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Summary

People their neighbourhood is foremost a place where they live and do their day to day activities. In general, neighbourhoods have many similar characteristics like social- and physical infrastructures, however, over time they change differently. Many researchers have tried to explain these changes and processes and can roughly be separated into three approaches namely; ecological, behavioural and institutional approach. In all three approaches – ecological, behavioural and institutional – residential mobility is discussed to a greater or lesser extent. In this research these approaches will be combined in order to reconstruct neighbourhood change in Neerbosch-Oost, a neighbourhood that has a negative reputation and consist of a large part of social housing. Especially, coverage by the media in September 2018 has again led to a lot of attention for the neighbourhood. Together this led to the following research question:

How is neighbourhood change experienced and perceived by stayers, in- and out-movers, and how is this influenced by the social housing sector and reputation of Neerbosch-Oost?

From this research question were multiple sub questions derived that focussed on specific neighbourhood change concepts as invasion and succession; diversity and interaction; neighbourhoods’ reputation; residential mobility; and the social housing sector. Due to the focus on Neerbosch-Oost, people’s experiences and perceptions it was needed to conduct a quantitatively orientated singly case study. The data collection is based on semi-structured interviews with experts and residents that belong to one of the target groups; stayers, in- and out-movers. The data that is collected by semi-structured interviews is supported by data from informal contacts in Neerbosch-Oost, for example, at Pizza Participate Party or during a coffee morning at the primary school in the neighbourhood.

One of the outcomes is that stayers have experience mainly the processes of invasion and succession. They have seen the neighbourhood change from a Dutch working-class neighbourhood to a multicultural neighbourhood with people from different backgrounds. Although most stayers experience their interaction with people with a different background as positive it is not experienced the same in all parts of Neerbosch-Oost. The area near the maisonettes is experienced as open towards all kinds of people, while the area around Tubaplein is not. There, for example, the locals showed forms of resistance by discriminating against migrants who lived there. Besides, these experiences of resistance are in-directly influenced by the decision of the municipality of Nijmegen to allocate people with a low socio-economic status and in need of help from the Benedenstad to this area in Neerbosch-Oost.

In-movers on the other hand experience the diversity of Neerbosch-Oost as given. They do not know anything else than that Neerbosch-Oost is a place where people with all kinds of backgrounds live together. The group of out-movers show a mixed image because some of them show similar characteristics with stayers and others with in-movers. Additionally, inter-cultural interaction has resulted in a mix of activities that take cultural habits into account. Even non-residents come to Neerbosch-Oost due to the availability of foreign products and shops. It seems that diversity also did become a characteristic which people identify Neerbosch-Oost with.

Outcomes regarding the reputation of Neerbosch-Oost show that residents and non-residents experience it as different. Stayers, in- and out-movers do not think that the reputation is still true nowadays. Especially stayers experience the reputation as something of the past. They experience Neerbosch-Oost now as a normal neighbourhood were occasionally something happens just like in other neighbourhoods. The only difference is that if something happens – negative event – in Neerbosch-Oost it is immediately news that reaches the media. It clearly shows that events from the past have a long-term effect on the reputation of Neerbosch-Oost.
Furthermore, the reputation is experienced by some participants when they talk to non-residents about Neerbosch-Oost. It shows that non-residents are influenced by the reputation of Neerbosch-Oost. Furthermore, the past living environment of in-movers is influencing their perceptions about the reputation of Neerbosch-Oost. If they lived in a similar neighbourhood as Neerbosch-Oost, they are less bothered by the reputation. Whereas people who live in a different type of neighbourhood would be more bothered by the reputation.

Another outcome is that residential mobility mostly relates to the life cycle of participants and life course event, also known as the behavioural approach. A surprising result is that stayers are not immobile as the name would suggest. Multiple stayers have moved within the neighbourhood. It shows that they feel a strong connection to Neerbosch-Oost. In- and out-movers who are dependent on social housing are limited in their options due to the available houses and allocations systems. Especially the respondents that do not have much registration time experience that they have little to choose and are for the most part at the mercy of luck.

Additionally, a lot of respondents have experienced that vulnerable groups, especially those with mental health issues, are influencing the daily life of Neerbosch-Oost. Most participants are worried about the inflow of these vulnerable groups. All the experiences clearly show that vulnerable people influence, in first instance, their local environment, but also Neerbosch-Oost as a whole.

The next outcome concerns the institutional approach, namely that, in particular the municipality has contributed to a culture of pessimism among stayers. It is experienced that the municipality promise beautiful ideas, but a lot of these ideas, stayed ideas or turned out differently. Consequently, in-movers are tempering their enthusiasm and conform to a certain extent to local norm of pessimism.

A relevant scientific outcome is that not all participants could easily be categorized in one of the three groups. Some stayers did live for a period outside of Neerbosch-Oost but stayed socially connected to the neighbourhood. The experiences of out-movers show a lot of similarities with those of either stayers or in-movers. It indicates that participants can switch between groups and group boundaries become more fluid.

Conclusively, Neerbosch-Oost is constructed in various ways and, consequently, it cannot be seen as one single object. Neerbosch-Oost means many different things for many different people. The neighbourhood has transformed from a Dutch working-class neighbourhood to a multicultural area which is accessible for many people that are in need of a house. This transformation is not experienced similar throughout the neighbourhood. The areas that are experienced as bad did also contribute for the most part to the reputation of Neerbosch-Oost. In the last couple years it is experienced that Neerbosch-Oost is developing in an upward direction and I hope it continues to do so.
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1. Introduction

Cities are constantly changing, new buildings are being built, maintained and transformed; people move into the city, out of the city, interact with each other; legislations are amended every once in a while. In other words, cities change over time. For most people that live in a city a neighbourhood is the place where they live and do their day to day activities. Although neighbourhoods are not exactly alike, they have a similar physical infrastructure – brick and mortar – such as roads, bike lanes, dwellings, parks, sidewalks, shops, etcetera. Also, in some way the social infrastructure looks the same, there are people, young, old, migrants, non-migrants, rich and poor. However, over time these neighbourhoods change differently (e.g. Argioul et al., 2008; Galster, 2001; Temkin & Rohe, 1996). Some neighbourhoods that were unpopular become popular again – gentrified – and others decrease in popularity and decline. Numerous scholars (e.g. Burgess, 1925; Fery, 1947; Schelling, 1971; Power, 1997) have tried to explain neighbourhood change resulting in a few central approaches; ecological, behavioural and institutional. Although, these approaches differ more from each other than that they look alike, in all three approaches residential (im)mobility is mentioned to explain neighbourhood change. According to Teernstra and Van Gent (2012) relationships concerning neighbourhood change are more complex than the relationship between neighbourhood income and real estate value development. Therefore, different relationships in neighbourhood change must be included to explain these processes. However, most studies do not include the role of residents who have lived in the neighbourhood for a long time, also known as stayers. Teernstra (2014) and Galster (1987) argue that stayers are of importance too when relating to change in the neighbourhood.

In the Netherlands social housing associations have a dominant position in the real estate market. According to Van Kempen and Priemus (2002) this is an unique situation in Europe because for a long time it was not only a segment for housing the poor, like in many other countries, but also a segment for middle income groups. Over time, social rental housing has increasingly become the sector for people with a lower income and less resilience, which among other things, resulted in a lesser reputation (Permentier et al., 2007, 2008, 2011). Especially in the neighbourhoods with a high percentage of social housing is this the case. Some argue that these vulnerable people segregate together in neighbourhood with a large amount of social housing. There are signs (RIGO, 2018) that this will indeed be the case, but people also self-segregate (Amin, 2002), for example, suburbs that are dominated by people with a middle-class income. How do residents experience and perceive these neighbourhood changes?

A neighbourhood that transformed from a newly built neighbourhood after World War II in the Netherlands is Neerbosch-Oost in the city of Nijmegen. After World War II there was a big shortage of housing. To reduce this housing shortage in many cities new neighbourhood were throw up. These people were probably very happy to live in these new houses and neighbourhoods due to the fact that a new neighbourhood never intends to become a deprived neighbourhood (Cammen & Klerk, 2003). However, in September ‘18 in a series of articles, of a local newspaper in the Netherlands “De Gelderlander” (Friedrichs, 2018a, 2018b, 2018c, 2018d; Bekker, 2018), Neerbosch-Oost did get a lot of attention. Even national politicians were asking questions about Neerbosch-Oost. One article in particular was generating a lot of attention with the title: “Drugs needles, junkies, and dealers; Welcome to the ghetto” (Friedrichs, 2018a). A very appealing title for readers of De Gelderlander, but for the people of Neerbosch-Oost a problematic situation. Such items do not contribute to the reputation of the neighbourhood that has been struggling for a longer time with a lesser reputation.

This research takes a social-historical – biographical – perspective of neighbourhood change by gaining in-depth insights in experiences and perceptions of change in Neerbosch-Oost. Due to the complex processes of neighbourhood change this research will emphasize on the following elements; in-movers, out-movers, stayers, social housing associations and reputation.
1.1. Societal relevance

Sooner or later everyone in society will participate in the housing market. Some people will buy a house while others prefer renting a house. However, depending on individual characteristics, not everyone has the same prospects. For example, for people with a lower income it will be difficult to buy a house and therefore, they will probably depend on social housing. The social housing sector is a so-called hybrid sector, combining public and private services to provide affordable and good quality houses for people with a lower income (central government, 2015). In numerous neighbourhoods social housing makes up a large amount of the total housing stock and people group together, or segregate, with individuals who rely on social housing. And segregation contributes a wide range of neighbourhood effects, some more significant than others, but one of those effects is (negative) perception or stigmatisation of the neighbourhood and its residents (Galster, 2012).

Perceptions change the way people think about a neighbourhood, their own neighbourhood and life (Permentier, 2008). Just by mentioning that you are now in a deprived neighbourhood or come from a certain neighbourhood with a lesser reputation people will immediately look from a specific perspective or get a stamp. Eventually, it can lead to disadvantages for residents in these neighbourhood, for example reduced job opportunities and self-esteem (Galster, 2012). Therefore, it is needed to acquire knowledge and insight in these processes and that people get equal opportunities regardless of where they come from or live.

Understanding causes of neighbourhood change is essential for policymakers in order to set up future policies regarding, for example, renovating or demolition of social housing. Residential mobility can give rise to social upgrading, gentrification, and social downgrading, decline of a neighbourhood (Teernstra, 2014). Knowledge about the relationship between mobility and neighbourhood change provides important insights in these processes. In combination with changing policies and response in behaviour it provides an extensive perspective of residents who experience these changes. This also relates to the change in top down to bottom up policies, or government to governance, and other forms of collective decision-making processes. Residents know for themselves what the need. In-depth knowledge about experiences and perceptions could contribute to the collaboration between residence and professionals especially in Neerbosch-Oost that deserves some extra support.

Furthermore, it is offering insight into different groups that, to some extent are forced to live together and their behavioural response to these changes. In-movers bring their own habits, cultural, and other forms of social behaviour with them. It could lead to different forms of resistance (Schwirian, 1983). These insight will provide a better understanding of the (group-)experiences of ‘us’ and ‘them’ and in what way residents of the same neighbourhood label each other.

It becomes clear that these neighbourhoods, like Neerbosch-Oost, deserve some more credits, because residents have over time dealt with stigmatisation, new populations groups, and other vulnerable people due to budget cuts in healthcare. Therefore, it might be no wonder that these places are sometimes the breeding ground for problems. Therefore, more solidarity is needed for creating an inclusive society. Additionally, this research can be used for the creation of new policies for both government and housing associations in the Netherlands. The knowledge that will be gained can be informative for other neighbourhoods in the Netherlands with similar issues. In a highly regulated housing market this case shows how these regulations are locally played out and maybe serve for inspiration for other countries to use, or not to use it as a model for their own housing market.
1.2. Scientific relevance

Research into neighbourhood change knows a long research history starting with Burgess (1925) and his colleagues of the School of Chicago, to Schelling’s (1971) tipping point and recent studies by, for example, Teernstra and Van Gent (2012) regarding upgrading and downgrading of a neighbourhood in a highly regulated housing market. Most of these studies use quantitative methods to explain neighbourhood change. This study contributes to the rich amount of data by providing qualitative data, a human focused approach, and therefore can provide new insights. Teernstra and Van Gent (2012) also argue that neighbourhood change is a more complex relationship than the relationship between neighbourhood income and real estate value development. Therefore, a more detailed perspective is needed. By focusing on experiences and perceptions, this study will provide detailed insights in these complex relations. Furthermore, it combines experiences of stayers, in- and out-movers with different approaches – ecological, behavioural and institutional approaches – of neighbourhood change, and by applying this in a new setting it will produce additional knowledge and shows that these three approaches are still relevant.

Another relation that is being studied is the relation between neighbourhood change and neighbourhood reputation or image. Both studies by Permentier et al. (2007, 2008) indicate that there is a relation between a neighbourhood reputation, behaviour response and perceptions of people who live in these neighbourhoods and people who have an external relation with a neighbourhood. By providing a long-term perspective it connects and adds other ways of understanding the relations between neighbourhood reputation and change.

Additionally, according to Permentier, Bolt and Van Ham (2011) there is less knowledge about how residents perceive the reputation of their own neighbourhood. This indicates a gap in the available knowledge. Therefore, it is needed to gain insight in the experienced and perceived reputations of people’s own neighbourhood. These insights could provide hints on how to improve the quality of life of residents in neighbourhoods with a lesser reputation.

Furthermore, Teernstra (2014) describes that most studies are unable to present data that distinguish in-, out and non-migrants. These categories are also present in this study and could result in new insight by providing an in-depth perspective. In this research these categories are referred to as stayers, in- and out-movers. Especially the group stayers could provide new knowledge because they are not included in many other studies but are important regarding neighbourhood change according to Galster (1987) and Teernstra (2014). For example, the experiences of the relation between in-movers and stayers. Moreover, this study is deepening the relationship between the concepts of neighbourhood change and mobility based on the experiences from stayers, in- and out-movers.

Also, a lot of research in the Netherlands into neighbourhood change has been done in larger urban areas like Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Den Hague and Utrecht (e.g. Van Beckhoven, & Van Kempen, 2005; Bolt, & Van Kempen, 2011; Turkington, Van Kempen, & Wassenberg, 2004). Instead of a large Dutch city, a medium size city, Nijmegen, is chosen. This could lead to new insights and knowledge for a medium size city which are most common in the Netherlands.

Lastly, this research contributes to the scientific discourse of neighbourhood change. Foremost, by exploring changes in relatively small neighbourhood with a lesser reputation, compared to most other studies, and providing multiple experiences and perspectives around this discourse that is extensive been research throughout the years.
1.3. Research objective

The goal is to get insights in the influence of the social housing sector on these experiences and perceptions of these different types of residents, because a large part of the housing stock consists of social rental housing and therefore, they are a key stakeholder in Neerbosch-Oost, for example, due to their influence on residential mobility. Additionally, this research aims to provide new knowledge on how the reputation of Neerbosch-Oost is experienced and perceived by stayers, in- and out-movers of Neerbosch-Oost. All this can support policy makers for future development of Neerbosch-Oost and in the debate around the changing social rented sector.

1.4. Research questions

In this master thesis the main research question is:

*How is neighbourhood change experienced and perceived by stayers, in- and out-movers, and how is this influenced by the social housing sector and reputation of Neerbosch-Oost?*

The following sub-questions arise from this research question and contribute in answering the main research question:

- How do stayers, in and out-movers experience and perceive the processes of invasion and succession?
- How do stayers, in- and out-movers experience and perceive the increased diversity of the population?
- What is the effect of the reputation of Neerbosch-Oost on the experiences and perceptions of stayers, in-, and out-movers? And how do they react?
- How does residential mobility of stayers, in- and out-movers influence their experiences and perceptions of Neerbosch-Oost?
- How does the social housing sector influence the experiences and perceptions of stayers, in- and out-mover of Neerbosch-Oost?

The concepts the experiences and perceptions of stayers, in- and out-movers will be studied:

- Invasion and succession
- Filtering
- Threshold effects
- Tipping points
- Social networks
- Life cycle
- Residential mobility
- Behavioural response
- Institutional approach
1.5. Reading guide

This thesis is divided into multiple chapters, each with their own contribution to the whole. In the first chapter the subject will be introduced, the social- and scientific relevance, the goal and of course the research question that derived from this. Chapter two will provide a theoretical overview of the concepts that are used and discusses the scientific knowledge that forms the basis of this thesis. In chapter three the methodology for conducting research will be discussed, including the possible challenges of this research. The next chapter, chapter four, will describe a historical perspective of the casus Neerbosch-Oost and the evolution of the Dutch social housing market. In chapter five the result will be presented regarding experienced and perceived neighbourhood change of stayers, in- and out-movers. Chapter 6 will describe the results regarding the institutional perspective – with an emphasis on the social rental sector – on the perceptions of stayers, in- and out-movers. In this chapter the classification of stayers, in- and out-movers will be let go is. Instead of this classification the results will be presented around different stories that have come forward. This will result in a better understanding of the institutional perspective in Neerbosch-Oost. In the seventh, and final chapter the conclusion, discussion, limitations and reflection can be found, besides answering the main research question, and providing recommendations for both praxis and further research.
2. Literature review and conceptual framework

In this chapter the most important theoretical- and scientific literature on neighbourhood change will be discussed. Neighbourhood change knows a long scientific history to build upon. This review will therefore discuss the most relevant theories for this research, which are the ecological approach, behavioural approach and institutional approach. Additionally, some other relevant concepts will be discussed as well. Before going into detail, it is needed to explain what kind of space a neighbourhood is.

Neighbourhood as a social unit

According to Dutch Central Statistical Office (CBS, n.d.) a neighbourhood “is part of a municipality that is homogeneously defined on the basis of historical or urban characteristics”. In this context homogeneously refers to the dominance of one specific function. In some neighbourhoods these functions can be mixed (CBS, n.d.). Although, this definition is general in nature there are some relevant parts, such as the mix of functions, homogeneously and historical. In neighbourhoods’ different functions can be combined, for example, residential area, commerce or recreation but there is always one dominant – homogeneous – function. This dominant function does not arise spontaneously but contains a historical element. For instance, there is a need for housing, and this leads to the development of a residential area. Although these functions may seem fixed, they are not and could alter over time, for instance in times of conflict or because of a loss of industry. For a working definition in this study it is too general and lacks a more human element.

In the dictionary of human geography (2009) a neighbourhood is described as: “An urban area dominated by residential uses, generally small enough to be covered easily on foot. It is sometimes assumed that neighbourhoods are also communities defined by social interaction or defined by geographical boundaries such as major roads, parks, or rivers, but this is not necessarily the case”. This is less general and has a clear focus on social features like residential uses, walkable and social interaction. For the purpose of this research a definition with relevant elements regarding experienced neighbourhood change will be used, because residents interact with each other and share their experiences and perceptions about the neighbourhood. In this case experiences and perceptions from Neerbosch-Oost.

From a more academic perspective Galster (2001) defines a neighbourhood as: “the bundle of spatially base attributes associated with clusters of residences, sometimes in conjunction with other land uses” (p. 2112). Although he is using some other words to describe a neighbourhood, his description shows several similarities with the definitions mentioned before, like multiple function of land uses and a space with a dominance of residential uses.

Furthermore, Galster (2001) distinguish four key users that together produce a neighbourhood: households, businesses, property owners and local governments. With other words, they collectively ‘create’ a neighbourhood, and as a result each neighbourhood is experienced differently. For households it is a place where they live and do their day to day activities, whereas for businesses it is an area to make their living. Property owners rent-out their property and maintain its value. Local governments provide services to the public and enforce regulations. Together these experiences, interests, meanings and activities contribute to creation – social construction – of a neighbourhood.

As already mentioned by Keller (as cited in Schwirian, 1983, p. 84) most definitions of a neighbourhood contain two general elements: the physical and the social. All three definitions have both elements, only Galster (2001) is not referring to the physical element directly but calls it “the bundle of spatially base attributes”. Nonetheless, it indicates that it is important to take both elements into account when studying neighbourhood change.
Due to the focus on experiences and perception of stayers, in- and out-movers a neighbourhood will be mainly viewed from a social perspective based on the definitions of Galster (2001). However, the physical infrastructure cannot be ignored and will be discussed in chapter 5 regarding the casus Neerbosch-Oost.

2.1. The process of neighbourhood change

Neighbourhood change has extensively been theorized over the years. As mentioned before there are multiple approaches, for example, the ecological, behavioural and institutional approach. These three approaches will be reviewed because of their relevance for this research. The ecological approach discusses the influence of a changing population on neighbourhood change. Instead of solely focusing on changing populations the behavioural approach explains neighbourhood change from a social perspective and individual choices. The institutional perspective will be discussed because of the focus on institutions that are strongly represented in the Netherlands.

