic minorities who are successful in leaving their minority concentration neighbourhood are more likely than others to move to another minority concentration neighbourhood* (hypothesis 3). Similarly we expect that *low-income households who are successful in leaving a poverty neighbourhood are more likely to move to another poverty neighbourhood* (hypothesis 4).

## **Data, selections and methods**

### ***Data and Selections***

For our study we use an unique combination of survey data and register data. We use data from two waves of the Housing Research Netherlands survey (WoON 2006 and WoON 2009), a periodical housing survey that is representative for the Dutch population aged 18 year and older (not living in institutions). We combine this data with longitudinal register data on residential mobility histories of the complete population of the Netherlands. Thereby we can follow the survey respondents over time, and test if they leave their neighbourhood in the two years following the survey and which neighbourhoods they move to. We enriched this data set with data from Netherlands Statistics on neighbourhood characteristics such as the share of rented dwellings, the average neighbourhood income and the share of various ethnic groups.

We used administrative neighbourhoods (*buurten*) as defined by Netherlands Statistics. Within urban areas, neighbourhoods are small, with an average size of 1.4 km<sup>2</sup> and an average number of 6.000 inhabitants. They often have natural borders. These neighbourhoods are the lowest administrative area level in the Netherlands. Therefore, more people will be found successful in leaving their neighbourhood than with other, larger definitions of neighbourhoods,

such as postal code areas or districts. By choosing the smallest possible neighbourhood definition, we minimise the number of people who successfully left their perceived neighbourhood, but whom in our data appear as movers within the neighbourhood.

In the Housing Research Netherlands survey, respondents are asked about their personal characteristics, household situation, housing situation and moving wishes. On a five-point Likert scale, respondents are asked to agree or disagree with: 'If possible, I would leave the neighbourhood'. In total there are 142,073 respondents, 64,005 in the 2006 housing survey and 78,068 in the 2009 survey. For respondents who are included in both surveys (870 respondents) we randomly selected only one survey year to ensure independence of observations. 3,298 respondents in the survey could not be traced in the register data two years after the interview, probably because they died or emigrated, and were therefore excluded from the data. Also adult children living at the parental home, respondents residing in another households dwelling, respondents who were planning to move and already found a new dwelling and respondents with missing data on neighbourhood characteristics (17287 respondents) were excluded, which leaves 120618 respondents in our sample.

In accordance with other research on the relation between residential mobility and neighbourhood characteristics, we focus only on urban areas. In the Netherlands there are very large differences between urban regions in the share of ethnic minorities. In the four largest cities the share of ethnic minorities is much higher than in other urban areas, which would make the results incomparable. To be able to study effects of the ethnic composition, we thus only selected the urban regions of the four largest cities. We included 39,549 respondents of which 6,836 (17%) state they (totally) agree with the statement 'if possible I would leave the neighbourhood'.

### ***Methods***

Below we focus on the 6,836 respondents who stated that they want to leave their neighbourhood. We estimated a binary logistic regression model of who is successful in realising their wish to leave the neighbourhood. In this model we included both personal characteristics (e.g. ethnic background, income and household type) and neighbourhood characteristics (such as the share of rented dwellings, the ethnic composition and the average neighbourhood income). Because we included variables on both neighbourhood and individual level we used clustered standard errors on neighbourhood level. On average we have 5 respondents per neighbourhood<sup>2</sup>.

Subsequently we only selected the respondents in the most ethnically concentrated neighbourhoods who want to leave their neighbourhood and estimated a multinomial logit model on their mobility behaviour. In this model there are three different outcomes categories: 1) respondents did not move at all 2) respondents moved to another ethnic minority concentration neighbourhood, or 3) they moved to a neighbourhood with higher shares of native Dutch. We estimated a similar model on the respondents who lived in and wanted to leave the lowest income neighbourhoods, to test whether they 1) did not move, 2) moved to another low-income neighbourhood or 3) moved to a higher income neighbourhood. Also in these models we used clustered standard errors on neighbourhood level.

---

<sup>2</sup> For the respondents in WoON 2009 we used neighbourhood characteristics such as share of minorities and average dwelling value from 2009, for the respondents from WoON 2006 we used neighbourhood characteristics from 2006 (except average neighbourhood income which we had to use from 2009 for all respondents, because of a change in definition). A neighbourhood in 2009 thus has different neighbourhood characteristics than the same neighbourhood in 2006 and has to be considered as a different neighbourhood. The 6,836 respondents are distributed over 1,416 unique neighbourhoods.

