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The basis

• *Some areas have all kinds of problems*
  – Physical
  – Economical
  – Social → concentrations!!

• *Demolition is seen as one of the main solutions*
Policy goal

Demolition would lead to more mixed neighbourhoods, especially in terms of income
Lot of research, typical results

- Movers are generally satisfied
- Traditional inhabitants do not have many contacts with the new inhabitants
- Owner-occupiers and renters do not have many contacts
- Natives and ethnic minorities do not have many contacts
- Does mixing lead to good results?
Less attention for forced movers, displaced households

(although research is emerging quickly now)
This presentation

- Focus on displaced households
- Focus on the effects of displacement
- In terms of housing
- In terms of neighbourhoods
- In terms of activities
- Finally: some thoughts about further research
Sources

- Literature (national and international)
- Own research on displaced households (Posthumus, Bolt, Van Kempen) in five Dutch cities
- Own research on displaced adolescents (Zwanenberg, Bolt, Kokx, Hooimeijer, Van Kempen) in Utrecht
Waterbed effects?

- The idea is that a push somewhere will lead to effects elsewhere
- Example: CCTV in high-crime areas
- Example: Area-based urban restructuring policy (demolition)
- Basic idea: waterbed effects are not taken into account when measuring the effects of a policy
9 statements
Statement 1

Displacement leads to an upward move in terms of housing conditions
Upward move?

- Yes, sometimes 80%  
- Objective and subjective  
- Logical result: people move from worst housing (?)  
- Some groups are less positive  
- Sometimes positive about small issue
Statement 2

Displaced households move to areas close to the demolished area
Close by?

• Why
  – Social contacts
  – Information
  – Opportunities (supply)
• Results: yes and no
  – Different interpretations possible...
  – See maps
Close by?
Statement 3

Displaced households move to areas with a large inexpensive housing stock
To cheap areas?

- Yes, according to: Bolt & Van Kempen, 2010; Pendall, 2000; Varady & Walker, 2000; Hartung & Henig, 1997; Venkatesh et al., 2004; Kleinhans & Van der Laan Bouma-Doff, 2008; Van Kempen et al., 2010
- Logical result, because demolished dwellings belong to cheapest parts, thus house many low-income households
Statement 4

Displaced households move to areas with a low socio-economic status
To low-status areas?

- Yes (Oakley & Burchfield, 2009; Hartung & Henig, 1997; Pendall, 2000; see also Van Kempen et al., 2010)
- But why exactly is not always clear
  - Forced to move to such areas
  - Preferences (contacts)
Statement 5

Displaced households move to areas with large shares of minority ethnic groups
To minority areas?

• Yes (Oakley & Burchfield, 2009; Hartung & Henig, 1997; Pendall, 2000; Goetz, 2002, Bolt et al., 2009)

• But why is again not always clear
  – Forced to move to such areas
    • Income
    • Discrimination
    • Information
  – Preferences (contacts)
Statement 6

Displacement leads to re-concentration in distressed areas
Distressed areas?

- Former results result in expectation that re-concentration is logical
- Own results show there is indeed re-concentration in distressed areas
- More for forced movers (60%) than for voluntary movers (39%)
- BUT: education and ethnicity matter!!
Statement 7

Displacement leads to less satisfaction with the neighbourhood
Less satisfied with nb?

• Better dwelling but worse neighbourhood?
• Yes (80% vs. 45%)
• BUT: nothing to do with voluntary or forced move
• Important: duration of stay and move to distressed neighbourhood
Statement 8

Displaced households stop with all kinds of activities as a consequence of their forced move
Changing activities?

- Many adolescents stop with doing activities like sports (30%) (so 70% not...)
- Distance as a main variable
- But also ethnicity and duration of stay in previous area
- But after some time...
- And: move or age?
Statement 9

Displaced households lose friends as a consequence of their forced move
Losing friends?

- After a move: fewer friends in the nb
- After a move: fewer friends in previous nb
- BUT: new friends are being made
- Structural change or question of time?
Conclusions and discussion
Conclusions and discussion

- Do we see positive effects?
- Do we see negative effects?
Positive effect, for sure!

Better housing
Mixed results...

• Re-concentration in specific areas...
  – ... but not always and everywhere
• Re-concentration is specific areas...
  – ... but not clear if forced or not
• Change in activities...
  – ... but probably not structural
• So structural effects of forced moves are unsure
Points of attention

- Mixed results allow different interpretations and thus different implications for policy
- We do not know too much about motivations for choosing a place after a forced move
- Avoid simple interpretations (maps)
- Time is important!
Discussion points

• Large satisfaction with home, but also relatively satisfied with neighbourhood. What to do with this?
• We do need good research designs: qualitative, quantitative, multivariate, longitudinal
• What do we exactly want with area-based policies? People? Places?
The end
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