2.1.1. Ecological approach

One of the first theoretical approaches is the ecological approach by Burgess (1925) of the School of Chicago. This approach assumes that neighbourhood decline is inevitable due the assumption that the housing stock is slowly aging and initiating processes of succession and invasion. The core idea, of succession and invasion, is that immigrants initially depend on cheap housing and are competing with sitting residents about available housing. Residents who can afford to move to a better neighbourhood will leave. The vacant housing will attract new immigrants. If this process of invasion continues, these new groups of residents replace the old residents and become the new dominant population. For example, in research on the Dutch neighbourhood Kanaleneiland from Van Beckhoven and Van Kempen (2005) support for these processes of invasion and succession is found. The residents in this neighbourhood changed from a homogeneous native Dutch population to a more diverse neighbourhood with, in particular, Turkish and Moroccans population. Furthermore, according to Schiravian (1983) newcomers must socialize to the way of day to day life of the area. If newcomers, also called in-movers are culturally or racially different than the local population it will be a greater task to fit them into the social system. Locals can even demonstrate forms of resistance against in-movers when they are socially unacceptable or competing for the same resources, such as housing (Schiravian, 1983). More recently Pemberton and Phillimore (2018) have noted that people need to adjust to a recently and rapidly change of new inflow of migrants. However, areas with a long history of immigrants develop a kind of attitude where the ongoing arrival of people from new countries is perceived as being ordinary because newness is one of the elements that the local population identifies themselves with (Pemberton & Phillimore, 2018).

Hoyt (1939) also explains neighbourhood change by succession and invasion but includes the process of filtering. According to him it is a combination of neighbourhood decline and an attractive new urban neighbourhood. As a result, it is residential mobility that causes processes of invasion and succession. This differs from Burgess who starts the process of invasion and succession with flows of migrants as mentioned before. Furthermore, Hoyt speaks of the willingness to invest by residents. When a lot of people within the neighbourhood invest in their dwelling then the neighbourhood will increase in value through elements like a paint job, new kitchen or skylight. This process is also working the other way around; when residents do not invest in their dwelling the neighbourhood declines. Additionally, Temkin and Rohe (1996) describe that filtering models explain neighbourhood change as a decision-making process by landlords regarding the amount of investment for maintenance of aging buildings. It predicts that landlord’s investment is decreasing as the housing stock ages and, therefore, more affluent residents move and create openings for other – less wealthy – people causing neighbourhood decline. In particular filtering models expect neighbourhood decline when the willingness to invest or lack of investment in an aging housing stock is decreasing. In the Netherlands housing associations
own a large percentage of the total housing stock in cities and have the obligation to invest in their property to guarantee a certain quality of living. As mentioned before, the social housing stock in the Netherlands is generally of a good quality (Van Kempen & Priemus, 2002). It seems that decreasing investment in an aging housing stock is less relevant in the Netherlands.

**Tipping point**

Within the general framework of the invasion and succession model a number of researchers have attempted to identify the tipping point. Thomas Schelling (1971), in particular, provides in his study about models of segregation specific attention to neighbourhood tipping. According to him; “Tipping is said to occur when a recognizable new minority enters a neighbourhood in sufficient numbers to cause the earlier residents to begin evacuating” (p. 181). With other words, tipping assumes that the response to neighbourhood change accelerates when a certain critical value is surpassed. Additionally, Schelling (1971) assumes that the degree of tolerance influences this process. Certain groups or individuals have somewhat more tolerance than others. He argues that there is a difference between stayers – people who already live there – and outsiders, simply because it takes a stronger stimulus to make a family move out than to make a family decide not to move in. According to Zhang (2011) tipping models demonstrate that seemingly unimportant random shocks could shake a neighbourhood out of one equilibrium situation and move it to another equilibrium that is radically different. Therefore, tipping points have be taken into account when studying neighbourhood change, although, it is difficult to identify such a point (Argioulu et al., 2008). These findings are supported by Quercia & Galster (2000), who argue that an important characteristic of tipping point is that there is no single, generalizable value for the tipping point. It all depends on the particular neighbourhood and unique context. This illustrates once more that neighbourhood change is a complex process and causal relations are difficult to distinguish.

Furthermore, most studies on neighbourhood change within this school of thought focus on the effect of in- and out-movers in upgrading and downgrading patterns. However, a recent research by Teernstra (2014) has also questioned the influence of stayers concerning changes in socioeconomic status of a neighbourhood. Her studies show that not only in- and out-movers have an impact on change of the socioeconomic status of the neighbourhood but that stayers are important too. Therefore, a more comprehensive study would include all these different groups.

A concept that show some similarities with tipping point is the concept of threshold effects. Quercia and Galster (2000, p. 147) describe threshold effect as follows: “a dynamic process in which the magnitude of the response change significantly as the triggering stimulus exceeds some critical value”. Neighbourhood do not solely change by the inflow of in-movers but also by other neighbourhood attributes, for example, high school dropouts, employment rate, violent crime and housing investment. A wide range of scholars (e.g. Galster, Quercia, & Cortes, 2000; Taub, Taylor, & Dunham, 1984) tried to find these threshold effects for each of these attributes. Although most of these neighbourhood attributes are relevant, most cannot be classified under the ecological approach. However, according to Quercia and Galster (2000) there are three populations groups that can influence, or are influenced by, threshold effects; in-movers, out-movers and stayers. In the next paragraph the influence of these groups will be discussed in more detail.

**2.1.2. Behavioural approach**

As most of the time, a strong theoretical discourse, like the ecological approach, automatically provides an opposite discourse. In this case the behavioural approach critiques the human ecology approach that neighbourhood change cannot solely be explained by economic motives and that neighbourhood decline is not inevitable.
The behavioural approach is arguing that people’s intentions to move or to stay also depend on social motives (Argioli et al., 2008) for example social networks, position in lifecycle, reputation and labels. Residents that feel connected with a neighbourhood have a higher willingness to invest in elements that influence the future development of a neighbourhood. Ferey (1947) was one of the first who argued that motives to stay in or leave a neighbourhood also relate to the binding – a social motive – someone had with a neighbourhood. Temkin and Rohe (1996) describe that this approach starts from the notion that all neighbourhoods within cities do not follow the same trajectory over time. Some decline, others rise or have a stable development.

**Life cycle**
The behavioural approach focuses on choices and preferences of individuals and households and have a connection with events in people’s lives or the life cycle of individuals. Research by Clark and Onaka (1983) shows that a significant number of moves are also generated by changes in household characteristics, changes which are not directly associated with initial housing dissatisfaction. For example, family expansion could lead to a decision to move to a better neighbourhood (Rabe & Taylor, 2008). Also, a neighbourhood with a lot of children can change relative quick into a neighbourhood with a large number of elderly people when suddenly a lot of children leave their elderly home. However, according to Joos Droogleever Fortuijn (personal communication, 2019) in the Netherlands the life cycle changed from a fixed transition between 1960-1980 to a flexible transition and household diversity from 1990 onwards. It shows that changes within society also has its influence in individual lives and that translate to other parts of peoples their lives, for example the neighbourhood.

**Threshold effects and behavioural approach**
As mentioned in paragraph 2.1.1., there are three populations groups that can influence, or are influenced by threshold effects; in-movers, out-movers and stayers. A neighbourhood could reach a certain point, often negatively, where potential in-movers are discouraged and make an alternative neighbourhood choice, or a positive threshold which can increase the sum of in-movers significantly. For out-movers the conditions in the neighbourhood may eventually reach the critical value where they become intolerable for some residents and are triggered to move to a better neighbourhood. Stayers are more likely to engage in certain types of behaviour if such behaviour in the neighbourhood passes the threshold (Quercia and Galster, 2000). For example, if there is an increase in waste dump in the neighbourhood that triggers stayers more to dump their waste as well under the guise of “no one will notice because everyone does it”.

Additionally, these threshold effects relate to other mechanisms to explain neighbourhood dynamics. The most useful mechanisms are collective socialisation, social contagion, collective efficacy and preference models. These mechanisms are based on social interactions, behaviour and other forms of relations between groups (Galster, 2012). For example, in-movers adapt their behaviour to conform to local norms that exist in a specific area. Social contagion is to a certain extent the opposite of collective socialisation. Instead of in-movers adopting specific behaviour of locals, in-movers spread their behaviour to their living environment. If in-movers stay below a certain threshold value, it is more likely they conform to the local – through collective socialisation – norms and values. If the threshold value is exceeded, the chance is greater that in-movers spread their behaviour and ‘contaminate’ the original inhabitants, also known as stayers. Both collective socialisation and social contagion mechanisms show similar characteristics with the Dutch saying: “waar je mee omgaat word je mee besmet”, but that aside. Furthermore, instead of the term’s contagion/contaminate, interaction is a more appropriate term because it is about the experiences with different cultural groups. Therefore, the term interaction will be used in this thesis.

Collective efficacy is a term introduced by Sampson and Groves (1989) and could be described as the ability of groups to achieve a goal. In the context of a neighbourhood it is about the ability to reach an effective social control level. Residents are willing to talk to each other about their behaviour and if
necessary, correct each other. This term is also used in combination with social cohesion (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997).

According to Quercia and Galster (2000) the principle of preference models is that residents in a neighbourhood will respond if the cumulative behaviour of others rises to an undesirable level, they themselves find tolerable. The residents with the lowest tolerance level will respond. These first responses in combination with additional changes in the neighbourhood will result in a new tolerance level. This new tolerance level can initiate a new round of reactions by residents for whom this level is now too high. This model shows a lot of similarities with racial tipping point as mentioned in paragraph 2.1.1. by Schelling (1971). Only preference models also take into account that residents also could have other motive to move out of the neighbourhood.

Perception and image of a neighbourhood

Other aspects that can influence neighbourhood change are perception, stigmatization and image of a neighbourhood. Permentier et al. (2008) describe that a neighbourhood reputation does not naturally exist and are socially constructed based on experiences, information from the media and easily observable functional and physical attributes of neighbourhoods. This notion shows similarities with Galster’s (2001) view on producers of a neighbourhood which are, as mentioned before, households, businesses, property owners and local governments. However, in constructing or producing a reputation the media is a powerful actant, especially for people from outside of the neighbourhood. For example, the media can paint a wrong image of a neighbourhood by constantly highlighting negative aspects or discussions between officials and residents could reinforce the stigma of the neighbourhood as a place of passive, dependent and disconnected residents (Blokland, 2008).

The study of Permentier (2008) also shows that residents do asses the reputation of their own neighbourhood higher than non-residents. This is likely to be related to the assumption that most residents will be positively biased towards the neighbourhood they have chosen to live in or according to their limited choice of an alternative (Permentier et al. 2008; Permentier et al. 2011). In general, it seems that the residents and non-residents may think differently about the reputation of the same neighbourhood (Permentier et al. 2008). Additionally, the ethnic composition of neighbourhoods as well as average neighbourhood income are the strongest determinants of perceived reputation, which reflects the stratification process of society as a whole (Permentier et al., 2011).

According to Galster (2012) neighbourhoods may be stigmatized on the basis of public stereotypes held by powerful institutional or private actors about its current residents. In other cases, this may occur regardless of the neighbourhood’s current population because of its history, environmental or topographical disamenities, style, scale and types of dwellings, or conditions of their commercial districts and public spaces. Such stigma may reduce the opportunities and perceptions of residents of stigmatized areas in a variety of ways, such as job opportunities and self-esteem (Galster, 2012, p. 3). Other authors, such as Hastings and Dean (2003) concludes that reputations are also connected to the history of the neighbourhood. In multiple neighbourhoods in the UK the current reputation was mainly related to the social class of its original residents of many years ago.

Permentier et al. (2007) developed a model of behavioural responses of residents to negative neighbourhood reputation based on the Hirschi’s (1970) Exit, Voice and Loyalty framework. This model assumes three responses: move out the neighbourhood; trying to improve the neighbourhood; and (dis)investing in social contacts within the neighbourhood. This model illustrates that a neighbourhood reputation can have both a negative – moving out – as positive – improving the neighbourhood – effect on the development of a neighbourhood. In this regard Andersen (2008) describes that there is a connection between residents’ perception of the reputation of their neighbourhood and their plans to move. However the main reasons for moving away are dissatisfaction due to social problems and crime. Therefore, it seems that moving out is not the first behavioural response of residents regarding a negative neighbourhood reputation.
2.1.3. Institutional approach

Within the institutional approach there is a less prominent role for individual households. Instead it emphasizes on interventions and regulations to explain neighbourhood change established by institutions such as governments and housing associations (Teernstra & Van Gent, 2012). A few examples of these regulations or interventions are; central rearranged rental prices, differences in rental subsidies, less newly built social housing and selling social housing (Argiolo et al., 2008). These decisions ensure that at the local level urban areas change differently. A particular neighbourhood can exclude low-income households because there is only few social housing, and other neighbourhoods can exclude high-income households because they largely consist of social rental properties.

In western countries such as the Netherlands, the welfare-state and social rental sector play important roles in changes in urban areas (Argiolo et al., 2008; Kempen & Priemus, 2002; Musterd & Ostendorf, 1998; Somerville et al., 2009). According to Musterd & Ostendorf (1998) the changing role of the government – receding government involvement and privatisation – is crucial in the development of cities or urban areas. Somerville et al. (2009) argue that the neighbourhood governance is a missing link in attempts to explain patterns of neighbourhood change. They describe three types of governance: hierarchical governance, self-governance and co-governance. Hierarchical governance makes decisions without involvement of residents. The opposite type of governance is self-governance. Residents make all the key decisions. Between the two both types there is co-governance, were there is collaboration between residents and governance in decision making processes (Sommerville et al., 2009). When ‘constructing’ a neighbourhood in a planned way, organisations using one of these three types of governance to succeed as they see fit. Although there are other forms of governance, it is not necessary to discuss all of these because they are less relevant for this research.

Other scholars within this approach focus less on the government or other large organisations but accentuate the people who work at these institutions more. Lipsky (2010) calls these persons gatekeepers and refers to people within institutions who are making decisions. A similar notion describes Anne Power (1997) in her book “Estates on the Edge: The social consequences of Mass Housing in Europe”, namely the importance of management. According to her, neighbourhood decline can happen by bad management, especially regarding the maintenance of a complex. For good management “nearness” is important because management from a distance does not provide a good view of the complexes or neighbourhood (Power, 1997).

An influential thought of institutions is the idea of mixing people from different socio-economic classes. Complete neighbourhoods did change and were renovated to realize this ‘ideal’ mix (Ostendorf, Musterd, & De Vos, 2001: Bolt & Van Kempen, 2011). Creating this ‘ideal’ mix is dubious because people, who have the opportunity, also self-segregate into neighbourhoods that they find more suitable, as Amin (2002) argues. It is referring to the concept of residualizing; changes in the socioeconomic composition in part of the housing stock (Forrest & Murie, 2014). In other words, segregation of certain groups in specific parts of a city. For example, in Stockholm the right-to-buy policy speeded up the gentrification process in inner city Stockholm. People with a higher socioeconomic status replace individuals with less resources (Andersson & Turner, 2014). Or as in the Netherlands where the socioeconomic composition of public housing changed from a large share of households with an above modal income to a housing segment with a concentration of individuals with less wealth (Van Kempen & Priemus, 2002). According to Wilson (1987) this could result in a so-called culture of poverty through a decrease of relevant contacts, political power and job opportunities. However, these possible effects do not always occur (Van Kempen & Priemus, 2002) and in the case of the Netherlands are difficult to distinguish and questionable (Musterd & Ostendorf, 1998). However, they are still recognisable as Gijsberts and Dagevos (2007) describe in their study about neighbourhood effects on multiple integration outcomes that with a sudden influx of non-Western citizens, inter-ethnic attitudes tend to be more negative. Pemberton and Phillimore (2018) show that new migrant
in neighbourhoods with a rapidly changing population feel excluded and not connected with the neighbourhood.

Connected to both residualizing and culture of poverty is the political economy approach. This approach places neighbourhood change in a broader perspective and argues that urban areas are used to accumulate capital by powerful elites (Temkin & Rohe, 1996). Although this approach could offer an interesting perspective it is less useful due to the predominantly micro- and practice-oriented objective of this research.

Within the Dutch context institutions, which are embodied by the welfare state and social housing associations, are of great importance to explain neighbourhood change. Therefore, chapter 4 will provide a more detailed debate on the role of the government and housing associations in the Netherlands from a historical point of view.

2.2. Residential mobility

“movement, per se, is not an evidence of change or of growth”
Burgess (1925, p. 58)

Nevertheless, in all three approaches – ecological, behavioural and institutional – residential mobility is discussed to a greater or lesser extent. Explaining neighbourhood change without discussing residential mobility would be incomplete, but it must be said that in many studies it is combined with other variables and indicators. In this section the focus will be on in-movers, out-movers and stayers. Although stayers do not show much residential mobility they are of relevance because stayers influence neighbourhood change, through their ability – or absence of it – to interact with in-movers and residents with a migration background. Actually, the quote of Burgess (1925) in the beginning of this paragraph expresses it exactly. Instead of solely focussing on movement – such as in- and out-movers – it necessary to pay attention to a more fixed/immobile group – stayers – that also can show signs of growth or decline over a long time period and therefore potentially can influence the course of a neighbourhood.

Among others, Feijten and Van Ham (2009, p. 2103) conceptualise residential mobility as “as a response to residential stress caused by a mismatch between a household’s residential needs and preferences and characteristics of its current housing situation”. Their study into the effect of neighbourhood change on residential mobility shows that lower-income groups more often have a desire to leave the neighbourhood but are least likely to realise their wish. Also, both static neighbourhood characteristics and subjective- and objective indicators have a significant effect on individuals desire to leave the neighbourhood. In short, if the neighbourhood is doing well, people are more likely to stay, and vice versa if a neighbourhood is in decline, people are more likely to leave. Furthermore, to make it more complex, this decision is influenced by the expectations about future change of the neighbourhood (Feijten & Van Ham, 2009).

However, a high residential mobility rate is not automatically an indicator of neighbourhood decline. According to Van Ham and Clark (2009) out-mobility in a neighbourhood can generally be explained by the composition of both the housing stock and population. Young people are more likely to move than elderly or young families and homeownership contributes to a lower rate of out-mobility. They do indicate that out-mobility is higher in neighbourhoods that have recently experienced an increase in the level of ethnic minority residents. This last result supports the theoretical notions of Burgess (1925) and Schelling (1971) as mentioned in paragraph 2.1.1. It seems that people look for a familiar living environment which leads to ‘like attracts like’, partly stimulated by otherness.
Additionally, Teernstra (2014) argues in their study on income development of in-movers, out-movers and stayers of neighbourhoods that socioeconomic status of stayers is of importance too, especially in reinforcing or impeding neighbourhood change. Research by Galster (1987) shows similar results and argues that neighbourhood change is caused by stayers that revitalise their house due to collective upkeep behaviour of homeowners. Furthermore, an increase of low-income groups that work just fine, although, this is rather the exception than the rule (Amin, 2002; Turkington, Van Kempen, & Wassenberg, 2004).

Another point of attention relating to residential mobility is that not all people end up in the neighbourhood of their choice. Van Ham and Clark (2009) describe that for most people a suitable dwelling will be the first priority. People who depend on social housing are either restricted to neighbourhoods where these houses are located, or they cannot find a suitable house in the neighbourhood they want. Finally, as mentioned before, there is a connection between residents’ perception of the reputation of their neighbourhood and their plans to move, though this is not often the main reason to leave (Andersen, 2008). These are all parameters that influence mobility.

In this research neighbourhood change is the central concept. Therefore, not one theoretical approach will be applied, but multiple concepts of each approach will be included. These are succession and invasion; tipping point and threshold effects; social motives; life cycle; perception of the neighbourhood reputation; and neighbourhood management. Because Neerbosch-Oost is a neighbourhood that for a large part consists of social housing, has a negative reputation and changed from a homogeneous Dutch population to a heterogeneous population due to, among others, an influx of migrants. The groups of stayers, in- and out-movers will provide experiences of historical events, but also more recent experience concerning the developments of Neerbosch-Oost. Besides, stayers are not included in many studies regarding neighbourhood change but are the group that has lived there the longest and are the most attached to the neighbourhood. Therefore, stayers are an interesting group to take into account. When all this is taken together, this study will reconstruct the transformation of Neerbosch-Oost over time through the experiences of the participants.
2.4. Conceptual framework

Figure 2.1 illustrates the conceptual framework and is showing the components of this research, as discussed in this chapter. Due to the fact that neighbourhood change is a complex process (Teernstra & Van Gent, 2012) the focus will be on specific elements of neighbourhood change. Therefore, this research is built around the neighbourhood change in Neerbosch-Oost, viewed from three theoretical approaches; ecological, behavioural and institutional. These approaches help us to understand the experiences of residents that are grouped in out-movers, stayers and in-movers and will result in experiences of neighbourhood change in Neerbosch-Oost. The black dotted circles visualise the most important components that make up the three different approaches. These approaches construct the experiences and perceptions of stayers, in- and out-movers. Finally, all this together – reflected by the blue dotted arrow – will result in the experienced and perceived neighbourhood change of Neerbosch-Oost.

The main focus is on micro-level – Neerbosch-Oost – and only the most important meso and macro processes will be discussed or touched upon, such as the Dutch housing policy.
3. Methodology

In this chapter the research methodology will be discussed. Each paragraph will focus on one specific part of the methodology, starting with the research approach, followed by methods and research strategy, techniques and data collection, data analysis, and finally, the research challenges.