## Results

### *Ethnic Differences in Leaving Wishes and Behaviour*

In total there are 39,549 inhabitants of the four urban regions of which 6,836 (17%) (totally) agreed with the statement ‘if possible I would leave the neighbourhood’ (see Table 1). Most respondents with a desire to leave their neighbourhood do not realise this desire within two years. Only 24% of the respondents with a desire to leave have left their neighbourhood within two years and 7.5% of the respondents *without* a desire to leave have also left their neighbourhood in the two years after the survey.

Non-western minorities more often want to leave their neighbourhood than native Dutch respondents and western minorities. Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese and other non-western minorities with a wish to leave their neighbourhood less often succeed in leaving their neighbourhood than western minorities and native Dutch respondents. Antilleans, however, more often than native Dutch respondents succeed in realising their wish to leave the neighbourhood. Non-western minorities, especially Antilleans and the category of other non-western minorities, are most likely to leave their neighbourhood when they did not have a desire to leave (see Table 1).

These ethnic differences in moving wishes and behaviour might be (partly) explained by ethnic differences in socio-economic, housing and neighbourhood situation. Ethnic groups differ in average income, age, tenure and neighbourhood ethnic composition and all these variables are known to affect moving wishes and behaviour. To test whether ethnicity has a separate effect on the realisation of wishes to leave the neighbourhood, we estimate multivariate models in which we take into account all sorts of personal and neighbourhood characteristics.

*Table 1: Leaving the neighbourhood, wishes and behaviour, percentages per ethnic group (N=39,549)*

	Wants to leave	Leaves	Leaves (within wants to leave)	Leaves (within does not want to leave)
Native Dutch	15.1	9.9	24.8	7.2
Moroccans	30.0	12.6	20.9	9.0
Turks	27.4	10.7	16.1	8.7
Antilleans	26.7	17.5	34.5	11.3
Surinamese	24.8	10.7	20.9	7.4
Other non-western minorities	28.4	15.7	22.7	12.9
Total non-western	27.2	12.2	21.8	9.6
Western minorities	17.7	10.2	26.2	6.8
Total	17.3	10.4	24.2	7.5

Source: Own calculations based on WoON 2006 and 2009 and SSB, provided by Netherlands Statistics

### *Who Realise their Desire to Leave the Neighbourhood?*

In hypothesis 1 we stated that non-western ethnic minorities are less successful in realising their desire to leave the neighbourhood. Models 1 to 4 (see Table 2) are logistic regression models that estimate which personal and neighbourhood characteristics are related to realising a desire to leave. These models are estimated on the 6,836 respondents who state they want to leave their neighbourhood.

In the first model we only focus on differences between ethnic groups, using native Dutch respondents as a reference category. We find that Turks and Surinamese are significantly less likely to realise their desire to leave the neighbourhood and Antilleans are significantly more

likely to realise their desire compared to native Dutch respondents. In model 1 we only control for the survey year and the desire to move<sup>3</sup>.

In the second model we take into account personal characteristics, such as age, household type, income and dwelling characteristics. When these characteristics are taken into account we find that Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese and the category of other non-western minorities are less successful than native Dutch in leaving their neighbourhood. Antilleans and western minorities are equally successful as native Dutch respondents. The ethnic differences found in model 1 and table 1 thus change when the ethnic differences in personal and dwelling characteristics are taken into account. In model 3, neighbourhood characteristics are included: average dwelling value, share of rented dwellings, average income, share of non-western minorities and urban density, as well as dummy variables for the four urban regions. However, none of these variables has significant effect on the realisation of desires to leave the neighbourhood. The effects of the personal characteristics on realisation are almost the same as in model 2. Neighbourhood characteristics thus have no effect on the *realisation* of desires to leave the neighbourhood. Neighbourhood characteristics affect the desire to leave the neighbourhood (Van Ham and Feijten 2008; Lee et al. 1994) and mobility out of the neighbourhood (Bolt and Van Kempen 2003; South and Crowder 1998; Van Ham and Clark 2009). However, we find that they do not affect mobility out of the neighbourhood *conditional on desires to leave*.

Hypothesis 1 states that non-western minorities are less successful in realising a desire to leave their neighbourhood. In model 3 we find that Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese and other non-western minorities are less successful than native Dutch in realising their desire to leave their neighbourhood. For these groups we can confirm hypothesis 1. However, Antilleans are equally successful as native Dutch in realising their desire to leave their neighbourhood. Antilleans live in the worst housing conditions (Kullberg et al. 2009) and most often move, also if they have no desire to move (Boschman and De Groot 2011). This might explain why they realise desires to leave the neighbourhood more often than other non-western minority groups.