3.1. Research approach

As a researcher doing research in the field of social science, it is necessary to consider your own position as well as the research approach. How do I conceive reality – ontology – and how can we ‘know’ this reality, or epistemology (Inglis & Thorpe, 2012). When reading about philosophical beliefs, this study is drawn to multiple paradigms. In the view of this research there is no such thing as one single reality but multiple, and ideas of reality are constructed in various ways. For example, stayers have more stored experiences of the neighbourhood than new-comers and therefore see a ‘different’ neighbourhood. This has more common ground with social constructivism, and that “reality is co-constructed between the researcher and the researched and shaped by individual experiences” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 35). A research based on qualitative data collection fits well with these beliefs.

Additionally, generally people do not look closely to numbers and data but talk more about experiences with each other, such as the experiences of their neighbourhood. If they perceive certain patterns, e.g. drug needles, there is a good chance they will tell this to their neighbours, and they will do the same. These perceptions can lead to the impression that the neighbourhood is deteriorating. Therefore, it is equally important to gain insight into experiences and perceptions as statistics and numbers because numbers are over interpreted.

3.2. Methods and research strategy

In order to answer the main research question and sub questions it is necessary to collect data in accordance to qualitative research methods and strategies. Therefore, a single case study has been chosen. This method provides, if well conducted, a detailed and in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (Creswell & Poth, 2018), as well as a significant contribution to knowledge (Della Porta & Keating, 2008).

Within the method of case studies, different types have been described by multiple authors (e.g. Yin, 2003; Porta & Keating, 2008; Creswell & Poth, 2018). For example, Yin (2003, p. 40) elaborates in his book about case study that there are five major rationales for a single-case designs; a critical case, representative case, revelatory case, longitudinal case and a unique case. Porta and Keating (2008) describes, instead of five, four main types of case studies: firstly, the descriptive case study, secondly the interpretive case study, thirdly the hypotheses-generating and refining case study, and fourthly theory-evaluating case studies (p. 227-228). Creswell and Poth (2018) describe three different variations regarding case studies: the single instrumental case study, the collective or multiple case study, and the intrinsic case study.

Although these authors use different names to indicate case studies, they show many similarities. Only because of the rich and detailed description of case studies by Yin (2003), this research will follow the terminology he uses concerning case studies. Therefore, the type of case study that will be used is a representative or typical single-case study. Or as Yin (2003, p. 40) puts is “the single case can then be used to determine whether a theory’s propositions are correct or whether some alternative set of explanations might be more relevant”. This coincides with the purpose of this study, to get an in-depth
and detailed knowledge about experienced and perceived neighbourhood change in a neighbourhood with a negative reputation. Based on these criteria, the case of Neerbosch-Oost is selected, a neighbourhood that has experienced a negative reputation for a long time. The knowledge that will be gained can be informative for other neighbourhoods in the Netherlands with similar issues. To get an in-depth understanding of the case multiple qualitative methods are used, which are semi-structured interviews as well as, secondary- and opportunistic data collection. These methods will be discussed in more detail in the following section.

Furthermore, Yin (2003) describes that a case study may involve more than one unit of analysis, also known as embedded case studies. In this study there are multiple units of analysis. Stayers, in-movers, out-movers and housing associations are combined with experience and perceived neighbourhood change. This is needed to get insight into the complex relationship of neighbourhood change and the experiences and perceptions of different groups that contribute to the construction of Neerbosch-Oost. Therefore, this study can be marked as an embedded case study. In paragraph 3.4 there will allude to how the data has been analysed.

3.3. Techniques and data collection

For the most part, the data collection is based on semi-structured interviews with experts and residents that belong to one of the target groups; stayers, in- and out-movers. Semi-structured interviews will provide the data needed to obtain the knowledge to answer the research question, but there is also room for flexibility. For example, a researcher forgot – or did not think about – certain perspectives and by responding to these new elements it could add extra value to the research. In appendix 2 the interview-guides can be found, which has been used for both interviews with experts and residents.

Residential groups and professionals

Due to the historical element in this research it is needed to talk to people from diverse residential groups. As mentioned before, these groups are stayers, in- and out-movers. For the perspective of social associations, it is needed to interview professionals with a wide range of work experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professionals</th>
<th>Organisation and profession</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frits Baghus</td>
<td>Housing associations Talis; network advisor</td>
<td>April 4th 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Hamers</td>
<td>Housing associations Talis; managing director</td>
<td>April 16th 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivo Rutten</td>
<td>Housing associations Talis; district manager Neerbosch-Oost</td>
<td>April 17th 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul van Roosmalen</td>
<td>Housing associations de Gemeenschap; managing director</td>
<td>April 25th 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riek Janssen</td>
<td>President tenant Association Accio.</td>
<td>April 24th 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Housing association participants.

Table 3.1 shows the professionals that participate in this research. The participants are from the housing association Talis, de Gemeenschap and Accio tenant association. These conversations contain detailed information about the perspective of the housing associations in Neerbosch-Oost.
Table 3.2 illustrates all the residents and households that participate in this research. The participants are grouped in stayers, in-movers and out-movers. The group of stayers includes the participants who have been living in Neerbosch-Oost for at least 24 years (average = 39 years), through most of them have been living there for a much longer time. The group of in-movers represent the participant who live in Neerbosch-Oost for a maximum of 10 years (average = 7.5 years). Participant who belong to the group out-movers are individuals who formerly lived in Neerbosch-Oost and moved to another district in Nijmegen. They have a wide range of duration of residence in Neerbosch-Oost. These boundaries are in particular set due to the order of the selection of participants. Firstly, the participants who belong to the group of stayers were approached. This resulted in an average duration of residence in Neerbosch-Oost of 39 years. To provide a different perspective it was necessary for in-movers to have a shorter duration of residence in Neerbosch-Oost, but long enough to have experienced the neighbourhood. Therefore, 10 years was chosen as a maximum for in-movers of Neerbosch-Oost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Resident type</th>
<th>Duration of residence</th>
<th>Dwelling category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch household 1</td>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>53 years</td>
<td>Social housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch household 2</td>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>35 years</td>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch residents 1</td>
<td>Stayer</td>
<td>53 years</td>
<td>Private rental sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch residents 2</td>
<td>Stayer</td>
<td>42 years</td>
<td>Social housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch household 3</td>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>41 years</td>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch resident 3</td>
<td>Stayer</td>
<td>54 years</td>
<td>Social housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish; resident 4</td>
<td>Stayer</td>
<td>35 years</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee morning Het Octaaf; three residents with a migration background</td>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>29, 26 and 24 years</td>
<td>Social housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch mover 1</td>
<td>Stayer, out- and in-mover</td>
<td>54 years connected to Neerbosch-Oost</td>
<td>Social housing for elderly and people with a disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrations background mover 2</td>
<td>Stayer, out- and in-mover</td>
<td>41 years connected to Neerbosch-Oost</td>
<td>Social housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration background in-mover 1</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch in-mover 2</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Social housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch in-mover 3</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Social housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch in-mover 4</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Social housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch in-mover 5</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Social housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration background in-mover 6</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>Social housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrations background out-mover 1</td>
<td>Out-mover</td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch household out-movers 2</td>
<td>Out-mover</td>
<td>46 years</td>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch out-mover 3</td>
<td>Out-mover</td>
<td>33 years</td>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish out-mover 4</td>
<td>Out-mover</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Social housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Resident participant, stayers, in- and out-movers.

However, there are some participants that cannot be grouped in just one category but in multiple. This is due to the fact the residents housing career started in Neerbosch-Oost, then moved to other places and then moved back to Neerbosch-Oost. Therefore, these participants cannot be grouped in one of the three main groups. The difference between residents and households is that a resident is one...
person and a household is a couple, in all cases the couple consisted of a male and female. These conversations provided information that is part of the core data of this research.

Furthermore, the sampling strategy is to a certain extent biased because some participants who were approached were happily to participate and to answer my question for this research. Consequently, residents of Neerbosch-Oost who were less willing did not participate and therefore these experiences cannot be included in this study.

**Secondary data**

In order to provide a historical context of the welfare state in the Netherlands, the development of the social housing sector and Neerbosch-Oost, secondary data such as statistics and scientific literature is used. For describing the welfare state and the social housing sector in the Netherlands desktop research is used as technique using search engines like RUQuest and Google Scholar and digital information sources, such as Central Statistical Office.

For a better understanding of the development of Neerbosch-Oost it was necessary to use archive material. Various sources have been consulted including Archive Nijmegen, Home of history of Nijmegen, Regional archive Nijmegen, Central Statistical Office and the Municipality of Nijmegen.

**Opportunistic data collection and spontaneous interaction**

Besides semi-structured interviews and secondary data, there is data collected in the form of notes, meeting reports and observations from a coffee morning at Het Octaaf; Pizza Participate Party, “belletje lellen 2.0”, and a tour around the neighbourhood with a district police officer. Due to the informal character of this kind of data, it was not possible to prepare and record all these interactions. Afterwards a summary or report was made of these interactions. This sampling strategy relates to what Creswell and Poth (2018, p. 159) call opportunistic sampling: “Follows new leads, taking advantage of the unexpected”. By using this strategy, this research covers a more diverse sampling population and more than just contacts of my internship organisations. Another reason to use a more informal setting, is provided by Porta & Keating (2008, p. 311). They argue that “in order to allow the informant to feel more at ease and less self-conscious, the researcher must find the situation most amenable to the interviewee and be ready to carry out informal interviews in informal settings”. These informal settings will be discussed briefly below.

Participating in these activities led to valuable interactions and conversations with a variety of residents in Neerbosch-Oost. Due to the spontaneous character of these conversations, they do not have the structure of an interview. Therefore, the data that is collected in this method have to be analysed in a slightly different technique than semi-structured interviews. The advantage of natural data collection is the high authenticity (Yuan, 2001, p. 275). Both the researcher and the object of research are free to speak, which could be different when that conversation would be recorded.

At the Pizza Participate Party, I made observations as a “participant as observer” (Creswell and Poth, 2018, p. 167). As a researcher I participated, made pizza, talked to residents and observed other groups of people who discussed their ideas and plans to develop the neighbourhood.

These observation and spontaneous interactions contribute to both broadening and deepening of this research. However, there are some drawbacks concerning this method for data collection, among which was that I had less control over the produced data. Therefore, the acquired data through this method complements the other data in this research. The core data remains the data that was produced by semi-structured interviews.

**3.4. Concept operationalisation**

In order to operationalise the different concepts that are used in this study, these are incorporated into the interview questions. For example, the concept of diversity is translated as: How do you deal...
with people with a different lifestyle? And with a short introduction: In the neighbourhood there are living people with all kinds of backgrounds. How do you interact with people from different backgrounds? This is done for all the concepts that are used in this study. In appendix 2 the complete interview-guide can be found that is used for interviews with experts and residents.

Most of the concepts are used quite literally. Sticking to the concept of diversity some participant describe that activities became more diverse, giving examples like iftar and halal lunch at “bouwdorp”. These experiences indicate a changing relation between locals and residents with a migration background. Interaction between these groups has resulted in intercultural exchange or behavioural change of residents of Neerbosch-Oost. The same applies for the concepts of invasion, succession, social network, life cycle, residential mobility and reputation. The next paragraph will discuss this in more detail.

The concepts of tipping point and threshold effects are slightly operationalised differently because of their explicit nature concerning one certain point. Therefore, multiple experiences/quotes from different participant are used to indicate a single tipping point or threshold effect. Furthermore, the operationalisation of the concepts that are used is to some extent translated into coding. The next paragraph will discuss this in more detail.

### 3.5. Data analysis

Conducting interviews will provide a rich amount of qualitative data. This data is analysed using ATLAS.ti, a program that is designed for analysing qualitative data. To provide structure, the data is coded in a specific order. There are three phases of coding; open-, axial-, and selective coding (Creswell & Poth, 2018). In the first phase, namely open coding, meaningful data will get a code. For example, a participant talks about interaction with newcomers in the neighbourhood. This is an indication of experience regarding neighbourhood change and therefore this will be coded. In the second phase of coding, namely axial coding, all the codes from the first phase are structured further. Codes that are used often or are similar, are grouped together. For example, multiple codes that relate to institutional neighbourhood change can form a single group. In the final phase, called selective coding, the groups and codes will be further specified and will form a “network tree”. Groups can be connected within this network tree to theoretical concepts and these links will be labelled with specific names such as: contradict with, is part of, is associated with, or other similar links. This tree will visualize the outcomes of the analysis and the results of the experienced neighbourhood change in Neerbosch-Oost. The network trees are included in appendix 3.

### 3.6. Research challenges

As mentioned before, a case study provides an in-depth knowledge of a specific phenomenon. Consequently, generalisability is difficult and not a goal in most case studies (Creswell & Poth, 2018), but it is something to keep in mind when conducting a case study research. The outcomes will provide indications of how it might be – or work – for other cases. Or as Porta and Keating (2008, p. 226) describe this: “Confronted with the case the challenge is to acknowledge and uncover its specific meaning, while extracting generalizable knowledge actually or potentially related to other cases”. Naturally they also indicate that it is important to do justice to the specific meaning of the case and from there extract knowledge that possibly is generalizable.

In this case study, one specific neighbourhood – Neerbosch-Oost – will be researched. However, the city around Neerbosch-Oost is transforming side by side and simultaneously with Neerbosch-Oost. Due to the time limits of this research, I will focus solely on the neighbourhood Neerbosch-Oost and much less on other areas in the city. This does not mean that these areas do not influence Neerbosch-Oost, but it will be involved in this research.
Moreover, as a researcher you are involved in a relation with the object of research and contributes directly to its perceptions within society (Porta & Keating, 2008). Studying in-movers, out-movers, stayers and a negative reputation, it contributes to the constructing of these groups and reputations. As a researcher it is important to realize that and therefore the concepts in this study will be carefully approached.

4. The case of Neerbosch-Oost

In this chapter the casus Neerbosch-Oost will be described. Different aspects of Neerbosch-Oost will be looked into like historic development, population, housing stock and social housing. To provide context and to show the influence of macro development relating to the case, it is necessary to begin with an overview of the development of the Dutch welfare state and public housing.

4.1. Welfare state and social housing in the Netherlands

In the Netherlands the housing associations were created in the second half of the 19th century as non-profit private housing providers. They provide an alternative to the market approach that was incapable of solving urban housing problems at a time of the height of industrialization (Priemus, 2003). In 1852 the first housing association was created “Vereeniging ten behoeve der Arbeidersklasse te Amsterdam” and dozens of other associations were established in the course of the 19th century (Beekers, 2012).

After the second World War the Netherlands had a large shortage of houses. Therefore, it was necessary to increase the number of houses as fast as possible. Due to government support social housing organisations could increase their number of dwellings from 12 percent in 1947 to 41 percent of the Dutch housing stock in 1990 (Priemus, 2003). See table 4.1 for the development of the total newly built houses in the Netherlands. It clearly shows a great increase between 1947 and the high point in 1973, from then onwards the amount of newly built houses decreases, with here and there a period of growth. The government and housing associations were good for a quarter of new housing (Beekers, 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>20000</th>
<th>40000</th>
<th>60000</th>
<th>80000</th>
<th>100000</th>
<th>120000</th>
<th>140000</th>
<th>160000</th>
<th>180000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40554</td>
<td>17770</td>
<td>5923</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40676</td>
<td>17463</td>
<td>5752</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41456</td>
<td>17586</td>
<td>5633</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42493</td>
<td>18281</td>
<td>5984</td>
<td>1748</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43456</td>
<td>18465</td>
<td>6093</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1.: Total newly built houses in the Netherlands between 1926-2018.

Source: CBS, 2019
Not only the amount of housing increased after the Second World War, but there was economic growth and an increase in welfare. For example, the car became available for a wide range of people just like the television and washing machine. The needs of people also changed in relation to housing. To respond to these changing needs, social housing associations gained more liberties in the mid-60 and therefore could operate more independently with less government intervention. Instead of government involvement, residents demanded a voice regarding development of new policies. It even resulted in tension between the growing professionalisation of the social housing associations and democratisation with residents. Sometimes the complete management of a social housing association was sent home (Beekers, 2012).

The privatization process of housing corporations accelerated in the ’80s and ’90s. The corporations would get more and more freedom to perform their public duties with grossing and balancing operation in 1995 as sort of final measurement to make them independent, also known as ‘operatie-Heerma’ (Beekers, 2012). The procedure involved writing off the housing associations’ debts to the state against the state’s commitments to the housing associations in the form of future annual property subsidies (Priemus, 2003). Since then housing associations have to use their own reserves to finance the maintenance and renovation of existing housing and they have to find funding for new construction on the capital market (Van Kempen & Priemus, 2002). The privatization process would also be beneficial for the so-called ‘mismatch’, households with a relatively high income that live in an inexpensive rented dwelling. Or the other way around, households with a low income lives in an expensive rented dwelling with a high individual housing benefit (Van Kempen & Priemus, 2002). Their public tasks are defined in the BBHS – Besluit Beheer Sociale Huursector BBSA – a new constitution of housing corporations Social Rental Sector Management Decision. Through these policy changes, the public housing sector transformed from a social security system to a safety net for vulnerable groups instead of being available for a wide range of people and classes (Beekers, 2012).

At the end of the 20th century a new policy of urban restructuring was launched. Within this policy, the large-scale differentiation of the urban housing stock – and especially the redifferentiation of those neighbourhoods with a large number of social rented dwellings – can be seen as one of the most important goals, because these areas were frequently seen as problematic areas due to, among other things, a concentration of low-income households (Van Kempen & Priemus, 2002).

In 2014 a parliamentary inquiry “Ver van huis” revealed the abuses of housing associations (Tweede Kamer der Staten Generaal, 2014). Some directors could not handle the independence and liberties what resulted in dubious practises, wrongdoings and a lot of criticism (Beekers, 2012, p. 287). For example, a director who was driving around in a Maserati was widely reported in the media. It led to a new housing law in 2015 that narrowed the liberties of housing associations and provided clarity about their duties. One of those narrowed liberties was limiting the financial risks that a housing association could take. They should focus once again on their core task: provide high-quality and affordable housing for people with low income (Central government, 2015).

In this short introduction of the welfare state and social housing it shows that a lot has changed over the years. From an alternative for the market approach social housing associations changed to a hybrid institution that combines public task – housing – and also engage in market operations like new building projects (Priemus, 2003). Furthermore, the social rental housings in the Netherlands are of a high quality (Van Kempen & Priemus, 2002) and according to Musterd & Ostendorf (1998) the welfare state makes a difference by smoothing effects of income and housing redistribution processes. Nevertheless, the sector became more and more the sector for a specific group of people; vulnerable and low-income groups, and it will remain that way in the future for now.
4.2. Characteristics Neerbosch-Oost

Neerbosch-Oost is nowadays surrounded by urban areas, but that was not always the case in the past. Traditionally it was one of the church villages that surrounded Nijmegen and it was called Neerbosch instead of Neerbosch-Oost, a name that is still used frequently in conversations with residents (Municipality of Nijmegen, 1981, 2015). Figure 4.1 shows the location of the neighbourhood in Nijmegen and photo 4.1 illustrates the white church that reminds of the past of Neerbosch-Oost as a church village. When Nijmegen continued to expand Neerbosch-Oost became surrounded by urban areas and is anno 2019 located in the district Nieuw-west Nijmegen.

Figure 4.1: Location of Neerbosch-Oost in Nijmegen. Source: Esri and edited in ArcGis.

Photo 4.1: Church “Witte kerkje” in Neerbosch-Oost. Source: Own photo.

4.2.1. Population and socio-economic statistics

Graph 4.1 shows the demographic development of Neerbosch-Oost. The age structure of the neighbourhood changed from a large number of children and young people in 1970 to a dominance of people between 25-49 and a higher percentage of people above 64 years old in 2017. Additionally, the total population dropped from 8076 in 1970 to 6745 in 1980. From 1980 the population increased again and fluctuated around 7700 from 2013 onwards.
The origin of inhabitants of Neerbosch-Oost in 2017 is shown in graph 4.2. It shows that Neerbosch-Oost does have a mixed population. According to Spectrum (2018) there live 138 nationalities in Neerbosch-Oost. The largest group are the Dutch with 62%, followed by migrants from Western countries with 12%, non-western migrants with 10%, Turkish and Moroccans with both 7%, Surinamese and Antilleans with both 1%. The appearance of these groups is in part caused by recruitment treaties with multiple Mediterranean countries for strengthening the Dutch labour force after the Second World War. There were connections with Spanish, Italian, Moroccan and Turkish governments. Furthermore, there was also a group of migrants that voluntarily came to the Netherlands to work (Zorlu & Hartog, 2001).

The municipality of Nijmegen describes Neerbosch-Oost as a focus area. The value of the real estate and the social economic position of the population in Neerbosch-Oost are belonging to the lowest of
Nijmegen in comparison to the other neighbourhoods (Municipality of Nijmegen, 2012). According to the Leefbaarometer – an instrument to monitor the quality of life in the Netherlands – the quality of life in Neerbosch-Oost changed from weak in 2002 to sufficient in 2018 (Leefbaarometer, 2019). Table 4.2. shows some social economic statistics of Neerbosch-Oost and Nijmegen. The statistics clearly show that a larger amount of the households in Neerbosch-Oost is live around the social minimum compared to average of Nijmegen. Furthermore, the average WOZ value – cadastral value – of Neerbosch-Oost lags behind the mean of Nijmegen. Based on these statistics, it is not surprising why the municipality of Nijmegen describes Neerbosch-Oost as focus area. According to Hastings and Dean (2003), there are certain stigmata in society about people with a low economic status and it could be a reason why Neerbosch-Oost developed a negative reputation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% households around the social minimum</th>
<th>% low-income households</th>
<th>WOZ value</th>
<th>Average income per inhabitant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neerbosch-Oost</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>€ 148,000,00</td>
<td>€ 19,700,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijmegen</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>€ 205,000,00</td>
<td>€ 24,200,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. Social economic statistics Neerbosch-Oost and Nijmegen. Source: Own chart based on data from municipality of Nijmegen 2018.

4.2.2. Housing stock and physical environment

The housing stock in Neerbosch-Oost consists of 1809 social housing, 598 of private rent and 1140 owner-occupied dwellings. Social housing makes up 50% of the total housing stock in Neerbosch-Oost (Municipality of Nijmegen, 2019). In figure 4.2 the locations of social houses are shown as well as the housing associations that manage these houses. It illustrates that there are multiple blocks of public housing, alternated with other blocks of housing and shopping centre. Furthermore, it shows that there are various social housing associations that own property in Neerbosch-Oost, which are Portaal, Talis, Standvast, De Gemeenschap and Woonzorg Nederland. However, in May 2019 Standvast and De Gemeenschap have merged into Woonwaarts (De Brug Nijmegen, 2019). Therefore, there are three key housing associations active in Neerbosch-Oost; Woonwaarts, Talis and Portaal. Although Woonzorg Nederland is also active in the neighbourhood, it cannot be classified as key actor because it owns a lot less property in Neerbosch-Oost compared to the other housing associations. In appendix 1 the different investment of former housing associations in Neerbosch-Oost can be found. For example, housing association “Kolping” – also known as Katholieke Woningvereniging Kolping – invested in 120 multi-storey houses. Later this housing association changed to Talis.
To visualise the housing stock the next page is transformed into a photo collage of the different types of housing in Neerbosch-Oost. The photo of the Nocturnestraat is showing the maisonettes, which is social housing, that are common in the south part of the neighbourhood. There are three high-rise buildings, which is also social housing, in Neerbosch-Oost, one of these flats is the Maas-Waal flat. The types of houses that are shown on the photo of Tubaplein and Rapsodiestraat are located in the northern part of Neerbosch-Oost. Pskovlaan and Etudestraat are both owner-occupied houses and are in the North and central part of the neighbourhood. Additionally, if something can be classified as unique in this neighbourhood than that would be the closed nature of the neighbourhood. Neerbosch-Oost is surrounded by the Neerbosscheweg and Graafseweg on one site and on the other site lies the Maas-Waal canal. Among other things, there is only one access road into and out of the neighbourhood. These elements act as a barrier and contribute to the isolated location of Neerbosch-Oost. This is one of the reasons why the casus Neerbosch-Oost is interesting.
Nocturnestraat

Maas-Waal flat

Tubaplein

Rapsodiestraat

Pskovlaan

Etudestraat

Source: own photos
4.2.3. Historical development

As mentioned before, Neerbosch-Oost was a former so-called church village and was split in two by the construction of the Maas-Waal canal in 1924 (Municipality of Nijmegen, 1981). This also resulted in the creation of Neerbosch-Oost and Neerbosch-west. The ‘dorpsstraat’ still has elements of the former village Neerbosch, see photo 4.1 for ‘het witte kerkje’. After the Second World War, the Netherlands had a shortage of houses and had to be rebuilt. Various urban districts have been added to Nijmegen as part of the reconstruction law like Neerbosch-Oost around 1962-1963. The Maas-Waal canal provided limited expansion options and worked as a barrier. That is why the aim was to achieve a higher housing density compared to the standard ratio used in Nijmegen (Municipality of Nijmegen, 1981). Instead of 60-40 ratio of single-family houses a 70-30 ratio was used (Eliëns, 1990). A higher housing density was also necessary to arrive at an acceptable operating plan and resulted in a rectangular allotment pattern with the smallest possible street area. In the plan there are 5 blocks in the neighbourhood that are grouped around the shopping complex central in the neighbourhood (Municipality of Nijmegen, 1981). See figure 4.3 for the 5 areas that are located around the planned shopping complex in the middle.

Figure 4.3: Design drawing of blocks of housing in Neerbosch-Oost
Source: Municipality of Nijmegen 1981.

Recreation in the form of parks did not appear in the plan because these could be filled in by the Goffert park and the future canal zone. Although, there was greenery planned between building blocks, roads and another smaller green elements (Municipality of Nijmegen, 1981). The plans also foresee, due to populations forecast, that there was a need for 3 or 4 kindergartens and 6 or 7 primary schools (Municipality of Nijmegen, 1981).

After the construction of the district in the sixties, it formed the edge of the urban development of Nijmegen-West for a period of approximately 15 years. This changed with the construction of Lindenholt and Dukenburg.
With the increase of welfare in the Netherlands houses became more luxurious, as it became possible to connect to the gas network for example. The family Gerrits, living at the Nocturnestaat in Neerbosch, was the first family that could let the stove and the geyser burn on natural gas. This scoop allows the family to purchase free gas for one year (Eliëns, 1990).

Figure 4.4 illustrates the construction year of the buildings in Neerbosch-Oost. The majority of the buildings are built between 1945-1975. Around the shopping malls in the central area of the neighbourhood are a few buildings from a later period and in the North is a part with houses from between 1982-1990. More specific, former contractor- and trading company of E.W. Smit has been redeveloped to make way for houses. The main reason to redevelop the site was because the quality was going downhill and a building was being squatted (Municipality of Nijmegen, 1983).

Figure 4.4: year of construction real estate Neerbosch-Oost.
Source: OpenStreetMap and adopted with EduGIS.
5. Results experienced and perceived neighbourhood change

This chapter will discuss the outcomes of the semi-structured interview, informal talks and other forms of data collected regarding experiences and perceptions of stayers; in-movers; and out-movers. To provide this chapter with structure, each group has its own paragraph, beginning with the experiences and perceptions of stayers.

As mentioned in chapter 3, the data is analysed by using ATLAS.ti and are individually coded groups in categories that form a network tree together. In the coding process some codes have been used multiple times, but to preserve the detailed information a lot of codes are coded individually. How often a code occurs, can best be indicated by the group these codes belong to. In appendix 3 a more detailed explanation can be found as well as the network trees that emerged from the analysis.

Another point I want to point out is that all the interviews have been done in Dutch. This has led to translation difficulties because some Dutch spoken phrases are very hard to translate to English.

5.1. Experiences and perceptions of stayers

In this paragraph there will be focused on the group that is called “stayers” in this research. As mentioned before, participants who belong to this group are residents of Neerbosch-Oost who have been living there for at least twenty years, though, most of them have been living there much longer. In table 3.2 details about stayers can be found, such as the durations of residence.

5.1.1. Ecological approach

Invasion and succession

The analysis shows that all stayers have experiences with change of population in Neerbosch-Oost. Although there are individual differences, they all have experienced the processes of invasion and succession in Neerbosch-Oost, though some more than others. In appendix 3.1 is the network trees of the analysis shown about the perceptions and experiences of stayers towards the ecological approach. Some of the stayers speak of: “I think in particular that the change is that more nationalities have arrived”, and describe the population in the past as: “when I came to live here there were fewer foreign people”, or “the composition of the population was different”. These are clear indications of experiences that relate to processes of invasion and succession.

A Dutch couple who have lived in Neerbosch-Oost since 1978 describe their experiences regarding the ecological approach as follows:

R: Many people lived here, I always understood, from the university and the people who worked there.
R1: Many medical people also lived here, but that had to do with the DSM [pension fund]. I don’t know how that worked, but there were quite a few people from there here. Doctors in training, there and here.
R: Yes, that has changed.

This experience clearly shows that the population back in the ‘70s was different and that employees from the Radboud were living in Neerbosch-Oost. They experience the following regarding the increase of diversity of the population:

R: The neighbourhood has changed just like the population at school, more foreign have come to live in the neighbourhood, multiple cultures.
I: A logical consequence that all that also changes?
Yes, and one person can handle it better than another, I think. Some have more difficulty with it and are quite negative about it.

It doesn't bother me that much.

No, and at school it is an enrichment to have all those differences.

Yes, indeed everyone brings their own story.

Yes, I think it would be great if it all blended a bit more. That people don’t go to school somewhere else, because you can learn from each other... And some people also say: I don’t understand people who speak a different language. Yes, that’s right. Also, you see how the stores change in the neighbourhood. When you enter the neighbourhood, there is a Turkish or Moroccan shop.

Both sections of the interview clearly show elements of the processes of invasion and succession. Additionally, it demonstrates that migrants/newcomers ‘spread’ their culture to a different part of the neighbourhood as a result of interactions at school or by opening various shops. Together these results suggest that the first groups of immigrants have built up their life in Neerbosch-Oost and influence the local community with their own cultural customs.

A female Turkish stayer that has been connected to Neerbosch-Oost for 41 years offers a different view. She grew up in Neerbosch-Oost and describes that the local population initially reacted by picking upon them, but eventually their behaviour changed. She describes it as follows:

That everyone was equal, and the front door was open for everyone. You could just walk in at the neighbours and it really did not matter which nationality you had. The neighbours come by when you were sick. It was one big family. That was very positive also because it did not matter if you were Dutch or had a different background. It was all equal. When I had the age of [age] we moved to another area of Neerbosch-Oost. To the infamous “Tubapleintje” at the time in the 80s. Then we really came to a part of the neighbourhood where we really thought; what is this? A period full of discrimination. A lot of girlfriends, foreign girlfriends, were bullied away during that time in that part of the neighbourhood. So that was a very tough period.

And we were a family who had the attitude of; you can have your opinions about certain things, but we have just as much rights to live here as you. You are going to have to deal with it. Eventually, we got very nice contacts.

I think that is because, first of all, we did not let ourselves be bullied away like other families. At some point we started to give a response. Then you were told words such as; piss off to your own country, dirty, filthy Turk. Our respond was then; do you know what you should do, go work on your topography and then you can come back. You make people think, why? And at a given moment you notice that people start to know you, see you grow up and realise that we were not that different from their own children. Also, my parents were very calm, we did not bother them. Eventually, we were seen as one of them. And now there are still neighbours that come chat with me and say negative things about ‘new’ foreign children. Then I provide them with feedback like; that is how you felt about us 20 years ago. And then they say: yes, but you are not such people. We have found our place there somehow.

It shows how she and her family experienced resistance from the local population at their new living environment at Tubaplein, but eventually were accepted by the locals. These results are similar to those described by Schwirian (1983) about different types of resistance from locals towards
newcomers. It seems like this type of behaviour by locals at Tubaplein is some kind of habit because they keep speaking negatively about new newcomers.

Furthermore, the analysis shows that invasion is also more recently experienced by some stayers in their housing complex, a high-rise building. Around 2012-2013, the housing association Talis – who owns these complexes – changed the policy by removing the senior label of all three complexes. This label ensured that only people from 55 years old and above could respond to vacant apartments. In order to prevent age discrimination, this label was removed and made sure that people from all ages are welcome (Ivo Rutten, personal communication, April 17, 2019). Stayers experience now that young people “invade” these complexes that were formerly dominated by the elderly. A female stayer (54 years resident of Neerbosch-Oost) describes this process as follows:

R:  
_Luckily, I live on the ‘island’_ [apartment that does not have direct neighbours because it is located between the outside wall and the central staircase of the flat] _instead of a terraced house, because then you can, for example, live next to a family with children_. Not that I have anything against children, but they do not belong in a flat. When those children grow older and start playing, where should those children go? On the gallery were they bike and play football, it is quite noisy. Luckily, I have no problems with that.

In an interview with a male, who has lived in Neerbosch-Oost for 42 years, he describes that in the “living room” of the high-rise building (a place where residents can drink coffee and socialize) that new residents also have to deal with prejudices (personal communication, May 10, 2019). This shows a similar process between locals and migrants as previously described. When these results are taken together, they suggest that ecological processes not only relate to racial population change, but also to changes in age structure. It is more about changing the dominance of one group to another, namely going from a local Dutch community to a multicultural community and from a complex for elderly to a complex for multiple generations. The old majority groups becoming the new majority groups as noted by Crul (2016) in his research into diversity in majority-minority cities.

_Tipping point_

The analysis shows that stayers experience and perceive individual tipping points, in other words, turning points in neighbourhood change. However, some of the tipping points describe not solely the classical tipping points as mentioned by Schelling (1971) in paragraph 2.1.1. A tipping point that is often mentioned by stayers are youth gangs, in different time periods, but the Manolito’s and Minolito’s are mentioned multiple times. Back in the 80s they were active in the neighbourhood and are not experienced as friendly. According to a male participant (39 years of age), who grew-up in Neerbosch-Oost, these youth gangs were described as the following:

R:  
_Yes, Manolito’s and Minolito’s. In a neighbourhood like this there are of course also problems. In the past, needless to say, some things have happened, the police had to act multiple times, robberies. That is also because young people in the past had less to do than the youth nowadays. In the past they had to figure it out by themselves. And back then things like burglary, car theft, or similar kinds of stuff happened more often._

It indicates that neighbourhood change is not merely associated with a high turn-over from a homogenous population to a more heterogeneous population, but also with crime and vandalism. Periods with less crime/vandalism/youth gangs/waste are experienced as times where Neerbosch-Oost is doing well and vice versa, when stayers experience and perceive an increase in crime/vandalism/youth gangs/waste, the neighbourhood is declining. These experiences of up- and down movement of a neighbourhood is in line with research done by Somerville et al. (2009).
Within the neighbourhood there are places where diversity is experienced completely differently nowadays and in the past. For example, the area around the maisonettes is described as open to diversity and it does not matter what your background is. Quite the opposite is experienced in the area around Tubaplein where the local populations did not like these immigrants. Although both areas consist of a large amount of social housing it is experience completely differently.

According to some other stayers it had to do with an institutional decision to place people from “De Benedenstad” in the houses around Tubaplein with professionals from welfare organizations in close proximity. After a while these professionals left, and these people were more dependent on each other leading to an increase of binding community. When people with a migration background moved into the area, it resulted in tensions between these groups.

5.1.2. Behavioural approach

**Threshold effects**

Threshold effect in combination with stayers is a difficult combination to analyse, because when an individual critical value has been exceeded there is a change that a stayer becomes an out-mover instead of a stayer. Stayers could potentially influence both positive as negative the critical value experience by in-movers.

Although there is one Dutch male stayer, who grew-up in Neerbosch-Oost and has been living there all his life, that describes a personal threshold effect that could be reached in the near future:

R:  *It is of course your neighbourhood that has declined. That is of course also because so many people have moved out and a lot of new people have been added. You see many Africans, actually of all kinds of nationalities, that you didn’t see in the neighbourhood before. I also know that a number of refugees have been placed here. The neighbourhood has totally changed regarding the people who now live there. And I understand that some people, such as my parents, are simply not happy with that. I also understand that very well... Formerly it was a top neighbourhood. I spent my childhood here, made friends and it was my neighbourhood. Now that is no longer the case. No, actually only my parents still live here and if they were to leave, it would be completely over for me. The connection is then gone.*

It illustrates that his connection with Neerbosch-Oost is slowly decreasing due to multiple factors. Although the changing population influences the critical value, it is not the only factor. Therefore, it is difficult to argue that his decreasing connection with the neighbourhood is solely because of a changing population.

According to Quercia and Galster (2000), stayers are however more likely to engage in certain types of behaviour if such behaviour in the neighbourhood passes the threshold. That a certain threshold has been exceeded, or rather that different cultures are considerate of each other, could for example be shown at some activities that are organised in Neerbosch-Oost. At “bouwdorp”, a week of activities for children, the organization that partly consisting of stayers took children with an Islamic background into account. A female stayer that has been connected for 54 years to Neerbosch-Oost describes it as follows:

R:  *But what I have noticed concerning “bouwdorpen” and also indicated in conversations with the municipality. Some “bouwdorpen” never have foreign people. They will come to us. Why it that? Some things can be traced back and sometimes you don’t know. It can also depend on the people. But what I have noticed that in the beginning, when there were not that many foreign people, they asked if the lunch was also halal? And that was not the case in the beginning, so then I told the parents on which days they...*
should provide their children with lunch themselves. And I told that to the first few parents and what I noticed was that the next day there were a few more. They did not come from Neerbosch-Oost, but from other neighbourhoods because they heard probably from their family that we take them into account. They will tell you when your child has to bring their own lunch. Nowadays it is taken into account that the sausages are halal and the hamburgers come from the Turkish butcher. And that goes around and spreads. If you take that into account, they will come earlier.

Another example is that a female stayer, who has been living in Neerbosch-Oost for 54 years, participated at an Iftar says the following about her experiences:

R: And this week I went to the iftar. I don’t know if you know that?
I: Not quite.
R: That is during the Ramadan. That is a festive meal where everyone brings some food and that was here in the main room. It was very busy. There were about a hundred people, almost all women and a few children. Everyone brings something to eat and then after half past nine you eat together because at that time is the official sunset and then you can eat. First came an Imam, or at least I think so. There were also a whole bunch of Dutch people.

It indicates that, although it is an Islamic festivity, people from different backgrounds are welcome and that stayers to a certain extent adopt behaviour of a different culture or enrich themselves with cultural habits of immigrants.

Both experiences – of “bouwdorp” and Iftar – show that stayers have adopted their behaviour in some ways to the new cultures in the neighbourhood. Or maybe it is the other way around; the non-Dutch cultures have adopted an active community life were Neerbosch-Oost is known for. Though, as mentioned before, it indicates there is a shift of minority- and majority groups in Neerbosch-Oost, which influences for example activities that are being organised. As mentioned before, this is in line with research done by Crul (2016) into diversity in majority-minority cities.

Social motives and life cycle
As expected, the analysis shows that stayers feel a strong connection to Neerbosch-Oost. They have built up their social contact, participate in activities and do volunteer work in the neighbourhood. The next quotes will illustrate this.

Stayers, as the name also implies, live for the majority of their lives in Neerbosch-Oost and have built their social networks there. The analysis shows that they have done or still do volunteer work. When the neighbourhood was as good as finished and many families came to live there, there was little to do for children. Therefore, some parents started to organized activities for children. The following quote from a female that has lived for 54 years in Neerbosch-Oost illustrates this:

R: And when we lived here for a while, there was nothing here, so I started organizing children’s afternoons with another woman on Wednesday afternoon. We did that in the community building at the Dennenstraat. There they provided use with space and we rummaged around the business park at companies for things like, cheap lemonade, wastepaper and all kinds of other things to tinker with. We did that for a long time, and it was later taken over by Sjano [Stichting JeugdActiviteiten Neerbosch-Oost].

Another female, resident for 53 years of Neerbosch-Oost, describes all the things she has done in Neerbosch-Oost in all these years:
Could you can list a number of these activities?
I have been in the parents’ council and have been a brigadier at school. When my son came to judo, I was asked to look after the children there, because they didn’t have someone to watch the children. If you had warned me in advance, I could have written it all down [laughs]. Treasurer of line dance club here because I do line dancing myself. I play table tennis where I am also the secretary. It’s about the neighbourhood, right?
Yes, it is.

I participate at the meeting terrace. I also often attend the neighbourhood consultation, or the pizza participate party. Difficult to pronounce.

As a result, they have simultaneously built up their social networks in the neighbourhood a mentioned before. Therefore, many stayers are attached to Neerbosch-Oost and see no reason to leave as the following quote of a female stayer that has been living for 54 years in Neerbosch-Oost shows:

Yes, I could have gone somewhere else, but I don’t want to leave Neerbosch. Also, because I do a lot here and I want to continue to do so.

Some respondents who would have been categorized as stayers due to their connection with Neerbosch-Oost, moved out due institutional reasons combined with life cycle. They both describe that when they moved out of their parental home, they moved to another neighbourhood because they were depending on social housing. They experienced that the allocation policy – and associated obligations – was the main reasons why they moved to another neighbourhood. One moved to Dukenburg and one to Tolhuis but for both participants it was their sleeping place because they had their life in Neerbosch-Oost.

The following quote from a Dutch female who for 54 years is connected to Neerbosch-Oost illustrates that although she has not always lived in Neerbosch-Oost, she always remained socially connected:

And are there other changes?
Of course, I stayed working here and therefore never really left. I only slept outside of the neighbourhood. I always said: Tolhuis is a dormitory neighbourhood. There is nothing. There are no stores, there is nothing.
That is a big difference with this neighbourhood.
Yes, there is much to do here. And I have always had my acquaintances here because I have worked here. When I retired, they never came to me in Tolhuis. I always had to come here. That was easier and I do not mind. Only, automatically you start doing activities in Neerbosch-Oost. I was going along with them to the community centre, to the hobby club and the mall. So, the connections were there.

Another female, from a migration background, and 41 years connected to Neerbosch-Oost shares a similar experience.

And when I got older and was getting married a new allocation system was implemented “Entree”, and then I had the misfortune that I could not stay in Neerbosch-Oost and unfortunately had to move elsewhere. I lived ten years in Dukenburg, but I always said: it is only a roof above my head. The ten years that I lived in Dukenburg I never felt at home.