In model 4 cross-level interactions between neighbourhood income and personal income and between the share of ethnic minorities in the neighbourhood and ethnicity on individual level are included. We use this model to test hypothesis 2, which states that ethnic minorities are less successful in leaving minority concentration neighbourhoods, even if they express a desire to do so. We find that none of the interaction effects is significant. Low-income households are less successful to leave their neighbourhood, but this effect is equally strong in high income neighbourhoods as in low-income neighbourhoods. Moroccans, Turks, Surinamese and other non-western minorities are less successful to leave their neighbourhood, but this effect is equally strong in minority concentration neighbourhoods as in native majority concentration neighbourhoods. Based on these outcomes, hypothesis 2 can be rejected.

In the next two subsections we focus on respondents who live in ethnic minority concentration neighbourhoods and/or low-income neighbourhoods and who have expressed a desire to leave. We not only focus on whether they are successful in leaving their neighbourhood, but also on the type of neighbourhood they move to. In hypothesis 3 we state that non-western minorities, if they are successful in realising a desire to leave their minority concentration neighbourhood, will be more likely to move to another minority concentration neighbourhood. Similarly, in hypothesis 4 we state that low-income households, if they are successful in realising a desire to leave a low-income neighbourhood, will be more likely to move to another low-income neighbourhood. In the models 5 and 6 we thus test who manages to escape from minority concentration or poverty neighbourhoods. In other words, we test which personal and neighbourhood characteristics affect the probability to move to a less concentrated or higher-income neighbourhood.

---

<sup>3</sup> Respondents are asked whether they want to move, or expect to be forced to move, in the two years following the interview.

Table 2: Logistic regression models: realising a wish to leave the neighbourhood (N=6,836)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
	odds ratio	odds ratio	odds ratio	odds ratio
Ethnicity (ref=native Dutch)				
Moroccans	0.755	0.532**	0.517**	0.607*
Turks	0.552**	0.440**	0.416**	0.479**
Surinamese	0.774*	0.772*	0.741*	0.745*
Antilleans	1.456*	1.115	1.066	1.066
Western minorities	1.056	1.009	1.006	0.997
Other non-western	0.837	0.659**	0.642**	0.662**
Year 2009	0.881	0.810**	0.781**	0.788**
moving wish (ref=wish)				
Expect forced move	1.251	1.326	1.305	1.290
No moving wish	0.226*	0.270*	0.271*	0.271*
Age (18-24=ref)				
25-34		0.683**	0.689**	0.699**
35-44		0.393**	0.399**	0.404**
45-54		0.279**	0.282**	0.288**
55-64		0.260**	0.263**	0.268**
65-74		0.270**	0.277**	0.282**
75+		0.452**	0.461**	0.471**
Household type (ref=single)				
Couple		1.239*	1.201	1.215
Family with children		0.886	0.833	0.845
Single parent		0.697**	0.667**	0.675**
Non-family household		1.685**	1.637**	1.651**
Education level (ref=low)				
Middle		0.958	0.969	0.971
High		0.997	1.028	1.027
Income (standardised)		1.123**	1.129**	1.111*
Owner		0.709**	0.701**	0.704**
Satisfied with dwelling		0.886	0.883	0.881*
Dwelling type (ref=single family dwelling)				
Apartment		1.306**	1.266*	1.267*
Other housing unit		1.926**	2.006**	2.006**
Overcrowded		1.171	1.203*	1.214*
Undercrowded		0.988	0.960	0.963
Average dwelling value neighbourhood			1.000	1.000
Share of rented dwellings neighbourhood			0.998	0.998
Average income neighbourhood (standardised)			1.015	1.018
% non-western minorities (standardised)			1.103	1.114
Urban density (ref=very strong)				
Strong			1.174	1.179
Average			0.993	0.992
Low			0.877	0.889
Not urban			0.822	0.823
Utrecht urban region			1.001	1.007
Rotterdam urban region			1.190	1.189
The Hague urban region			1.165	1.175
Moroccan*share of non-western minorities				0.807
Turkish*share of non-western minorities				0.850
Surinamese*share of non-western minorities				0.976
Antillean*share of non-western minorities				0.979
Western*share of non-western minorities				1.196
Other non-western*share of non-western minorities				0.891
Income*average income neighbourhood				1.031
Intercept	0.488**	1.104	1.125	1.119
R2	0.056	0.113	0.115	0.116

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; Source: Own calculations based on WoON 2006, 2009 & SSB, provided by Netherlands Statistics

### ***Who is Successful in Leaving Ethnic Minority Concentration Neighbourhoods?***

In model 5 we selected households who live in ethnic minority concentration neighbourhoods and who state they want to leave their neighbourhood. We defined ethnic minority concentration neighbourhoods as neighbourhoods with more than 40% non-western minorities<sup>4</sup>. In total 2,250 of the 6,836 respondents with a desire to leave live in an ethnic minority concentration neighbourhood. For this group we estimated a multinomial logit model, to test whether they did not move, moved to an ethnic minority concentration neighbourhood<sup>5</sup> or moved to a neighbourhood with a lower share of non-western minorities. Of the 2,250 respondents, 1,616 (72%) did not move, 220 (10%) moved to an ethnic concentration neighbourhood and 414 (18%) moved to a less concentrated neighbourhood. The reference category are respondents who did not move.