Oke, what was that about? Or how did that happen?
Probably because Neerbosch-Oost my home was. I had all my social contact in Neerbosch-Oost, and I knew a lot of people. I only slept in Dukenburg and that was it. I did my volunteer work in Neerbosch, actually I did everything in NBO except owning a home and sleeping. I lived there but for the rest I never really felt connected with Dukenburg.
Both quotes clearly show that although they did not always live in Neerbosch-Oost they felt a strong social connection to Neerbosch-Oost and that connection is probably even stronger than the connection to the neighbourhood where they actually lived.

**Interaction and diversity**

As explained in the theoretical framework the term *interaction* is used instead of *contagion* because interaction is a more appropriate term. Furthermore, this section shows some similarities with the section *threshold effects* discussed earlier. This is because both concepts use a behavioural element.

A female respondent that has been connected to Neerbosch-Oost for 54 years describes how she learned to interact with immigrants:

I: And have you noticed a difference between the time when you came to live here in 1965 and that the time that you came back in NBO?
R: Yes, a lot has changed in the neighbourhood. In the beginning there were no foreign people living here. That has gradually become more, more, more. I have no problems with it, I can deal with them. I know at some point how to say or do certain things because I know their customs and how they will react.
I: And how did you find out?
R: Yes, by the mothers at school. Conversely, I am not the worst at all to interact with some of those boys. For example, when I walk past the mall to the Schalmei [community centre] and at the hairdresser’s there are those boys talking outside to each other, then it looks like they are arguing but they are not arguing [harsh language]. I know that by now, but if I walk past it, I still say: Gentlemen we are not arguing? Madam we don’t do that at all, when we have a fight, we are calm. That’s how I got an explanation.

It illustrates that with a more or less open attitude towards people with among other things a migration background, people will understand one another better. It also shows that Dutch cultural customs are projected on those of immigrants and this does not always correspond, for example, harsh language is associated with an argument while this is not always the case. These projections can stimulate prejudices and could be treated differently. This is in line with research done by Dovidio et al. (2008) into majority and minority group perspectives on a common ingroup identity. In the section concerning social work and Tubaplein in paragraph 6.1 more details about other interactions between locals and people with a migration background can be found.

In an interview with a female that lived for 53 years in Neerbosch-Oost she describes a conversation with another woman with a migration background talking about joining activities in Neerbosch-Oost. It illustrates the influence of culture on experiences and perception regarding social interaction between different cultures.

I: With an open attitude you always achieve much more than start directly with an uproar. But the other way around, do you experience an open attitude from the new people in the neighbourhood?
R: Not so. We give more than them. They are more self-contained. You notice that at the meeting terrace. There are almost only Dutch people there. Occasionally there is a Turkish or Moroccan, but rarely. I recently spoke with [name] because she was sitting by the terrace and she said: why didn’t you go to national women’s day? what am I supposed to do there? It is fun and you will get this and that. And then I ask: why don’t you come here for the fashion show? And then she said: what am I supposed to do there? The national woman’s day was not for me and the fashion show was not
something for her... Then I said again: why don’t you come here? why Moroccan women do not come here or others? I will tell you she said: that is because they are not allowed if their men are not there and then they will not come. And that’s the difference... There is an occasional foreign one but rarely. They don’t want to. Or I have that idea. I greet them in a friendly manner, and I have no further problems with them.

Although they invite each other for activities, this conversation demonstrates that personal reasons which are influenced by their cultural norms and values, form a barrier in their participation of those activities. It seems that ‘like attracts like’ is partly applicable here. In another interview a female who has been connected to Neerbosch-Oost for 54 years, describes a similar experience, namely: “That mother or woman also comes to sit at the meeting terrace with us, while most foreign ladies walk by and say: ‘no, I have already had coffee’. Or: ‘no, I do not have time’. But there are also men”. It implies that a specific group of women with a migration background have different cultural customs regarding activities like meeting terrace. According to anthropologist Marjo Buitelaar (2006) in Moroccan culture there is a difference between males and females and their use of both private as public space. For example, a cultural custom is that Moroccan women do not openly interact with other males in public spaces, although it may vary between women. On the other hand, for Moroccan men it is much more self-evident that they engage in public spaces. This is also reflected in the quote that Moroccan women do not participate that much in the meeting terrace. Additionally, it shows that cultural customs are being translated in activities that are being organised. This relates to what Dovidio et al. (2008) describes in their article ‘Another view of “us”’ about majority and minority group perspectives on a common ingroup identity.

Reputation

The analysis shows that stayers strongly believe that what happens in Neerbosch-Oost is not that special and that is also happens in other neighbourhoods. However, when those same events happen in Neerbosch-Oost it is immediately news. The Reputations already existed in the past, shaped by the image of Tubaplein as well as the youth gangs present in the neighbourhood such as Manolito’s and Minolito’s. In addition, stayers have the perception that the reputation mainly comes from specific areas in Neerbosch-Oost.

A couple that has been living in Neerbosch-Oost for 41 years, describe that the reputation is, among other things, is based on the area around Tubaplein:

R1: Yes, that is right. Actually, it had already a somewhat bad name when we came to live there. Are you going to live in Neerbosch?
I: That was already then?
R: Yes, that was mainly due a certain area over there. All the people who needed to move from the “Benedenstad” were put together in that area with some social workers in between. However, the social workers did move out after a while because their lives were made sour. Or that is the story that goes around. Yes, and then you get an area that is socially weak I will say.

A female that has been connected to Neerbosch-Oost for 54 years, describes her experiences of the reputation of the past:

I: When you talk about Neerbosch with people from outside of the neighbourhood they often say: Neerbosch-Oost is not such a good neighbourhood. What do you think about the reputation of the neighbourhood?
R: Yes, we had that reputation for a while. In the past there were two youth gangs, the Manolito’s and Minolito’s, and they were both very capable youth gangs [causing a lot of nuisance]. At some moment they started a project in that area, the so-called area
with lesser people, were they put “normal” people in between that could serve as an example or as a role model. It turned out that the opposite happened. In that time the shopping centre could not be closed and every time something happened the youth of the so-called lesser area were blamed. At a certain point we, the community council, had a chat with these youth and then one of those boys said: “ma’am, I don’t want to be annoying but you never hear anything about the other side and they do it because it was not us”. Then we decided to invite them both for a meeting. The young people from there (the so-called lesser area) were there and the others were not. And so, I slowly discovered that in the “better” areas there are also young people who cause problems as well.

I: Okay, and how did it end?

R: Yes, it gradually calmed down, but at some point, it already effected the reputation of the people who lived there, like you should not belong to that certain area. It just depends on how you look at it and how you approach it yourself. They have, and maybe it sounds a bit weird, better social abilities then their neighbours from the other side.

The quote also shows that within Neerbosch-Oost itself there are specific areas that are seen better or worse than others. Ivo Rutten, district manager Neerbosch-Oost of Talis, notice that both so-called lesser areas point to each other saying that the other side is worse to live in (Ivo Rutten, personal communication, April 17, 2019). Maybe this indicates that nobody wants to live in the worst part of the neighbourhood or that both areas are equally worse.

Another point that emerges from the analysis is that a lot of stayers’ experience and perceive these problems of something of the past and that the reputation is not experienced anymore. However, when something happens in Neerbosch-Oost, it is immediately big news. A couple living in an owner-occupied house for 41 years in Neerbosch-Oost, describe this as follows:

R: No, it doesn’t bother us. This part of the neighbourhood is great living. Absolutely, great living. Then there is an article in the Gelderlander about Neerbosch-Oost in which we do not recognize the neighbourhood.

R1: In the early 80s it was just [silent]. Then there was a small group of young people in the neighbourhood who had been terrorizing it.

R: Yes, that is right.

Also, many stayers do not like it when people, especially the newspaper, talk or write negative about Neerbosch-Oost. A female, living in a private rental home, and has been living for 54 year in Neerbosch-Oost describes why she get irritated about the coverage of the media about Neerbosch-Oost:

R: That is why I am actually angry because they talk so badly about the neighbourhood. Everywhere you see people with drugs, everywhere you see people with things, it is everywhere and not just here. It’s everywhere and it hasn’t bothered me yet. Now they are not there anymore, but if you just say hello to those people and boys who are sometimes hang here then there is nothing wrong. However, some people are already scared beforehand and then they still have to go out for a walk.

As mentioned before, stayers experience Neerbosch-Oost as an ordinary neighbourhood, they do not recognize their neighbourhood that way it is written about in the news. This is in line with what Permentier et al. (2008) writes about the difference between the assessed reputation between residence and non-residence. Residents assess their reputation of their own neighbourhood higher than people from outside of the neighbourhood. It seems that the reputation of the past, which is described by stayers, still affect non-residents today. These results are similar to that found by Hastings and Dean (2003) who writes that reputations are connected to the history of the neighbourhood. In the case of
Neerbosch-Oost these were for example the youth gangs Manolito’s and Minolito’s that had a negative impact on the neighbourhood and its reputation.

5.1.3. Residential mobility

Although, the name stayers suggest that they stay put, but the analysis shows that they are not completely immobile regarding residential mobility. A lot of stayers moved within the neighbourhood. A lot of elderly describes that they want to grow old in the neighbourhood and move from a single-family home to one of the three high-rise buildings in Neerbosch-Oost. A female, resident of Neerbosch-Oost for 54 years, living in public housing, describes this as follows:

R: And yes, I lived there for 48 years at Standvast and then I moved because climbing the stairs became difficult just like the backyard. Then I moved to a dwelling of Talis with all the necessary problems.
I: Oke.
R: The dwelling was not in good condition. I knew that lady who lived there, so I also knew that the house was becoming vacant. And I always have said: ‘When I move, I do not want to leave Neerbosch-Oost, and move to the high-rise building near the canal, a senior apartment not higher than the fifth floor and on the corner’. So, then I responded to Talis before it came on Entree [website] and then they already said: ‘It needs to go on Entrée first’.

However, there is a difference between stayers who rent a house and those who own a house. The people who own a house have a stronger connection with their dwelling and therefore are less mobile then people who rent a dwelling. A couple that bought their rental home and lived 41 years in Neerbosch-Oost saying: “Yes, I like it here. I would not want to live anywhere else”. Or another couple who owns a house in Neerbosch-Oost from 1974 onwards saying: “Yes, we would not go to a strange environment... We can manage fine. Although, we are getting older and it is quite a bit of maintenance. As long as it is possible, it is possible and then we will see. Otherwise we hire someone who will come and do the garden”. It suggests that dwellers who own a home want to grow old in their house as long as this is possible.

Another reason why some stayers moved within the neighbourhood is that a large number of stayers moved to Neerbosch-Oost with their parents and grew up there. Although, they could have looked for a place outside Neerbosch-Oost they stayed in the neighbourhood, probably because of their strong social ties to the area. Also, at a conversation at a coffee morning at the primary school “Het Octaaf” a female describe that she formerly lived in a maisonette and moved to a single-family home near the Fanfarestraat because the needed more space (personal communication, coffee morning May 23, 2019). It seems that stayers are not completely immobile and move within the neighbourhood because of behaviour reasons like social motives and event in people their life cycle.
5.2. Experiences and perceptions of in-movers

In this paragraph the result of experienced and perceived neighbourhood change of in-movers will be discussed. Participants who belong to the group in-movers are relatively new in the neighbourhood. They have lived in Neerbosch-Oost for at least one year, up to ten years. The next part will begin with the ecological approach, followed by the behavioural approach in section 5.2.2., and residential mobility in 5.2.3.

5.2.1. Ecological approach

Although in-movers are what Burgess (1925) calls the people or groups that are part of the invasion process, they probably will experience this process completely differently than participants who belong to the group ‘stayers’ as discussed in paragraph 6.1. This part can be kept short because in-movers have little experiences that can be considered part of the ecological approach. This is due to the duration of their residence in Neerbosch-Oost and the selection of respondents in this research. An example of how this works is Galsters (2001) notion on how in-mover ‘fit in’ to their new neighbourhood. Most in-movers moved to Neerbosch-Oost because they could access cheap social housing and therefore these results will be discussed in the paragraph about the institutional approach in chapter 6.

5.2.2. Behavioural approach

This paragraph will discuss the results of in-movers and neighbourhood change based on the behavioural approach. In appendix 3.2. the network trees of in-movers regarding behavioural approach and reputation can be found.

Social networks

The results of in-movers and social networks show a mixed picture. Some in-movers are more connected to Neerbosch-Oost than others. Years of residence seems a possible explanation, though, there is also an in-mover with a relative short duration of residence who actively participates in the community life in Neerbosch-Oost.

The social contacts of in-movers within the neighbourhood are mainly based on contact with neighbours and they experience that contact as “normal contact with neighbours”. They have fewer contacts in other parts of the neighbourhood than stayers. Although some in-movers have an active community life.

A female that moved to Neerbosch-Oost six years ago does not experience a social connection with Neerbosch-Oost, she describes it as follows: “I do not care much for the neighbourhood. I think it’s great living. I live well here, but I have nothing to do with the neighbourhood”. Although she experienced the neighbourhood as pleasant living, she does not feel the same social connection to Neerbosch-Oost as experienced by stayers.

The analysis shows that in-movers experience a gap between elderly, the young people and themselves. A male in-mover that has been living for 10 years in Neerbosch-Oost describe the following:

R: I had that when I came to live here and started volunteering. Even then, the elderly opposed young people and foreigners. I thought it was not too bad then. And after ten years I thought; watch out that you don’t become an old sourpuss, because actually it is not too bad. There in the [street name] I noticed that I was pulled down in the negative atmosphere.
It suggests that in some areas of Neerbosch-Oost there is a negative atmosphere. This atmosphere could influence in-movers their perceptions about the “lesser” quality of life they live in. Although, it is difficult to prove is shows that in-movers can partly be influenced by their new neighbours and living environment, also known as neighbourhood effects, which is extensively discussed by Galster (2012) in his paper about ‘Mechanism(s) of Neighbourhood Effects’.

**Life cycle**

In-movers moved to Neerbosch-Oost due to various reasons but most of them because of a next step in their live course, or a major live course event, for example, their first house, divorce, becoming unemployed, or in need of more room for their family. These live course events influence the neighbourhood experience of in-movers. For example, a female in-mover who divorced and moved to Neerbosch-Oost six years ago illustrates that people experience and perceptions also depending on what you are used to and where you come from.

R:  It's just some irritations. A person from below just keeps an eye on everything and sometimes it just drives you crazy. You are right here at the gallery when you open the door. First, I had a big house with a front garden and a backyard. I lived in a white neighbourhood and now you are more locked up. You all have the same entrance.

It also shows that in-movers experience foremost a difference in their lives instead of a difference in specific elements of the neighbourhood change.

**Interaction and diversity**

A culture of pessimism is experienced between stayers and in-movers. Due to their longer stay in Neerbosch-Oost, stayers have experienced and perceived more of Neerbosch-Oost, or as they say themselves: “we know the neighbourhood very well” or “we have a lot of knowledge about the neighbourhood”. It seems that stayers think that they know what is best for Neerbosch-Oost because of their knowledge and show this in interactions with in-movers. The next example illustrates how stayers could influence in-movers through interactions, thereby passing their culture of pessimism to these in-movers. A male that moved in ten years ago describes his experience with stayers and volunteer work as follows:

I:  And how does that express itself? Can you give an example?
R:  There are of course many elderly people here who play a sort of waiting game. And yet you get the strong impression that you have to adapt to how it always has been and will stay that way. It is a village, just a village.
I:  Can you give an example of how you have adapted or how they want it or not want it?
R:  You adapt by tempering your enthusiasm. We have already done that, it has already failed, you will not get that done.

This result shows similarities with what Galster (2012) describes as collective socialisation and that social interactions can shape an individual’s values, and behaviour. Individuals may be encouraged to conform to local norms, like an in-mover that conforms to the local norms of pessimism by tempering their enthusiasm. Furthermore, it also relates to the minority and majority argument of Crul (2016) and ingroup identities of Dovidio et al. (2008).

Although, in-movers also influence the individual values of stayers. An in-mover could provide locals information about their culture and this new information is further distributed among others. The next experience of a female in-mover with a migration background illustrates this:
R: Also, it is often about incomprehension. I can give an example. A woman at the community centre realized that I could speak Dutch well and she started asking questions. I think that’s super great. And she said: ‘We then invite a group of women from abroad’ who say: ‘we come’. And in the end, they don’t come and do not cancel. And then I said to her: ‘We can communicate because we understand each other, I understand you, but I am not sure if they understand you. Often, they just nod yes, but they don’t understand what you mean at all’. Plus, in some cultures it is very rude to say no and then they just say yes. And calling off is a big step for them, they can’t just pick up the phone and dial a number and then explain to you that they cannot come. And then she said; ‘oh yeah, I’ve never seen it that way’. And that is it. She expresses herself but not everyone does that. If people do that then you can tell them how it has been for someone else, for example.

I: And thus, create more mutual understanding.

R: And I heard her talk about that to someone else on another time on a whole different:

Yes, it is not connected. It is really not connected because that area over there is not connected to this area over here. That is not necessary, but I never know what happens over there. For me it is still a maze. I still know this, but it is also a kind of island.... Just an island with islands in it [island is used as another word for building blocks].

A male with a migration background that move to Neerbosch-Oost eight years ago, experiences a positive development of interaction between different groups/cultures:

R: In the past, white people were, sorry to say so, very derogatory towards others. And now there is mutual respect and people have gotten to know one another and their cultures. Now there is mutual respect and I like that. I was surprised when I came back after I was away for 5 years that people were taking each other into account. That was the first thing I noticed.

It could be that not everyone knows what is happening in other parts of the neighbourhood and because of that the neighbourhood as a whole does not feels connected. However, it could be that
different cultural groups accept another more than in the past, but it is not visible for the whole neighbourhood. Another result that may influence the feeling of a disconnected neighbourhood, is that in-movers – just like stayers – experience and perceive parts of Neerbosch-Oost as differently. They also talk just like stayers about better and worse parts of the neighbourhood. Although they experience their own living environment as good, other people may disagree. Maybe this is also one of the reasons the neighbourhood is not experienced as connected by some in-movers.

As mentioned before, in-movers experience Neerbosch-Oost as diverse which is also reflected in the malls. According to in- and out-movers it attracts people from other areas of Nijmegen to Neerbosch-Oost because of their choice in foreign products. It indicates that Neerbosch-Oost is also known for its diversity in Nijmegen.

Reputation
The analysis shows a mix of experiences and perceptions. The overall picture is that they do not experience the negative reputation of Neerbosch-Oost the way it is known in Nijmegen. However, there are certain areas that are experienced as lesser areas compared to other parts of the neighbourhood. A female in-mover that has been living in Neerbosch-Oost for five years says the following about the reputation “It doesn't bother me”. Another female that moved six years ago to Neerbosch-Oost says: “I do not worry much about it or I don't notice it. That is also possible”.

Some in-movers agreeing that Neerbosch-Oost was not their first choice of neighbourhood to live in due to the reputation of the neighbourhood but that the neighbourhood is different than they expected. For example, a female in-mover had to find a new place after a life cycle event. In her search for a dwelling Neerbosch-Oost was not her first choice: “And Neerbosch-Oost does not have my first preference to live. Absolutely not... The prejudice. It is not the best neighbourhood of Nijmegen”.

Although in-movers do not experience the Neerbosch-Oost as expected based on the bad reputation the neighbourhood has, some in-movers sometimes feel embarrassed to tell that they live in Neerbosch-Oost. A male with a migration background that move to Neerbosch-Oost 8 years ago describes the following:

R: Sometimes I feel embarrassed. If I say that I live in Neerbosch-Oost people judge you differently. I work in Arnhem and then I say that I live in a different neighbourhood, a better neighbourhood than Neerbosch-Oost. People still think that Neerbosch-Oost is a bad neighbourhood, while that is not the case.

It also shows that non-residents view Neerbosch-Oost differently than residents. Furthermore, other in-movers did not let the bad reputation influence their decision because they also have lived in other neighbourhoods with a negative reputation: “I also lived in Waterkwartier and in Hatert. Also, neighbourhoods with a poorer reputation, but that didn't stop me from living in Neerbosch-Oost”. This is also reflected in research from Van Ham and Clark (2009) after the influence of reputation on mobility.

As mentioned before, it seems that it is depending on a person’s previous living environments. If an in-mover has lived in a similar neighbourhood as Neerbosch-Oost, they care less about the reputation. If they have not, they doubt more whether they want to live in Neerbosch-Oost. Once they are settled, they do not experience the negative image or prejudice that they had of the neighbourhood.
5.2.3. Residential mobility

In-movers show a diverse picture when it comes to residential mobility. Some in-movers want to stay in Neerbosch-Oost, while others want to move out of Neerbosch-Oost. One in-mover wants to move out because she does not like the physical appearance of the housing, or as she describes it: “boring, post-war style”. However, another in-mover would like to stay in Neerbosch-Oost because of the richness of diversity of the people. A male with a migration background 8 years ago to Neerbosch-Oost says: “Yes, I think Neerbosch-Oost is a nice place and I know it very well”. It shows that individual preferences have a strong influence on the decision of in-movers to move out or to stay in Neerbosch-Oost. These results are in line with research done by Feijten and Van Ham (2009) into neighbourhood change as a factor influencing residential the residential choice process. They also conclude that although lower-income groups have a desire to leave the neighbourhood more often, they are least likely to realise their wish. It suggests that a desire to leave is not always realized in reality and low-income groups live longer in a specific neighbourhood than they want.