Model 5 (Table 3) shows that there are no significant ethnic differences in the probability to move to ethnic minority concentration neighbourhoods. However, Moroccans, Turks, Surinamese and other non-western minorities are less likely to move to a *neighbourhood with a lower share of non-western ethnic minorities*. For these four groups, the model thus confirms hypothesis 3. Antilleans and western minorities do not differ from native Dutch respondents in their probability to move to a neighbourhood with a lower share of non-western minorities.

Besides ethnicity also other personal characteristics affect the probability to move. Compared to the youngest age group of 18-24 years, older respondents are less likely to move, both to a concentration neighbourhood and to a neighbourhood with a lower share of non-western minorities. Similarly, respondents who did not want to move and those who live in an owner-occupied dwelling are less likely to move to both neighbourhood types. Respondents who are satisfied with their dwelling are less likely to move to a minority concentration neighbourhood, but equally likely as dissatisfied respondents to move to a neighbourhood with a lower share of non-western minorities. Probably respondents who are satisfied with their dwelling only move when they can significantly improve their neighbourhood situation. Respondents who live overcrowded are more likely to move to neighbourhoods with a lower share of non-western minorities. This is surprising, because overcrowding can be a reason for urgent moving desires, which will leave not much choice in the selection of a neighbourhood. On the other hand, especially families with (young) children live in crowded conditions, and this is especially the group that moves from (inner-city) ethnic minority concentration neighbourhoods to (suburban) neighbourhoods with lower shares of minorities.

Also neighbourhood characteristics affect whether people move and which neighbourhood type they move to. In neighbourhoods with high shares of rented dwellings, respondents less often move to other ethnic minority concentration neighbourhoods. In the Utrecht urban region, respondents are less likely to move, both to other concentration neighbourhoods and to less concentrated neighbourhoods. Respondents in the most dense urban areas are less likely to move to less concentrated neighbourhoods than respondents in less dense neighbourhoods. A high share of non-western minorities in the neighbourhood reduces the probability to move to less concentrated neighbourhoods. Hereby it is important to take into account that less concentrated neighbourhoods are defined as neighbourhoods with less than 40% non-western minorities.

---

<sup>4</sup> Within the four urban regions, 7% of the neighbourhoods have more than 40% non-western minorities but 19% of the inhabitants live in these neighbourhoods. For comparative reasons we also estimated a model in which minority concentration neighbourhoods are defined as having more than 25% non-western minorities. Most outcomes are similar, except for Antilleans, who in this model are found to less often move to less concentrated neighbourhoods, while this is not significant in the presented model.

<sup>5</sup> Including moves within the same neighbourhood.

Table 3: Multinomial regression models

Model 5: did not move (ref), moved to ethnic minority concentration neighbourhood, or moved to neighbourhood with a lower share of non-western ethnic minorities (N=2250)

Model 6: did not move (ref), moved to low-income neighbourhood, or moved to higher income neighbourhood (N=2780)

	Model 5		Model 6	
	To ethnic minority concentration nbh	To nbh with lower share of minorities	To low-income nbh	To higher income nbh
	odds ratio	odds ratio	odds ratio	odds ratio
Ethnicity (ref=native Dutch)				
Moroccans	0.932	0.351**	0.983	0.369**
Turks	1.227	0.117**	1.415	0.102**
Surinamese	1.361	0.508**	1.175	0.515**
Antilleans	1.878	0.657	1.319	0.741
Western minorities	1.055	1.215	1.070	1.087
Other non-western	0.825	0.567*	0.969	0.470**
Year 2009	0.924	0.696*	0.968	0.892
No moving wish	3.650**	3.938**	2.630**	4.311**
Age (18-24=ref)				
25-34	0.730**	0.755	0.565**	0.945
35-44	0.329**	0.538**	0.291**	0.639*
45-54	0.304*	0.276**	0.241**	0.319**
55-64	0.453	0.278**	0.399**	0.281**
65-74	0.407	0.377**	0.509*	0.391**
75+	0.702	0.633	0.350*	0.737
Household type (ref=single)				
Couple	0.916	1.183	0.751	1.217
Family with children	0.948	0.713	1.032	0.697
Single parent	0.666	0.744	0.620	0.612*
Non-family household	2.041	1.362	1.386	1.672*
Education level (ref=low)				
Middle	0.960	1.190	0.928	1.028
High	0.840	1.215	0.783	1.299
Income (standardised)	0.934	1.186	0.972	1.029
Owner	0.552*	0.602*	0.447**	0.711
Satisfied with dwelling	0.758*	0.860	0.665**	0.992
Dwelling type (ref=single family dwelling)				
Apartment	1.200	1.050	1.108	1.019
Other housing unit	2.111	1.482	1.495	1.143
Overcrowded	1.279	1.399*	1.025	1.466*
Undercrowded	0.949	0.894	0.765	0.850
Average dwelling value neighbourhood	0.997	1.003	0.995	1.000
Share of rented dwellings neighbourhood	0.984**	0.998	0.992	0.994
Average income neighbourhood	0.910	0.748	0.963	0.915
% non-western minorities (standardised)	1.223	0.781	1.039	0.992
Highest urban density	0.835	0.459**	0.910	0.667
Utrecht urban region	0.482*	0.671	1.201	0.631*
Rotterdam urban region	0.958	1.741	1.379	1.044
The Hague urban region	0.666	1.704	0.849	0.980
Intercept	0.485	0.319	0.876	0.380
R2	0.126		0.119	

\* p<0.05

\*\*p<0.01

Source: Own calculations based on WoON 2006 and 2009 and SSB, provided by Netherlands Statistics

### ***Who is Successful in Leaving Low-Income Neighbourhoods?***

For this model we selected households who live in low-income neighbourhoods and who state they want to leave their neighbourhood. We defined low-income neighbourhoods as neighbourhoods where the average gross income per inhabitant is lower than €18,000 per year<sup>6</sup>. 2,780 of the 6,836 respondents with a desire to leave their neighbourhood live in low-income neighbourhoods. Of this group 1,983 respondents (71%) did not move, 298 respondents (11%) moved to another low-income neighbourhood and 499 respondents (18%) moved to a higher income neighbourhood. In a multinomial logit model (see Table 3, model 6) we test which characteristics of individuals and neighbourhoods are related to the probability to not move at all, to move to another low-income neighbourhood or to move to a higher-income neighbourhood. The reference category are the respondents who did not move. Ethnicity has no effect on the probability to move to another low-income neighbourhood. However, Moroccans, Turks, Surinamese and other non-western minorities are significantly less likely to move to a higher-income neighbourhood.

In hypothesis 4 we stated that low-income households who want to leave their low-income neighbourhood will be less likely to move to a higher income neighbourhood and more likely to move to another low-income neighbourhood. Based on the model outcomes we can reject this hypothesis. For respondents in low-income neighbourhoods who want to leave their neighbourhood, income has no significant effect on not moving, moving to a low-income neighbourhood or moving to a high income neighbourhood. This is surprising, as high income households usually have more opportunities to realise their desire to leave the neighbourhood and especially more opportunities to move to higher income neighbourhoods.

Compared to the youngest age group of 18-24 years, all other age groups are less likely to move, both to another low-income neighbourhood and to a higher income neighbourhood. Single parent families are less likely to move to higher income neighbourhoods and non-family households are more likely to move to higher income neighbourhoods. Respondents who want to move or who expect to be forced to move are much more likely to move, both to low-income neighbourhoods and to higher income neighbourhoods than respondents who do not want to move. Respondents in owner occupied dwellings and respondents who are satisfied with their dwelling are less likely to move to another low-income neighbourhood. Probably because they only leave their attractive dwelling if they can improve their neighbourhood situation. Households who live overcrowded are 1,5 times more likely to move to a higher income neighbourhood. This might be explained by a similar mechanism as why this group is most likely to leave minority concentration neighbourhoods; couples who live in low-income minority concentration neighbourhoods and who move to a larger dwelling in a wealthier and less concentrated neighbourhood after they have their first child. Respondents who live in the Utrecht urban region are less likely to move to higher income neighbourhoods.

## **Conclusions and Discussion**

A substantial body of literature has analysed the characteristics of people who want to leave the neighbourhood or who actually do leave the neighbourhood. Several studies have shown that the native majority is more likely than ethnic minorities to (want to) leave neighbourhoods with

---

<sup>6</sup> Approximately 30% of Dutch residents have a gross income below €18,000 in 2009. Within the four urban regions 15% of neighbourhoods is a low-income neighbourhood according to this definition. However, 22% of the *inhabitants* of the four urban regions live in neighbourhoods with an average income below 18,000 euro per year. For comparative purposes, we also estimated a model in which low-income neighbourhoods are defined as neighbourhoods with an income below 16,000. Most outcomes from this model are similar.

higher shares of ethnic minorities. Selectivity in desires to leave one's neighbourhood can produce or reproduce (ethnic) residential segregation (Van Ham and Feijten 2008), but only if people actually realise their desire to leave. Residential mobility research, however, reveals that most people with a desire to move, do not realise this desire. The discrepancy between moving desires and behaviour appears to be especially large for ethnic or racial minorities (Crowder 2001; De Groot et al. 2011).