Additionally, in the three high-rise buildings – see for example the picture of the Maas-Waal flat on page 33 - will slowly change due to removal of 55 plus age label. The overall elderly population in these complexes will change to a more diverse population. If an elderly passes away, there is a good possibility that a younger new resident will move in instead. As mentioned before, the group elderly that are now a part of the majority, could become a minority in the future in these high-rise buildings. This will result in new dynamics.

5.3. Experiences and perceptions of out-movers

In this paragraph, there is a focus on the experiences and perceptions of neighbourhood change of out-movers in Neerbosch-Oost. As mentioned before, out-movers are participants who formerly lived in Neerbosch-Oost and now live in another district of Nijmegen. See table 3.2 for more details about out-movers and appendix 3.3 for the network trees related to out-movers. The structure of this section is similar to the previous sections: first the ecological approach will be discussed followed by the behavioural approach and residential mobility.

5.3.1. Ecological approach

Invasion and succession

A mixed picture emerges from the analysis of out-movers and experiences of invasion and succession. The duration of the residence is most likely an explanatory variable, because out-movers who lived over 30 years in Neerbosch-Oost describe a change in populations. Out-movers who have a shorter duration of residence, like 6 to 11 years, experience a different Neerbosch-Oost. The following quotes show the differences in experiences, starting with a male out-mover who grew-up in Neerbosch-Oost and lived there for 33 years followed by a quote of a couple that owned a house for 33 years in Neerbosch-Oost:

I: And how has it changed?
R1: Yes, I think more influx of immigrants. Not that that is bad per se, but that gives a different atmosphere in the neighbourhood. It used to be more a working-class neighbourhood and now it feels more distant if you don’t belong to one of these groups. You also notice that more groups are being formed in the neighbourhood. That used to be less when I was young [male].
R2: In my opinion, mostly middle incomes have left and they have been replaced in particular by people with a lower income. There used to be doctors, Radboud staff, Philips employees and other well-educated people [couple, male].
Both quotes show clearly experiences that are related to the processes of invasion and succession. Middle income groups did move out and low-income groups and migrants moved in, resulting in a different composition of the population in Neerbosch-Oost. The first quote even showing signs of an individual threshold effect, because he experiences a transformation of the atmosphere in the neighbourhood due to the influx of immigrants. This relates to what Quercia & Galster (2000) describe in their article about threshold effects and neighbourhood change. They conclude that actors in a neighbourhood have different tolerance levels but – naturally – the least tolerant act first.

Nevertheless, a female out-mover that lived for 6 years in Neerbosch-Oost says: “I thought it was compared to Den-Bosch that I was in a different world... I’m Turkish myself, but a lot of immigrants”. It suggests that immigrants have become a large population group. Although, they vary in the place of origin, see table 4.1, they are more experienced as one group (Dutch people and immigrants). It does indicate that there is a certain degree of succession. Immigrants are connected to Neerbosch-Oost, or in other words, have found themselves a place in Neerbosch-Oost, which is reflected in the assortment of shops among other things. It even attracts people from outside Neerbosch-Oost. As mentioned before, it seems that diversity is an element of Neerbosch-Oost which is also known in other parts of Nijmegen. Applying the classification of Amin (2002) regarding multicultural neighbourhoods, Neerbosch-Oost can be referred to as “an old white working-class area with successive waves of non-white immigrants’ settlement” (p. 916).

The out-movers who show similar characteristics as stayers – long durations of residence in Neerbosch-Oost – also experience invasion and succession processes. Out-movers who have a shorter duration of residence in Neerbosch-Oost show similar results as in-movers.

5.3.2. Behavioural approach

Social networks

The findings show that almost all out-movers still feel connected to Neerbosch-Oost because they grew up there, still have social contacts, and/or lived there for a relatively long period. A couple that lived in Neerbosch-Oost for 33 years describe that they always have lived pleasantly in Neerbosch-Oost for much of their life:

R1:  We still regularly return to Neerbosch-Oost, to the “Goede Herder” [church], for groceries or to visit friends. We have lived happily in Neerbosch-Oost for much of our life and we still feel connected to the neighbourhood. This is also one of the reasons that we return regularly. So, it’s good that we still live close by.

A female with a migration background that recently bought a single-family home in Lindenholt describes her connections to Neerbosch-Oost as follows:

R:  But I do miss Neerbosch-Oost.
I:  What do you miss most?
R:  I do not know exactly, but if you have lived here for 12 years you cannot simply forget that.
I:  What really stands out in Neerbosch-Oost?
R:  I don’t know, I love this neighbourhood.
I:  A feeling?
R:  Yes, I feel good here…. I have often been on vacation and that never went wrong, nothing stolen or something like that. I had asked the neighbours if they would pay attention. That is nice and you feel safe.

Although she finds it difficult to state in detail why she will be missing living in Neerbosch-Oost, it is clearly the case.
**Life cycle**
The analysis shows that the life cycle of out-movers is an important parameter to explain their motives to, firstly move to Neerbosch-Oost and later to move out of the neighbourhood again. Because it is intertwined with residential mobility it will be included in paragraph 5.3.3. residential mobility.

**Interaction and diversity**
Diversity of Neerbosch-Oost is experienced differently by in-movers. An interesting result is that a Turkish out-mover experiences the diversity of Neerbosch-Oost as a limitation of her quality of life. Due to a life cycle event, namely a divorce she experienced Neerbosch-Oost differently. According to her, it is unusual to divorce in their culture and therefore she was being treated differently than before. This was for her a reason, among other things, to move out of Neerbosch-Oost.

R:  ... Being a woman, maybe it's because I'm Turkish myself, I don't know how it is differently, but being divorced in that culture is strange anyway. And if people know then the expectation of males is also different, then greetings, while they never greeted before. And if you do not greet back then you are bad in their eyes. It's very weird. I don't know how to describe it otherwise, but maybe it is because of that. I did not feel at ease, really not.

It also shows that due to a life event she experienced that people from specific groups treat her differently afterwards. This gave her an unpleasant feeling and sometimes a feeling of unsafety. Also, it shows that people with a migration background do not ‘automatically’ experience diversity as positive. In her case it seems as she experienced cultural pressure from a specific sub-group in Neerbosch-Oost. Furthermore, it shows once more that these experiences are influenced by people’s past living environment and their familiarity with diversity.

Another out-mover – a male – from Dutch origin that lived in Neerbosch-Oost for 33 years describes his experiences with diversity in Neerbosch-Oost as follows:

I:  No, and how I now interpret it is that the new people who come to live in Neerbosch-Oost have to get used to it?
R:  I think it depends a bit on where they come from. I can imagine that you have to get used to some things. It also depends a bit on where you end up in the neighbourhood. Where I myself lived in Neerbosch-Oost, in the back of Klaroenstraat, that is great living because that is a very quiet part and with those houses too. That’s fine, quiet, really nice. But I think if you come to live near the maisonettes, where there is a lot of diversity – in terms of backgrounds and nationalities – and you are not used to that, it will be quite a turnaround. People have to get used to it, but if you are not too easily frightened, because often it has to do with a feeling of fear. But if you kindly say hi to people there are only a few people who do not respond kindly back and then I also discovered that normal contact is also possible among each other.
I:  Yes, indeed, it often starts with that.
R:  Yes, that’s true. If you see each other as an outsider or something like that, you also get an atmosphere like that. And if you are just friendly to each other then it’s fine. I always had nice contacts with other neighbours from whatever nationality.

He describes that a fear of ‘other’ people is an element that influences the interaction with people who have a different background than yourself. If you are used to diversity or find it common that people have other background/appearances then yourself, there is a chance that this will promote intercultural interaction.
Reputation

The analysis of the reputation shows that out-movers partly recognize the reputations of Neerbosch-Oost, although they experience it differently than the way it is described by the media. A female with a migration background that moved to Lindenholt after having lived in Neerbosch-Oost for 12 years, describes the following:

It shows that the reputations did not influence her decision because she also lived in Tolhuis, also a neighbourhood with a negative reputation in Nijmegen. In research done by Van Ham & Clark (2009) it is also mentioned that residents who have lived in similar neighbourhoods are less concerned about the reputation of the neighbourhood.

A Dutch male out-mover who grew up in Neerbosch-Oost describes his experience regarding the reputation of the neighbourhood as follows:

\[ R: \quad \text{When I was young, I am now almost 40, and was in my teens, Neerbosch already did not have a very good reputation. Just like the Willemskwartier and the Kolpingbuurt. Those were not really neighbourhoods that were known for being very social and things like that, but that's more if you are an outsider of the neighbourhood. That is with all those neighbourhoods. If you do not grow up there and do not belong to the neighbourhood, then you will soon be seen as an outsider in such neighbourhoods.} \]

It shows that if you are part of Neerbosch-Oost and live there, your experiences and perceptions regarding neighbourhood reputations are different than if you do not live there. These results reflect those of Permentier et al. (2008) who also found that residents assess their own neighbourhood different than non-residents. It even seems that, because of the negative reputation, people have a stronger connection to their neighbourhood, what leads to a stronger separation between in-siders and out-siders. This relates to research done by Mazanti and Pløger (2003) who found that residents of a neighbourhood with a negative reputation stand together if there is a common interest. In the case of Neerbosch-Oost it could be that therefore residents stand up for each other against non-residents.

5.3.3. Residential mobility

The analysis shows that most out-movers did not move to another neighbourhood in Nijmegen because of the reputation. However, there is one reason that could be associated with the neighbourhood reputation, but it seems that other individual characteristics also influence the decision to move out. Nevertheless, not all reasons to leave Neerbosch-Oost were the same, though they all relate to the life cycle of people. A couple moved out due to health issues of the man, others moved because they could not find a suitable single-family home in Neerbosch-Oost and another moved because she got divorced.

A female with a migration background that lived in Neerbosch-Oost for 12 years before recently moving to Lindenholt describes the following regarding her reasons to move:

\[ R: \quad \text{... I wanted to have a family home. I was busy for years with maybe leaving. In the past it was not necessary because the children were small. Then it was ok, and it went well. And then I got a permanent contract a few years ago and then I thought; now it's time to move. And then I did it.} \]

It shows that a combination of life cycle events – growing children and permanent work – led to the decision to move out.
A Dutch male that grew-up in Neerbosch-Oost describes the following concerning his decision to move to Weezenhof:

I: And has it also been a conscious decision not to continue living in Neerbosch-Oost?
R: I just wanted to move and that did not have much to do with the neighbourhood, but more with the house because I wanted to live bigger. So, it wasn't so much that I didn't like Neerbosch-Oost anymore because I grew up there and I feel at home there too. My parents still live there and have no further problems getting there. I still think it's a good neighbourhood, but I just wanted to live bigger. And I thought the Weezenhof was a nice neighbourhood, a bit remote, close to nature, nice and quiet. And coincidentally there was the house that I wanted to buy.

This illustrates that, although he did like living in Neerbosch-Oost, there are also other motives to move out, for example, the desire to buy a bigger residence.

Other out-movers who depend on social housing are limited in their choice to move to another district of Nijmegen and even more so if they want to move to another city. An out-mover originate from Den-Bosch would had liked to move back to Den Bosch. However, because she was not registered in Den-Bosch for social housing it would be difficult to move back to Den-Bosch. She, describes the following regarding her residential mobility:

I: And not necessarily that you wanted to move to Oosterhout?
R: No, because I was also thinking about going back to Den Bosch, but I wasn't registered there yet. It was just too difficult for me to get a dwelling in Den-Bosch. And then I thought: You know what, then I just want to live where it is a bit quieter. And it sounds stupid to say Turkish, but where there are fewer immigrants, where I do not feel I am so much on display and where I feel more at ease. And then I ended up in Oosterhout. And it was very difficult to get a home in Oosterhout, but it succeeded with a bit of luck.

Especially the last sentence shows that getting a dwelling in a specific neighbourhood is also experienced as luck. It indicates that it is perceived as out of their control. In a certain sense, this is also the case because the allocation policy is based, among other things, distribution by a lottery system and years of registration (F. Baghus, Personal communication, April 4, 2019). If someone has a relative short registration time, then they are largely dependent on the lottery system. As mentioned in the literature review, a negative neighbourhood reputation is not the main reason people leave the neighbourhood, although it can influence their decision. This is in line with Andersen (2008).
6. Institutional approach, social housing sector, experiences and perceptions

In this chapter the results will be presented of the analysis concerning perceptions and experiences based around the institutional approach. In order to answer the main research question, the focus will be on the social housing sector. Additionally, this chapter will follow a different structure. Instead of focusing on stayers, in- and out-movers this chapter will be shaped around stories that came forward in all the conversation with professionals, stayers, in- and out-movers. The first narrative is based around perceptions and experiences with the government. From there onwards, the next narrative will focus on themes that relate to the social housing sector in Neerbosch-Oost. The network trees that relate to the institutional perspective are added in appendix 3.

6.1. Government

In the analysis, two major storylines came forward regarding the culture of pessimism on the one hand, and social work around Tubaplein on the other hand.

Culture of pessimism

The analysis show that that there is a so-called culture of pessimism towards the government. Especially stayers share the experiences of different government agencies – political parties and municipality – that promise beautiful ideas, but a lot of these ideas, remain just ideas or turn out differently than promised. A female stayer who lived in Neerbosch-Oost for 53 years describes her experience with the municipality at a neighbourhood consultation as follows:

I: Now it is called this [pizza participatie party] but what was it called before?
R: The neighbourhood consultation.
I: And what was it like?
R: A lot of stuff was told there. However, the following year others came, and they had different ideas. At home I have a big pile of documents of these neighbourhood consultations and after these meetings and you think: what was actually told and will it all be realized? No, it is not. That is how we have experienced it. We have experienced what is told here. They were all good intentions, everything has been named, but they have never asked; who is going to do these things. If you don’t do this, you won’t get anywhere. That is what the municipality did and after one or two years there were new people, with different ideas and thoughts. Only much of the same is coming back every time.

As a result, people have developed a certain distrust of organisations, which in turn contributes to a culture of pessimism among residents, especially stayers. In-movers who participate in neighbourhood projects or initiatives alongside stayers, describe that their initial enthusiasm was tempered due this culture of pessimism as already mentioned in paragraph 5.2.2.

Furthermore, in-movers also experience and perceive different aspects of government intervention. They experience that projects from the past that have failed sometimes still influence new ideas and projects and that neighbourhoods are approached differently. The next quote of a male that has been living in Neerbosch-Oost for 10 years describes how he experienced the willingness of the municipality regarding plans in Neerbosch-Oost:
R: What I remember most is that he said; if you have a swing on the tree in Bottendaal then it is called citizen participation and they say; look we make our own playground. If you hang a swing on the tree in Lindenholt, it is called vandalism....

I: Yes, I find these kind of difference interesting to look at.

R: That’s what they say here too. [Name] was working on a project to hang flower boxes, but that will not happen. The municipality then says; that they are concerned about watering, but I think that vandalism also plays a role in the background.

It shows that the intentions of the representatives of the municipalities are not trusted, as the ‘real’ reasons they give for not going through with projects is a different reason than the foreseen difficulties such as watering the plants. Eventually too many rejections of new ideas could work demotivating for civic participation.

A similar experience is shared by a female in-mover that has been living in Neerbosch-Oost for 7 years at a meeting about a noise barrier:

R: I was once at an information meeting about noise cancelling measures. At that time, they initially only intended to make a noise barrier on the Energieweg and not on the Neerbosscheweg, while there are only companies on the Energieweg and here people live along the road. Neerbosch is simply forgotten.

These findings suggest that institutions treat Neerbosch-Oost differently than other neighbourhoods to a certain extent. Though, it is difficult to argue that this treatment is a consequence of the reputation of Neerbosch-Oost or that it is simply a planning error. The reputation probably does not work in favour of gaining economical, political or social investments from the municipality or the national government. Galster (2012) describes in his research that institutions may be stigmatize neighbourhoods and could reduce the opportunities and prospects of residents. This could also be the case of Neerbosch-Oost.

Social work and Tubaplein

During the analysis of the interviews of stayers, in- and out-movers, there was one element that was described by all these groups namely the social work project that has failed. Although, some experiences regarding the Tubaplein were mentioned before, this section provide additional knowledge.

A man and a couple who previously lived in Neerbosch-Oost describe a similar perception that the municipality failed to provide the right social work in that area. This could be an important factor that caused the area to be experienced as problematic. The couple describes it as follows:

R: The municipality has made mistakes with the allocation of housing in the area around Tubaplein. People from the ruined “Benedenstad” no longer had a house and they had to go somewhere. Many of these families could not get along together and that is asking for problems. In the beginning there was a complete social neighbourhood team close by, but they left later.

Another couple that has been living in Neerbosch-Oost for 41 years describes that the area around the Tubaplein is a failed government project from the past. They describe it as follows:

R1: Tubastraat and Trompetstraat that area, that were people who are housed here from the “Benedenstad”. But we have never had problems with it.
Later this area was, among others, confronted with a change in population; from a native population – originating from the “Benedenstad” – to a more diverse population through an increase of people with migration backgrounds. As mentioned in paragraph 6.1.1. this resulted in resistance between both groups. However, it seems that the government indirectly influenced this process by providing migrants resources like a house, that contributed to the feeling immigrants were being treated differently than the locals.

Tubaplein is described by a female Turkish stayer as a place where migrants were getting picked on and discriminated against. Furthermore, this area has contributed to the negative reputation of Neerbosch-Oost. It is considered a problematic area. Although it would be short sighted to argue that the contribution to the negative reputation of Tubaplein is solely because of the people who live there. Some institutional decisions, for example drawback of caretakers in the ’70s, did not work in their favour. Though they sure do play a role.

As already mentioned in paragraph 5.1.2, these results are similar to that of Hastings and Dean (2003) who writes that reputations are connected to the history of the neighbourhood. In the case of Neerbosch-Oost, the historical event that contributed to the negative reputation was the decision to move people from the Benedenstad – with a low social-economic status – to Tubaplein who later bullied social workers who lived in the same area. However, it is surprising that the decision of the municipality to move people from the Benedenstad, are part of the experiences and perceptions of some in-movers, because these decisions were made long before they were residents of Neerbosch-Oost. It indicates that this decision still has a strong impact on how people experience and perceive this specific area. Therefore, it can be marked as tipping point in experience neighbourhood change of Neerbosch-Oost.

6.2. Social housing sector

In this paragraph the experiences regarding the social housing sector will be discussed. The experiences and perceptions are based around three narratives. The first narrative is about the transformation of influence tenants, the second one about specific groups, vulnerable people and core target groups, and the third narrative is focused around allocations policies. All the stayers, in- and out-movers who rent a social house have experiences with different systems and policies of housing associations, in other words, the transformation of the social housing sector. Although, some participants live in an owner-occupied house (private house) they also have experiences and perceptions about the social housing sector in Neerbosch-Oost. Especially if they live in close proximity of areas with social houses. Despite the focus of this paragraph on the social housing sector, it would not be correct to view it as an individual organisation because it combines public and private tasks, has a hybrid organisational structure, and has a strong connection with the Dutch government.

Transformation of influence tenants

As Beekers (2012) describes in his book about the history of social housing associations in the Netherlands the influence of tenants changed over the years from tenant driven organisations to a professionalized organisation structure. A female that has been living in Neerbosch-Oost for 54 years experienced this transition up close. She was as tenant a committee member of “Gezonde Woning” – a former social housing association in Nijmegen – and advocated against the professionalisation of social housing associations around the 70s. She advocated against the professionalisation because this eventually would lead to less influence of tenants. She describes her experiences as follows:
We then set up a residents' committee, and then I joined the members' council of the “Gezonde Woning” [60s, early 70s]. Yes, that was quite a good time because the council of members was the highest body of the housing association, because at that time it was still an association. At one point they wanted to merge and we as members' council did not agree. It had to be a foundation and we didn't want that and then we sent the entire board home. Or at least, we wanted to submit a vote of no confidence and they knew that, so they already said: We are going. And that was good. Then we started a whole application process and from that we chose a new board and appointed a supervisory board. After that we still merged with “Eigen Haard”. The larger the foundation becomes, the harder everything becomes, but we had a very good contact. We met once a year with the Supervisory Board. And then everything changed.

And what was the big difference between the time before the merger and after the merger for residents?

That residents have nothing to say anymore. For that they had to ask for our advice and we could say; we don't want that or that. If it is a foundation, then it is simply imposed because the foundation is the boss. It was always possible to talk to them, but when it gets so big, then more and more other people are added.

It shows that the transformation of housing associations did not go without a struggle. This is also mentioned by Beekers (2012) in his book about the historical development of housing associations. Housing corporations developed from active participations of tenants towards autonomic institutions with professional employees.

Tenants have regained since the new housing law of 2015 a part of their influence/power. In an interview with Riek Janssen – president tenant Association Accio – describes that they are an interlocutor for both the municipality and housing association Talis. Together they make performance agreements in the field of living (R. Janssen, personal communication, April 24, 2019). For example, in Neerbosch-Oost they are trying to realise a charging point for electric bicycles and mobility scooters in a high-rise building. It also shows that although housing associations are professionalized, and tenants had to give up a certain amount of power it does not necessarily mean that this is permanent.