This paper has focused on individuals with a *desire to leave their neighbourhood*. We investigated ethnic differences in the extent to which people are able to fulfil their desire, including whether they are successful in escaping from ethnic minority concentration or low-income neighbourhoods. This will give more insight into the mechanisms behind (ethnic) residential segregation, especially in the context of the debate on voluntary versus involuntary segregation.

In line with our hypothesis, we find that Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese and other non-western ethnic minorities are less successful than native Dutch in realising a desire to leave their neighbourhood. This effect is not significant for Antilleans and western minorities. Non-western minorities and low-income households who want to leave their neighbourhood are less likely to leave and thus more likely to be trapped in undesired neighbourhoods.

Many studies have found that a combination of personal characteristics and neighbourhood conditions affect the desire to leave the neighbourhood (Lee et al. 1994; Van Ham and Feijten 2008) and many studies have found significant effects of neighbourhood characteristics on actual mobility out of the neighbourhood (Bolt and Van Kempen 2003; Ellen 2000; Van Ham and Clark 2009). We, however, have found no effect of neighbourhood characteristics on the realisation of wishes to leave the neighbourhood. Although neighbourhood characteristics have been found to affect both desires to leave and mobility out of the neighbourhood, they do not affect mobility out of the neighbourhood *conditional on the desire to leave*. For individuals who want to leave, neighbourhood characteristics such as the share of minorities or average income do not affect their probability of success.

Many studies show that ethnic minorities less often than natives leave ethnic minority concentration neighbourhoods, or that non-Hispanic Whites are more likely than other groups to leave Black neighbourhoods. We studied whether ethnic minorities are also less successful in leaving ethnic minority concentration neighbourhoods *if they have expressed a desire to leave their neighbourhood*. For none of the ethnic groups the share of ethnic minorities in the neighbourhood has a significant effect on their realisation of desires to leave. Non-western minorities are equally successful if they want to leave ethnic minority concentration neighbourhoods as if they want to leave neighbourhoods with lower shares of minorities. The fact, found in earlier research, that ethnic minorities are less likely to leave ethnic minority concentration neighbourhoods is thus most likely explained by the fact they are less likely to *want to leave* these neighbourhoods, which could indicate voluntary segregation. Regardless of neighbourhood characteristics, Moroccans, Turks, Surinamese and other non-western minorities are found to be less successful in realising desires to leave. Since these groups often live in ethnic minority concentration neighbourhoods, their inability to realise their desire to leave can keep segregation at relatively high levels. This is further emphasised by our finding that Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese and other non-western minorities from ethnic minority concentration neighbourhoods are less likely to move to neighbourhoods with lower shares of non-western minorities.

Next to ethnic background, we examined the role of income. Focussing on individuals in the lowest income neighbourhoods, we hypothesize that low-income households are less likely to escape these neighbourhoods and move to higher income neighbourhoods. Contrary to our expectations, income has neither an effect on the probability to escape from the lowest income neighbourhoods, nor on the probability to escape from the most ethnically concentrated neighbourhoods. We do, however, find an effect of *ethnicity* on the probability to escape from

low-income neighbourhoods. Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese and other non-western minorities who want to leave their neighbourhood and live in the lowest income neighbourhoods are less likely to move to higher income neighbourhoods.

More insight in the drivers of selective mobility will contribute to a better understanding of the causes of segregation. This paper provides new insights in selective mobility because it shows selectivity in the discrepancy between desires to leave and actual mobility out of the neighbourhood. Ethnic minorities are found to be less successful in realising desires to leave the neighbourhood and even if they manage to leave low-income or ethnic minority concentration neighbourhoods they more often move to other low-income or ethnic minority concentration neighbourhoods.

## Acknowledgements

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007-2013) / ERC Grant Agreement n. 615159 (ERC Consolidator Grant DEPRIVEDHOODS, Socio-spatial inequality, deprived neighbourhoods, and neighbourhood effects) and from the Marie Curie programme under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007-2013) / Career Integration Grant n. PCIG10-GA-2011-303728 (CIG Grant NBHCHOICE, Neighbourhood choice, neighbourhood sorting, and neighbourhood effects).

## References

- Aslund, O. (2004). Now and forever? Initial and subsequent location choices of immigrants. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 35, 141-165.
- Bolt, G. (2001). *Wooncarrières van Turken en Marokkanen in Ruimtelijk perspectief*. Utrecht: KNAW/ FRW.
- Bolt, G., & Kempen, R. van (2003). Escaping poverty neighbourhoods in the Netherlands, *Housing, Theory and Society* 20 (2), 209–222.
- Bolt G., & Kempen, R. van (2010). Ethnic Segregation and Residential Mobility: and socioeconomic determinants of neighbourhood desirability. *American Sociological Review*, 64 (3), 461-479.
- Boschman, S., & Groot, C. de (2011). Verhuiswensen en verhuisgedrag, verschillen tussen herkomstgroepen. *Migrantenstudies*, 27 (1), 101-117.
- Brama A. (2006). White flight? The production and reproduction of concentration areas in Swedish cities 1990-2000. *Urban Studies*, 43, 1127-1143.
- Brown, L.A., & Moore E.G. (1970). The intra-urban migration process. A perspective. *Geografiska Annaler B*, 52, 1-13.
- Castles, S. (2006). Guestworkers in Europe: A resurrection? *International migration review*, 40 (4), 741-766.
- Clark, W. (1991). Residential Preferences and Neighbourhood Racial Segregation: A test of the Schelling Segregation model. *Demography*, 28 (1), 1-18.
- Clark, W., Deurloo, M., & Dieleman, F. (2006). Residential mobility and neighbourhood outcomes. *Housing Studies* 21 (3), 323-342.
- Clark, W., & Ledwith, V. (2007). How much does income matter in neighbourhood choice? *Population Research and policy review* 26, 145-161.
- Connerly, C. (1986). The impact of neighborhood social relations on prospective mobility, *Social Science Quarterly*, 67 187-194.

- Coulter, R. Ham, M. van & Feijten, P. (2011). A longitudinal analysis of moving desires, expectations and actual moving behaviour. *Environment and Planning A*, 43 (11), 2742-2760.
- Crowder, K.D. (2001). Racial Stratification in the actuation of mobility expectations; microlevel impacts of racially restrictive housing markets. *Social Forces*, 79 (4), 1377-1396.
- Dagevos, J. (2007). Arbeid en Inkomen In J. Dagevos, M. Gijsberts (Eds.), *Jaarrapport Integratie 2007* (pp. 131-162). Den Haag: SCP.
- DaVanzo, J. (1981). Repeat migration, information costs, and location-specific capital, *Population and Environment*, 4, 45-73.
- Dawkins, C. (2006). Are Social Networks the Ties that Bind Families to Neighborhoods? *Housing Studies*, 21 (6), 867-881.
- Dekker, K. (2013). Testing the racial proxy hypothesis: What is it that residents don't like about their neighbourhood. In M. Van Ham, D. Manley, N. Bailey, L. Simpson & D. McLennon (Eds) *Understanding neighbourhood dynamics* (pp. 225-254). London: Springer.
- Doff, W. (2010). The significance of self-selection for neighbourhood sorting. In: *Puzzling Neighbourhood Effects* W. Doff (IOS Press, Amsterdam) 121-138.
- Ellen, I.G. (2000). Race-based neighbourhood projection: A proposed framework for understanding new data on racial integration. *Urban Studies* 37 (9), 1513-1533.
- Farley, R., Schuman, H., Bianchi, S., Colosanto, D., & Hatcher, S. (1978). Chocolate City, Vanilla Suburbs; Will the Trend towards racially separate communities continue? *Social Science Research*, 7, 319-344.
- Feijten, P., & Ham, M. van (2009). Neighbourhood Change. Reason to leave? *Urban Studies*, 46 (10), 2103-2122.
- Friedrichs, J., Galster, G., & Musterd, S. (2003). Neighbourhood effects on social opportunities, the European and American Research and Policy Context. *Housing Studies*, 18 (6) 797-806.
- Groot, C. de, Manting, D., & Boschman, S. (2008). *Verhuiswensen en verhuisgedrag in Nederland; een landsdekkend onderzoek*. Den Haag: PBL.
- Groot, C. de, Mulder, C.H., & Manting, D. (2011). Intentions to move and actual moving behaviour in the Netherlands, *Housing Studies*, 26 (3), 307-328.
- Harris, D. (1999). Property values drop when blacks move in, because; Racial and socioeconomic determinants of neighbourhood desirability. *American Sociological Review*, 64 (3), 461-479.
- Harris D. (2001). Why are whites and blacks averse to black neighbors? *Social Science Research*, 30 (1) 100-116.
- Kan, K. (1999). Expected and unexpected residential mobility. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 45, 72-96.
- Kearns, A., & Parkes, A. (2003). Living in and leaving poor neighbourhood conditions in England. *Housing Studies*, 18 (6), 827-851.
- Krysan, M. (2002). Whites who say they'd flee: who are they, and why would they leave? *Demography*, 39 (4), 675-696.
- Krysan, M., Couper, M.P., Farley, R., & Forman, T.A. (2009). Does race matter in neighbourhood preferences? Results from a video experiment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 115 (2), 527-559.
- Kullberg, J., Vervoort, M., & Dagevos, J. (2009). *Goede buren kun je niet kopen*. Den Haag: SCP.
- Landale, N.S., & Guest, A.M. (1985). Constraints, Satisfaction and residential mobility: Speare's model reconsidered. *Demography*, 22 (2), 199-222.
- Lee, B.A., Oropesa R.S., & Kanan J.W. (1994). Neighbourhood Context and residential mobility. *Demography*, 31 (2), 249-270.
- Logan, J.R., & Alba R.D. (1993). Locational returns to human capital; minority access to suburban community resources. *Demography*, 30, 243-268.