Specific groups, vulnerable people and core target groups

Over the years, social housing in the Netherlands became the sector for people with a low income (Van Kempen & Priemus, 2002). This transformation is also experienced in Neerbosch-Oost by stayers. As mentioned in paragraph 5.1.1 they describe that in the ’70s some residents of Neerbosch-Oost were working at Radboud and Philips – nowadays NXP – who rented a house in Neerbosch-Oost. Over time the residents who worked at Radboud and Philips moved away.

A man that grew up in Neerbosch-Oost and still lives there describe that social rental housing attracts a certain type of people, who concentrate in one area and this concentration of certain types of people negatively influences the development of the neighbourhood.

In Neerbosch-Oost you have social housing, the homes are pretty cheap and that naturally also attracts a certain kind of people. People who receive benefits

Housing associations are also obliged to house people with a small wallet.

Yes, you can see that here in the neighbourhood that it is all concentrated in one place. You notice it anyway at the mall, which has deteriorated a lot. In terms of stores there and the certain kind of people. If you look at the Lidl, you also see a lot of Bulgarians and people from Eastern Europe. I do not want to discriminate but that was not the case in the past. I grew up with two foreign boys in the classroom at school. And if you
look at it now, a high percentage is from ethnic minorities. And then you see that it has really changed. And I can honestly say that it doesn't really benefit the neighbourhood.

Although, he mainly attributes this change to social housing in Neerbosch-Oost, he also describes experiences that relate to the processes of invasion and succession. It also shows that processes of invasion and succession are influenced by the amount of social housing in a neighbourhood.

A relatively new trend is the influx of vulnerable people with psychological problems, who are housed in social houses (RIGO, 2018). All participants – stayers, in- and out-movers – are worried about the influence of vulnerable people in their daily life. A female that has been connected to Neerbosch-Oost for 41 years describes the following:

R: We also once had a confused neighbour who was just walking up and down the garages for nights in the winter, without a coat, without anything. We were really worried, and the neighbours sent messages to each other like: what should we do, how the hell can we help this person. I happened to know which care institution was helping this person. So, I already traced the supervisor and told what was happening, and please do something because it is not going well. He tried to make contact, but this person did not open the door and therefore they could not do anything. Fortunately, she was so thoughtful to pass this on; I could not reach him. The police don't do anything either. Then who should you contact? The police only intervened when this person unzipped all the cookies at the Coop. Then there was enough reason to intervene. Then I think; does this person have to embarrass himself in the entire neighbourhood before they act? Because people know immediately; oh, that's that person who did this and that. And you could have prevented this by intervening in advance, without affecting his image.

This anecdote clearly shows her worries. While she does not solely blame the housing corporations, she especially criticizes the cooperation between different institutions or rather the ambiguity of the responsibilities of the different institutions.

A male in-mover describes his experience regarding vulnerable people who live in the maisonettes:

R: The last few years the maisonettes have been too much allocated to people with some kind of problem. From those people you only need a few who show inappropriate behaviour and immediately it changes the atmosphere.

Both quotes illustrate that vulnerable people also influencing their surroundings. Although, these people are guided by specialised welfare organisations, they can still cause nuisance. Furthermore, tenants also turn to the professionals of housing associations, because the housing association have to manage the quality of life of their complexes. It seems that it is a complex interplay between vulnerable people, their neighbours, housing association, welfare organisations and police. In any case, the current situation contributes to the feeling of powerlessness of residents who are worried about the psychological wellbeing of vulnerable neighbours and their own quality of life.

Allocation policies
Another theme that emerges from the analysis are the experiences that relate to the allocation policies. It shows that registration time and the allocation of certain kinds of groups – mostly people with urgency and vulnerable people – are an important element in experiences of participants. Although it does relate to the above story about specific groups and vulnerable people, the allocation policies will have a prominent role. Additionally, changes in allocation policies do not only affect the people who are in need of social housing but also residents that live in a certain complex or flat.
The analysis shows that almost all the residents – mostly stayers – who live in one of the three flats have experiences that relate to the removal of the seniors’ label. As already mentioned in paragraph 5.1.1. this label ensured that only people above 55 years old could live in these complexes. Due to the removal of the seniors’ label, the population is changing due to the influx of younger new residents in these three flats. This will change the composition of the population and therefore it also shows some characteristics of the ecological approach. In particular because the elderly have the feeling that young people ‘invade’ their flat and change their relatively calm lifestyle.

Another point that came forward in the analysis is that of the registration time. Some participants argue that a registration time of 10 years seems long, but it is not. Therefore, residents with a relatively short registration time have a lower chance to end up in a dwelling that they would like to. They have to accept certain kinds of dwellings or lower their standards due to their limited registration time. It indicates a shortage of vacant social housing besides other limiting factors like their financial situation.

A 39-year-old male that grew up in Neerbosch-Oost describes the following about his registration time:

R: [Talking about possible housing options in the near future] ... However, at this moment I only have 13 or 14 years of registration time and then you do not have much chance. I once placed a reaction for a dwelling near the city centre and then I was 47th of the 288. So, it will take a while but eventually I will make a change and then I will see how it will go.

The next two quotes are from two female participants that moved relatively recently to Neerbosch-Oost, describing similar experiences:

R: Yes, I was looking for a house and I had 12 years of registration time. That may sound like a lot, but it really isn’t because there was just little choice. There was also a lot of options in Dukenburg and Lindenholt, but eventually I choose for Neerbosch-Oost to what extent you can choose. Mostly because it is on the right side of the canal in contrast to Aldenhof and Malvert or that kind of neighbourhoods.

R: This was the only house where I had a high score at Entrée [website for social housing in the region Nijmegen and Arnhem], and I was third here. It looked very worn out, but I had intended; no matter how it looks I will take it.

It shows that people’s residential mobility is influenced by the allocation system. The 39 year old male wants to move but has to wait until he has enough registration time or until another opportunity comes along. Both females arguing that because they are relying on social housing it limits their options and they have to settle for options from which they can choose.

Besides the participants who rely on social housing there are also participants who live in an owner-occupied house. Their experiences show that they are worrying about the mix of people that are being housed by the housing corporations. A couple that have been living in a private house in Neerbosch-Oost describes it as follows:

R1: It could be that it is because we live in an owner-occupied house. Then you may experience a different kind of people, although you may not say this, with a different mentality than people who are being placed in the maisonettes and are being happy with the house they got. Plus, they may not have the financial means to do anything else and have to do everything but maybe cannot do. They put it all together and that
is a pity. That could be done differently. It would be nice if this could be more mixed, but you cannot control that.

A female stayer that has been living in Neerbosch-Oost for 53 years says the following about the social housing sector:

I: And now we are talking about the social rental sector. What do you think of the role of social housing in Neerbosch-Oost? What are they doing well or what could they do differently?

R: I do not know because I have little to do with them [living in a private rental home], but I do think is that they put everyone together. I know that there are Dutch people who moved out because they could not stand the nuisance anymore. All kinds of people are being put together and they disagree, argue with each other and cause nuisance. Earlier that was not the case at [street name] but now it is.

Both quotes clearly show their worries about the allocation policies of housing associations and possible consequences on, for example, the decline of the quality of life in the complexes and the neighbourhood. Furthermore, it seems that these institutional decisions influence a lot of the people who live in areas that are dominated by social housing.
7. Conclusion and discussion

In this final chapter the results will be translated into a conclusion and the main research questions and sub questions will be answered. Furthermore, it consists of recommendations for both policy purposes as well as further research. Also, the research limitation and reflection will be discussed.

7.1. Conclusion

This study has emerged from the following research questions:

How is neighbourhood change experienced and perceived by stayers, in- and out-movers, and how is this influenced by the social housing sector and reputation of Neerbosch-Oost?

In order to answer the main research question five sub questions were formulated based on theoretical approaches of neighbourhood change and urban geographical concepts about neighbourhood’s reputation, diversity and residential mobility. Answering these sub questions will also result in answering the main research question for the most part. Therefore, the sub questions will be answered first before returning to the main research question.

The first sub question is: how do stayers, in and out-movers experience and perceive the processes of invasion and succession? The participants who belong to the group’s stayers have the most experiences that relate to the processes of invasion and succession. They have lived for a long time in Neerbosch-Oost and therefore have seen the neighbourhood change from a relative homogenous Dutch working-class neighbourhood to a multicultural neighbourhood of people with all kinds of backgrounds. Stayers are the only group that have experiences of former residents of Neerbosch-Oost who worked at Philips and Radboud. They experienced that these former residents opened the space for new people when they left. Many of these new people were migrants. In first instance these people were Spanish guest workers and later Surinamese, Antillean, Moroccan and Turkish immigrants. More recently refugees from Somali and Syria as well as immigrants from East European countries replace out-movers. It indicates that Neerbosch-Oost is a neighbourhood where people can start their lives in the Netherlands. An accessible neighbourhood that provides ‘starters’ housing and a change to build up their life and housing career.

Furthermore, there are experiences of resistance towards immigrant, but it depends in which part of the neighbourhood one lives. Although the neighbourhood changed from a Dutch working-class neighbourhood to a multicultural neighbourhood, the experiences are not the equally distributed throughout the neighbourhood. The difference is mainly experienced between the social rental properties on both sides of the neighbourhood. Migrants experienced the most resistance around the Tubaplein where locals, for example, showed forms of resistance by discriminating migrants who lived there. A possible explanation could be that migrants needed the same benefits as locals, for example cheap housing, and therefore migrants were considered competitors or rivals for the same scarce resources and benefits. Other areas such as near the maisonettes are experienced as more open and the background of the residents is of lesser importance.

In-movers on the other hand do not have experiences that relate to the processes of invasion and succession. Although the participants that belong to the group of in-moves have multiple years of experience in Neerbosch-Oost, they experience the diverse population of Neerbosch-Oost as a given. It strongly suggests that the transformation of the population as experienced by stayers already had happened before in-movers moved to Neerbosch-Oost.

The group out-movers shows a varied picture. The ones who had a long duration of residency in Neerbosch-Oost share similar experiences with stayers. The other way around, out-movers with a
relative short duration of residency in Neerbosch-Oost show similar experiences with in-movers. Overall, it can be said that the duration of residence is the main reason for out-movers, as well as for other participants, regarding to their experiences of the processes of invasion and succession. This result also shows that concepts of invasion and succession are still relevant in explaining neighbourhood change in post-war neighbourhoods in the Netherlands.

The second sub question is: how do stayers, in- and out-movers experience and perceive the increased diversity of the population? As mentioned before in-movers experience the diversity of the populations as given and experience it as a positive element of Neerbosch-Oost. It also could be that in-movers are more familiar with diversity, for example, by their previous living environment. In-movers who formerly lived in a similar neighbourhood as Neerbosch-Oost are more often used to people with a different background. In-movers who did not live in a similar neighbourhood experience the neighbourhood differently. However, in-movers are facing differences with a group they might not have expected, namely the older residents. In Neerbosch-Oost lives a large amount of elderly people and they participate in different community events, meetings and other participation projects. They bring a certain pessimism with their presence. “We already did that, it does not work, or we tried that already”. They seem to forget that circumstances are constantly changing and that something that did not work in the past maybe work in the future. Some in-movers have experienced this as a limited factor for changes in the neighbourhood. It also shows that social interaction between different groups shape the individual’s values and behaviour. For example, in-movers conform to the local norm – e.g. culture of pessimism – by tempering their enthusiasm or that stayers become familiar with other cultural habits that they translate these into the activities that are organise in the neighbourhood.

Most participants who belong to the group of stayers, consider themselves open towards people with a different lifestyle or background. Although some also experience that the increase of diversity has resulted in a decrease of connections in Neerbosch-Oost. According to these stayers, the neighbourhood used to be more united. Now they experience less unity in the neighbourhood and more different groups and networks.

Furthermore, the open attitude of stayers towards diversity is influence by the increase of diversity in the neighbourhood and it exceeded individual thresholds. Diversity can be considered a characteristic of the neighbourhood. This has resulted in a cultural and behavioural exchange between Dutch stayers and people with a migration background, such as halal lunch at Bouwdorp and joining iftar. However, there are also experiences of misconceptions between groups due to other cultural practices and values. For example, multiple stayers have experienced that females with an Islamic background prefer activities that are specially organised for woman. The other way around, it is experienced that Dutch people prefer activities where alcohol can be consumed. Out-movers, once again, share similar experiences with stayers or in-movers depending on their duration of residency in Neerbosch-Oost.

Furthermore, the increase of diversity in Neerbosch-Oost has also resulted in an increase of availability of foreign products and shops. It even attracts people from other parts of Nijmegen to Neerbosch-Oost. It seems that Neerbosch-Oost is also known for its diversity or rather, its diverse range of products that can be bought.

The third sub question is: what is the effect of the reputation of Neerbosch-Oost on the experiences and perceptions of stayers, in-, and out-movers and how do they react? Stayers have, naturally, dealt with the negative reputation of Neerbosch-Oost the longest. However, they experience the reputation as something of the past. In the ’70s people from the Benedenstad had to move due to reconstruction work. They were allocated in social housing around Tubaplein. These people had a low social-economic status. To provide these people support, social workers lived among them. After a while the social workers left because they have been literally bullied away by the residents. Therefore, this area contributed to the negative reputation of Neerbosch-Oost and is even seen by residents of Neerbosch itself as a bad part of the neighbourhood. Later in the ’80s there were youth gangs active in Neerbosch-
Oost which, as some stayers describe: “were terrorising the neighbourhood”. Especially the Manolito’s and Minolito’s were mentioned multiple times by stayers. Luckily, youth grows up and start their adult life whereby the nuisance also did decline. Although, these experiences belong to the past, both events/stories have contributed to the negative reputation of Neerbosch-Oost today. Besides, the last few years stayers experience Neerbosch-Oost as a normal neighbourhood. Still, now and then there are incidents, but it is perceived that these incidents also are happening in other neighbourhoods. However, when it happens in Neerbosch-Oost is immediately news. It is perceived/experience that the reputations based on historical events still influences the way the media is covering news about Neerbosch-Oost. This suggest that a negative reputation is difficult to change even when the negative reputation is not experiences anymore by residents, non-residents still have a different image of Neerbosch-Oost.

In-movers on the other hand did not experience both historical events and were non-residents themselves not that long ago. Just like their experiences with diversity, it depends on their former living environment how they react to the negative reputation of Neerbosch-Oost. If they lived in a comparable neighbourhood then they care less about the reputation. In-movers who lived in a neighbourhood that is not comparable experience more doubt. Although, they described that these doubts mainly relate to prejudices about Neerbosch-Oost and are not based upon experiences in neighbourhood itself. It indicates that the negative reputation of Neerbosch-Oost is affecting mostly non-residents/in-movers who are not familiar with neighbourhoods like Neerbosch-Oost. Although, it is difficult to say if it prevents people to move to Neerbosch-Oost because only participants who actually moved to Neerbosch-Oost are included in this study.

Other aspects regarding the reputation of Neerbosch-Oost is the coverage by the media and conversations with non-residents about Neerbosch-Oost (relations with outsiders). Overall, stayers, in- and out-movers do not experience the reputation that is described by the media. Some stayers even react angry, because they experience that the media doesn’t tell the truth about Neerbosch-Oost and it is not nice to read negative things about your neighbourhood. Especially not when they experience the neighbourhood always as pleasant area. In line with the media coverage in-movers and stayers experience the reputation sometimes in their day to day live, for example, if they tell people outside of Neerbosch-Oost where the live, and they react like: “That you want to live in Neerbosch-Oost” or “that is not a very pleasant neighbourhood to live right?”. Situations like these are a result of the reputations of Neerbosch-Oost which is not always experienced as pleasant. Both examples indicate that the reputation is experienced differently by residents and non-residents.

The fourth sub question is: how does residential mobility of stayers, in- and out-movers influence their experiences and perceptions of Neerbosch-Oost? An interesting result is that stayers, in particular stayers who rent a house, are not as immobile as the term would suggest. When they moved, they did so within the neighbourhood, because of their social connections in and with Neerbosch-Oost. Even some out-movers are still connected to Neerbosch-Oost due to social networks like family and friends. An older couple – who moved-out due to a life course event – still occasionally does groceries in Neerbosch-Oost. When they do it takes way longer than it normally would take because of their familiarity with the people and the neighbourhood. Other respondents who have live outside Neerbosch-Oost for a while, as well as an out-mover, did not want to move out of the neighbourhood but due to their financial resources, personal preferences, dependence on social houses, their options were limited in Neerbosch-Oost. Therefore, they decided to move out of Neerbosch-Oost.

Furthermore, the residential mobility of in-movers and out-movers has mostly to do with their life cycle or life course event, for example, additional room for their family, getting a permanent work contact, a divorce or want to live on their own. These results suggest that residential mobility relates mostly to the behavioural approach. In- and out-movers who are depending on social housing are limited in their options due to the available houses and allocations systems. Especially the respondents
that do not have much registration time experience that they have little to choose and are for the most part at the mercy of luck. As mentioned before, in the three high-rise houses there live a large majority of elderly that are more or less immobile because most of them will spend their last years there. Consequently, there is less residential mobility in these high-rise houses, although this will change due to the removal of the 55 plus label. Residents who move to an elderly home or pass away are replaced by younger residents. Therefore, the composition of the population will change. Eventually, the current majority group of elderly will become a minority group. However, for now elderly still form the majority group in these high-rise buildings. Therefore, new residents – especially younger people – have to deal with prejudices because the majority group has the feeling that their quality of life will decline by the inflow of people with a different lifestyle. In a sense this residential mobility will influence people’s experiences and perceptions of Neerbosch-Oost, because these are mainly based on people their local living environment.

The fifth and final sub question is: how does the social housing sector influence the experiences and perceptions of stayers, in- and out-movers of Neerbosch-Oost? For this sub question, the distinguish of stayers, in- and out-movers is let go. With almost 50 percent of the total housing stock in Neerbosch-Oost, the social housing sector is an important stakeholder in the neighbourhood. Over the years the sector has changed a lot.

Almost all participants, except the participants who live in an owner-occupied home, have experiences that relate to the allocation policies of the housing associations. Especially, the years of registration is an important element, because it is influencing people’s options and decisions about housing. Just like the houses that are allocated by a lottery-system, participants that depend on social housing experience that they have little influence on their own housing career.

Numerous respondents have experiences that relate to the removal of the seniors’ label of the three high rise buildings in Neerbosch-Oost. Due to the removal, the population of these complexes is changing which is resulting in another dynamic. The majority of the dwellers in these complexes have adopted a certain kind of lifestyle that is changing because of the influx of new, and younger residents. To a certain extent the removal of the senior’s label contributes to the processes of invasion and succession, because the composition of the population is changing. Some elderly show form of resistance, for example, by complaining to the housing association. Some residents experience that their quality of life will reduce and, therefore, individual threshold/tipping points can be exceeded that increases the change that they will move out. Although, it clearly shows that the removal of the senior’s label makes sure that a large amount of dwellers experience that their complex is changing. This indicates that neighbourhood change can also be experience as a localized phenomenon.

A lot of respondents have experienced that vulnerable groups, especially those with mental health issues, are influencing daily life of Neerbosch-Oost. Most participants are worried about the inflow of these vulnerable groups. For example, the worry about if these people are getting the right care; if the housing associations even know what kind of – vulnerable – people they house; who is responsible for them and can be called in stressful situations. All the experiences clearly show that vulnerable people influencing, in first instance, their local environment, but also Neerbosch-Oost as a whole. For example, there was a person that showed confused behavioural, however the institutions – in this case the police – only interfered when this person unzipped all the cookies at the Coop. Incidents like this probably will not benefit anyone, not the confused person, nor the institutions, nor the other people in the neighbourhood. Furthermore, it could even stimulate the negative reputation of Neerbosch-Oost. Although, this is probably the least of someone’s worries when it comes to housing vulnerable people. It must also be said that housing vulnerable people is a complex interplay between multiple institutions and organisations, which makes it difficult to intervene in order to prevent vulnerable people from being neglected or causing problems.
Homeowners have somewhat different experiences than residents who depend on social houses. Although, they also share similar experiences, especially if homeowners live in close proximity of social houses. A dominant experience of participant who own a home is that they experience that the housing associations put everyone together in their houses which is asking for problems.

To return to the main research question Neerbosch-Oost, as the title also implies, is constructed in various ways and, consequently, it cannot be seen as one single object. Neerbosch-Oost mean many different things for many different people. In this study it is co-constructed by stayers, in- and out-movers and multiple theoretical concepts of neighbourhood change. Neerbosch-Oost changed from a newly built neighbourhood in the 60s with a majority of Dutch families – working class – with a lot of children to a multicultural and diverse neighbourhood where starters on the housing market can begin their housing career for both individuals who depend on social housing and for people who want to buy a house but have a relatively small budget. The diversification of the population started with migrant form the Antilles, Suriname, Spain and Italy. In the ’70s it continued with migrants from mostly Turkey and Morocco. From then on primarily refugees from all kinds of war zones have been added to the mix, for example, Yugoslavia, Somalia, and more recently Syria. Also, the last years labour migrants from Poland and other east European countries have come to live in Neerbosch-Oost. Especially, stayers have experienced this transformation. They describe that the neighbourhood has become multicultural and have experienced the processes of invasion and succession, in other words the ecological approach. Although, these processes are not experienced as the same throughout the neighbourhood. In one specific area – Tubaplein – locals resist immigrants, for example, by discriminating them. Although these experiences clearly relate to the processes of invasion and succession a municipal decision also influenced this. The municipality allocated people from the “Benedenstad” with a low economic status to this area who already needed extra care themselves. Consequently, this area did become problematic and contribute to the negative reputation of Neerbosch-Oost. While stayers have experienced how Neerbosch-Oost did get its negative reputation from, they do not think it is true anymore and consider it as something of the past. They do not think Neerbosch-Oost is that different than other neighbourhoods in Nijmegen nowadays. It also shows that this allocation decision had a long-term effect on the development of Neerbosch-Oost.