- Lu, M. (1998). Analyzing migration decisionmaking: relationships between residential satisfaction, mobility intentions and moving behaviour. *Environment and Planning A*, 30, 1473-1495.
- Lu, M. (1999). Do people move when they say they will? Inconsistencies in individual migration behaviour. *Population and Environment; A Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 20, 467-488.
- Moore, E.G. (1986). Mobility intention and subsequent relocation. *Urban Geography*, 7 (6) 497-514.
- Mulder, C.H., & Hooimeijer, P. (1999). Residential relocations in the life course. In L.J.G. van Wissen & P.A. Dykstra (eds) *Population issues An interdisciplinary focus*. Den Haag: NIDI.
- Murie, A. (1974). *Household movement and housing choice*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham, Centre for Urban and regional studies.
- Pais J, South S, Crowder K, 2009, White flight revisited; a multi-ethnic perspective on neighbourhood out-migration. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 28, 321-346.
- Park, R.E., Burgess, E.W., & McKenzie, R.D. (1925/1967). *The City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Parke, A., Kearns, A., & Atkinson, R. (2002). What Makes People Dissatisfied with their Neighbourhoods? *Urban Studies*, 39 (13), 2413-2438.
- Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: its origins and applications in modern sociology, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 1-24.
- Priemus, H. (1984). *Verhuistheorieën en de verdeling van de woningvoorraad*. Delft: Delft University Press
- Quillian, L. (2003). How long are exposures to poor neighborhoods? The long-term dynamics of entry and exit from poor neighborhoods. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 22, 221-249.
- Rossi, P.H. (1955). *Why families move; a study in the social psychology of urban residential mobility*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.
- Schaake, K. Burgers, J., & Mulder, C (2010). Ethnicity at the Individual and Neighbourhood level as an explanation for Moving Out of the Neighbourhood. *Population Research Policy Review*, 29, 593-608.
- Schelling, T.C. (1971). Dynamic Models of Segregation. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 1, 143-186.
- Schwartz, A. (1973). Interpreting the effect of distance on migration. *Journal of political economy*, 81 (5), 1153-1169.
- South, S., & Crowder, K.D. (1997). Residential Mobility Between Cities and Suburbs: Race, Suburbanization, and Back-to-the-City Moves. *Demography*, 34 (4) 525-538.
- South, S.J., & Crowder, K.D. (1998). Leaving the hood: Residential mobility between black, white and integrated neighbourhoods. *American Sociological Review*, 63 (1), 17-26.
- South, S.J., Crowder, K.D., & Chavez, E. (2005). Exiting and Entering High Poverty Neighbourhoods: Latinos, Blacks and Anglos Compared. *Social Forces*, 84 (2) 873-900.
- Speare, A., Goldstein, S., & Frey, W (1975). *Residential Mobility, Migration and Metropolitan Change*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Swaroop, S., & Krysan, M. (2011). The determinants of neighbourhood satisfaction: racial proxy revisited. *Demography*, 48, 1203-1229.
- Van Ham, M., & W. A. V. Clark (2009). Neighbourhood mobility in context: Household moves and changing neighbourhoods in the Netherlands. *Environment and planning A*, 41, 1442-1459.
- Van Ham, M., & Feijten, P. (2008). Who wants to leave the neighbourhood; the effect of being different from the neighbourhood population on wishes to move. *Environment and Planning A*, 40, 1151-1170.
- Wilson (1987). *The Truly Disadvantaged*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wolpert, J. (1966). Behavioural aspects of the decision to migrate. *Papers in Regional Science*, 22, 92-102.