In general, stayers, and out-movers who have similar characteristics as stayers have experienced the complete transformation of Neerbosch-Oost from a mainly Dutch working-class neighbourhood to a multicultural neighbourhood. In-movers and out-mover with similar characteristics as in-movers experience only what Neerbosch-Oost had become; a multicultural neighbourhood.

Stayers also experienced more periods of good and bad times in Neerbosch-Oost than in-movers and most out-movers. This is not that surprisingly, because stayers have many more experiences from which they can draw. They know Neerbosch-Oost differently because they have lived there for a longer time than the other participants. Although, Neerbosch-Oost had bad periods, stayers continued to live in Neerbosch-Oost mostly because they are socially connected to the neighbourhood. Their reasons to stay in Neerbosch-Oost are mostly found through the behavioural approach of neighbourhood change. Furthermore, interactions with migrants have resulted in cultural exchange which some of them have incorporated in activities that are organised in the neighbourhood. Though, it is also experienced that the community has changed due to increased diversity. Residents move within their own social networks and groups, however, there are also group-transcending activities that promote intercultural interactions.

The institutional approach is reflected in many experiences of all the different participants. As mentioned before, it was a municipal decision to relocate the people from the Benedenstad to the area around Tubaplein. Due to the impact of this decision on the development of Neerbosch-Oost it shows a lot of resemblance with a tipping point. Although, this decision was made a long time ago, the
consequences are still experienced. Additionally, the institutions like the municipality contributed to a “culture of pessimism”. Especially stayers experience that institutions promise beautiful ideas, but a lot of these ideas, stayed ideas or turn out differently. This culture of pessimism seems to influence enthusiasms of in-movers who participate in the community life in Neerbosch-Oost.

Furthermore, allocation policies of housing associations limit people, in particular in- and out-movers who are depending on social housing. They experience that they do not have much choice and have to be lucky to end up in a dwelling of their choosing. Other experiences that can be marked as a tipping point that are often mentioned by stayers is the youth gang who are referred to as the Manolito’s and Minolito’s. Around the 80s they were very active in Neerbosch-Oost and had a negative impact on the quality of life of the neighbourhood, for example, vandalism and the negative reputation of Neerbosch-Oost. As these young people become older their activity decreased but the memories of their actions remained.

Overall, the experiences of respondents do not reflect one specific theoretical approach but there are specific group related experiences and perceptions noticeable. It shows, once more that neighbourhood change is a complex process that almost impossible to explain as a whole.

A scientific outcome of this research is that some participants cannot be classified into one group. For example, there were two individuals who due to personal reasons moved outside of Neerbosch-Oost but came back. In their years of absence, they stayed connected to the neighbourhood especially due to their social contacts and networks. Perhaps this classification is due for revision. Participants move between different groups and therefore classification becomes rather a barrier than a helpful tool. Therefore, I would argue for more fluidity regarding classifying participants in certain groups or an approach based on intersection between several characteristics.

Additionally, experiences seem to be largely based on micro scale – street level – and places in the neighbourhood were people spend their time, for example, at the shopping mall, the community centre, the pedestrian area near Maas-Waal canal, the petting zoo, and the primary school, instead of the scale-level of the neighbourhood. Therefore, research based on experiences and perceptions in neighbourhoods should take micro scale into account.

7.2. Recommendations

This paragraph will describe both policy recommendations and recommendations for further research. The policy recommendations will be described first, followed by the recommendations for further research.

7.2.1. Policy recommendations

*Culture of pessimism and cultural exchange*

The first recommendation refers to the culture of pessimism and cultural exchange in Neerbosch-Oost. To turn this culture of pessimism around, the municipality needs to form a future development directive for Neerbosch-Oost that will provide direction for residents and institutions that are active in Neerbosch-Oost. Projects and initiatives can be assessed based on this future perspective and therefore be realized faster. Furthermore, new project managers, staff and residents have guidelines that will help them to work more efficiently with less repetitions and duplications of ideas and projects. Although, there should be room for some flexibility and ensures that ‘real’ new ideas also get a change.

Other elements that emerge in this research are the experiences regarding activities to promote intercultural interactions. Residents from different cultural backgrounds project their own cultural habits and customs into other cultural groups which can lead to misunderstandings and wasted energy. In order to organise activities that can form a bridge between multiple cultures have to take cultural
customs/habits consciously into account. For example, the municipality could organise such activities or support residents that want to organize intercultural activities themselves.

Reputations Neerbosch-Oost
Changing the negative reputation of Neerbosch-Oost is a difficult thing to do, because it involves many different stakeholders with different interests. A possibility to produce positive attention is to create a landmark, for example an artwork on the sidewalk of the Aubade flat near the entrance of Neerbosch-Oost. This could be realised by collaboration between the housing association Talis, residents of the Aubadeflat and children of the primary school “Het Octaaf”. For example, by organising a drawing competition, where the jury consists of residents of the Aubadeflat and the winning drawing forms the basis of the professional design.

Another possibility to brand Neerbosch-Oost more positively, concerns diversity and inclusion. Migrants are part of the history of Neerbosch-Oost, while it also is accessible for other low-income groups as well as higher income groups. Therefore, I suggest making other historical events – diversification – a part of the reputation of Neerbosch-Oost and highlight the positive elements instead of the negative elements. Although, it is difficult to answer who will benefit from this branding strategy. A important starting point for this branding strategy would be the residents and future residents of Neerbosch-Oost.

Housing associations
In order to stimulate and manage the quality of life in Neerbosch-Oost, I would recommend that the key housing associations of Portaal, Woonwaarts and Talis increase their collaboration. Examples of areas in which collaboration could be improved are waste management, maintaining semi-public space around their complexes, and how to deal with vulnerable people. Their collaboration could be improved by setting up regular meetings, for example once per quarter with all the managers of Neerbosch-Oost to discuss the development of the neighbourhood and their corporations. Where Do the associations encounter bottlenecks and how can they resolve these problems together? Another important starting point would be improving the protocols on how to deal with vulnerable people. Especially in case of emergency, it is important to know who is responsible and how they need to intervene so the person themselves and the neighbourhood are not affected.

The final policy recommendation relates to the renovation or redevelopment of the maisonettes because it is an important element in the future development of Neerbosch-Oost. As mentioned before, this project would benefit from a collaboration between the housing associations that own maisonettes in Neerbosch-Oost. Instead of solely renovate these complexes they could work together. Especially because this collaboration opens the debate on how to rearrange the types of houses. An option would be to increase the amount of single-family homes because several participants prefer or are in need of a single-family home.

7.2.2. Recommendations for further research

This section will offer some recommendations for further research concerning selecting participants, intercultural interaction, minority and majority interaction and neighbourhood’s reputation.

In this study the participants have been selected to fit one of the three main groups. However, during interviews and informal contacts, it turned out that not every respondent fit exclusively in one of these groups. For example, some stayers have lived outside of Neerbosch-Oost at some moment in their life but stayed socially connected to Neerbosch-Oost. Therefore, I would recommend that future research concerning studies of demarcated areas, to select their participants on the basis of an intersection of several characteristics instead of predefined groups.
Additionally, in Neerbosch-Oost it is experienced that groups move within their own social networks and that intercultural interaction cannot be taken for granted. Therefore, it is recommendable to further investigate intercultural interaction, future studies should look into interactions between residents who already live in a neighbourhood and new residents. At what point do people “break out” of their existing social networks and start mixing with other social networks?

Furthermore, it would be interesting to view neighbourhood change from a different perspective than is used in this research. The analysis of the data showed that interaction between cultural groups in Neerbosch-Oost is influenced by minority – majority groups of the neighbourhood and even in certain complexes. There is a need for a for a shift from an ‘ethnic’ lens to a multidimensional lens of different characteristics of individual members of ethnic groups. This recommendation is in line with Crul (2016) notion on diversity in majority and minority cities. Also, to promote community life in neighbourhoods’ institutions, such as the municipality could organize initiatives that stimulate intercultural interactions. However, these initiatives do not always reach these goals, since cultural customs are interpreted differently. What some people experience as normal, can be seen as odd by others and vice versa.

Concerning the reputation of the neighbourhood, in this case Neerbosch-Oost, it is clear that historical events have a long-term effect on the reputation of Neerbosch-Oost. Some in-movers argue that Neerbosch-Oost was not their first choice because of the reputation. This would suggest that that there are also people considering moving to Neerbosch-Oost but do not actually move because of the reputation. This effect is not incorporated in this study. Therefore, it is necessary to study the effect that a neighbourhood’s negative reputation has on potential new residents.

7.3. Limitations and reflection

In this final paragraph I will discuss the limitations of this research and will reflect on my own role within the research and internship period at Talis housing association.

Just like any other research, this research has some limitations. When looking at the sampling strategy, it is, to a certain extent, biased because some participants were happy to participate and willing to answer my questions for this research. Consequently, residents of Neerbosch-Oost who were less willing, did not participate and therefore these experiences cannot be included in this study. However, at the coffee morning at the primary school in Neerbosch-Oost the three women with a migration background were considered as open by the coordinator of the parent child centre Eefje Melssen. It shows that there are also participants included in this research who were less accessible, although most participant were happy to participate. Furthermore, the out-movers in this study was the group that was most difficult to approach, mainly because they do not live in Neerbosch-Oost anymore. With the help of the church “Goede Herderkerk Neerbosch-Oost” and my internship organisation I managed to get in contact with several out-movers who were willing to participate in this research. Besides, some new relationships did not have a direct link with my research, but I learned – with the support of my internship supervisor – that you never know where a new relationship is leading to and it may become valuable.

Another limitation in this research is the validity and reliability of the informal interactions where a small part of the data comes from. At meetings, community events or coffee mornings it is not always possible to record these conversations. Although they offer valuable information, it was difficult to record these in order to increase the reliability and validity. Therefore, this data only makes up a small amount of all the data that is collected.

Furthermore, neighbourhood change is a complex process which is difficult to grasp as a whole. By focussing on Neerbosch-Oost I did not take other macro or meso elements into account. As mentioned
in chapter 3, Nijmegen and the Dutch society change over time, what also influenced the development of Neerbosch-Oost.

In this case study, one specific neighbourhood – Neerbosch-Oost – was researched. However, the city around Neerbosch-Oost is transforming simultaneously with Neerbosch-Oost. Due to the time-limitions of this research, I choose to focus solely on the neighbourhood Neerbosch-Oost and much less on other areas in the city. This does not mean that these areas do not influence Neerbosch-Oost, but it was taken into account to a lesser amount.

For this research I used qualitative methods in the form of interviews and informal interactions. Only, by using the program ATLAS.ti for the analysis I had the feeling that the analyses became to a certain extent qualitative. In the final stage of the coding process, I looked at how often codes occur, and which became a group, super group or even a network tree. Although, this is necessary to come to a well-founded conclusion, it sometimes feels as if the ‘real’ experiences are becoming less important, the once that are emotionally loaded. Perhaps it is a possibility for future research to use an ethnographic method which also incorporate emotions and other individual characteristics. Although, every research method has its pros and its cons.

Next to the research limitations, I also experienced limitations during this research period. I will reflect on these limitations, why they did occur and how to deal with them in the future. First of all, I underestimated the importance of reputation and prejudices regarding Neerbosch-Oost but also in general. Of course, I did know about prejudices, but I did not know that some of these are or can become so strong that these can influence entire organisations and institutions. I think, if I continue to be a researcher, it is important not the fall in the prejudice trap and be explorative and open towards predominant discourses.

Another point that I learned during this research period is that I need deadlines in order to force myself in a good working mode and be more productive. At the start I did not set concrete deadlines, therefore the focus of my research developed later in the process. If I had set deadlines in an earlier stage, I would have had to make the choices that would lead to more focus sooner. However, it is also possible that it is part of the process that should not be rushed. Although both arguments are legitimate, I prefer to set deadlines at an earlier stage the next time. Especially if I have to work with other people instead of by myself.

Furthermore, because I worked most of my research period by myself, it makes it trickier to participate at my internship organisation. Although, I participated in multiple events and meetings, it is different when you do a work internship as opposed to a research internship. Therefore, I need to involve people more in my research, both within the organisation and outside of it, because it is a good way to start knowing an organisation. People get to know me and the other way around I get to know the organisation and the people within. It also relates to my observation regarding new relationships and finding participants. You never know where it can lead but maybe you can benefit from each other.

As a final comment I am happy with the way this thesis has come into being. It is really my masterpiece of the study Human Geography.
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### Appendices

**Appendix 1: Investment of social housing in Neerbosch-Oost 1963**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aanduiding terrein</th>
<th>Naam en bouwplan</th>
<th>Grondprijs</th>
<th>Toegest. door Ministerie</th>
<th>Kostprijs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K. Woningverb. Kolping (M.V.2644-NB'65)</td>
<td>144 maisonnnettes en 71 garages in onderbouw</td>
<td>706,208,62</td>
<td>590,567,82</td>
<td>691,120,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Woningverb. Kolping</td>
<td>120 etagewoningen (M.V.2583-NB'65)</td>
<td>579,830,49</td>
<td>457,001,37</td>
<td>591,942,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Woningverb. Nijgemen (M.V.2589-NB'65)</td>
<td>96 etagewoningen en 31 garages in onderbouw</td>
<td>437,449,37</td>
<td>327,109,21</td>
<td>467,858,58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Woningverb. Nijgemen (M.V.2610-NB'65)</td>
<td>152 eengezinswoningen</td>
<td>849,396,65</td>
<td>589,037,22</td>
<td>938,433,87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Woningverb. De Gezonde Woning (M.V.2428-NB'64)</td>
<td>136 eengezinswoningen</td>
<td>622,296,71</td>
<td>622,296,71</td>
<td>622,296,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Woningverb. De Gemeenschap (M.V.2508-NB'64)</td>
<td>168 maisonnnettes en 82 garages in onderbouw</td>
<td>805,614,40</td>
<td>725,344,30</td>
<td>871,958,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Woningverb. Eigen Haard (M.V.2529-NB'64)</td>
<td>120 eengezinswoningen</td>
<td>640,134,78</td>
<td>533,481,07</td>
<td>697,615,85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Class.opp.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>12829 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>9433 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>7547 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>14338 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12629 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>14367 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totaal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Interview guides

Appendix 2.1. Professionals of housing associations

Woningbouwvereniging:
Functie:

Vragen:
- Wat is de invloed van sociale huurwoningen in een wijk als Neerbosch-Oost?
- Welke sociale maatregelen kunnen er worden genomen om buurtverandering te beïnvloeden?
- Hoe kijkt u aan tegen het toewijzen van woningen aan de hand van levensstijlen?
- Op welke wijze is het management ingericht in wijken?
- Wet langdurige zorg?
- Hoe ervaart u de reputatie van Neerbosch-Oost?
- Wat is de functie van de wijk Neerbosch-Oost?
- Welke fysieke maatregelen kunnen er worden genomen om buurtverandering te beïnvloeden?
- Hoe is de samenwerking tussen andere corporaties in de wijk?
- Wat zijn de belangrijkste veranderingen van de sociale huursector de afgelopen jaren? Veranderend imago van blij om te wonen in een sociale huurwoning naar een sector met een specifieke doelgroep?
- Hoe heeft u de renovatie van verschillende complexen in Neerbosch-Oost ervaren? Merkt u ook een verandering bij bewoners?
Appendix 2.2. Participants

Categorie deelnemer:
Type woning:

Inleiding:

Hoe bevalt het wonen in Neerbosch-Oost?
- Hoe lang woon je al in Neerbosch-Oost?
- Hoe bent u terecht gekomen in Neerbosch-Oost?
- Wat waren je eerste ervaringen met de wijk nadat je er kwam wonen?
- Op welke wijze is de wijk veranderd ten opzicht van toen u er kwam wonen?
  Woonomgeving, woningen, infrastructuur, winkelcentrum en bewoners?

Omgang met andere bewoners:

Hoe bent u ontvangen als nieuwe bewoner in Neerbosch-Oost?
- Hoe is het contact met oudere bewoners in Neerbosch-Oost?
- Hoe ervaart u de omgang met de overige bewoners van Neerbosch-Oost?

Merkt u wel een dat u anders bent dan anderen? Op welke manier?
- Hoe gaat u zelf om met mensen met een andere levensstijl?

Reputatie van de wijk:

Hoe ervaart u de reputatie van de wijk?
Klopt het hoe er wordt gedacht over Neerbosch-Oost?

Woningbouwcorporaties:

Wat zijn uw ervaring met betrekking tot het contact met de woningbouwcorporaties?
Wat vindt u dat de rol is van woningbouwcorporaties in een wijk als Neerbosch-Oost? Bv. Met betrekking tot de leefbaarheid in de wijk?

De woningbouwvereniging heeft de afgelopen jaren geïnvesteerd in bepaalde complexen in de wijk. Hoe heeft u dit ervaren?

Mobiliteit:

Hoe zit u toekomstige woon carrière er mogelijk uit?

Als u een woning zou kopen zou u dan in Neerbosch-Oost blijven wonen?
Hoe bent u terecht gekomen in Neerbosch-Oost? Heeft de reputatie invloed gehad op uw beslissing? (in-mover)

Waarom bent u vertrokken uit Neerbosch-Oost? Heeft de reputatie van de wijk nog meegespeeld in u beslissing? (out-mover)

Overige:

Besteedt u hier ook uw vrije tijd in Neerbosch-Oost?
Van welke voorzieningen maakt u gebruik in Neerbosch-Oost?

Hoe zou u de wijk Neerbosch-Oost omschrijven?

Wat zou u veranderen in de wijk? En waarom?

Hoe ziet een ideaal Neerbosch-Oost er voor u uit?
Appendix 3: Data analysis and network trees

After collecting all the data by semi-structured interviews, it was time to analyse the data in ALTAS.ti. The analysis was based on three phases; open-, axial- and selective coding. Each group (stayers, in- and out-movers) are coded separated to provide structure and a better overview. Although, each group is coded separately all codes are based on the conceptual model. See figure 2.1 for the conceptual model.

Open coding phase
In the open coding phase, the codes that have been made are as much as possible describing the actual experience or perception. A lot of codes are relative unique and are only reused for comparable experiences. As a result, there are only a few codes that are reused. This does not mean that people do not experience or perceive similar processes because they do. But to provide a detailed and in-depth analysis these are coded separately and will be grouped together in the next phase of coding, axial coding. Open coding phase have result in 398x codes of stayers; 221x codes of in-movers; and 148 codes of out-movers.

Axial coding phase

Stayers
- Groups with 0-3 codes:
  Old boys’ network (2x); policy and regulations (3x); government (3x); neighbours (3x); and positive experience (3x).
- Groups with 3-6 codes:
  Succession (4x); Manolito’s and Minolito’s (4x); experience of mixing cultures (4x); negative experience of reputation (4x); positive experience of reputation (4x); Mall as meeting place (4x); decrease social networks (5x); reputations of from the past (5x); reaction outsiders (5x); institutional reasons (5x); ecological reasons (5x); language (5x); differences (6x); negative experience (6x); locally specific experiences (6x); communal activities (6x); life cycle reasons (6x).
- Groups with 6-9 codes:
  Allocation policy (7x); invasion (7x); newspaper and media (8x); renovation (9x); resistance (9x); experience development housing organisation (9x); housing associations (9x); ideas and plans (9x); activities and networks (9x).
- Groups with more than 9 codes:
  Response to reputation (10x); connected to NBO (10x); moving (10x); social reasons (11x); interaction between cultures (12x).

In-movers
- Groups with 0-3 codes:
  Connected to NBO (3x).
- Groups with 3-6 codes:
  Decline of community (4x); Maisonettes (4x); Life cycle (5x); Other local experiences (5x); Positive experience (5x, diversity); Positive experience housing association (5x); Negative experience housing association (5x); Experience of renovation (5x); Experience of neighbourhood change (5x); Government (6x); Influence local living environment (6x); Other perceptions of diversity (6x).
- Groups with 6-9 codes:
  Negative experience (7x); Social networks and diversity (7x); Reputations and actions (7x); Positive reputation (8x); Contact with neighbours (9x); Negative reputation (9x); Mobility (9x).
• Groups with more than 9 codes:
  Housing association (10x)

Out-movers
• Groups with 0-3 codes:
  Institutional (2x); newspaper and media (2x); outsiders and reputation (3x); ecological (3x);
  negative experience (3x); experience reputation positive (3x); connection with NBO (3x);
  diversity and culture (3x); life cycle (3x); compared to other neighbourhoods (3x).
• Groups with 3-6 codes: Public housing (4x); experience reputation negative (4x); government
  (4x); positive experience (4x); diversity (5x); experience other neighbourhood (5x); in-mover
  from (5x); response to reputation (6x); social networks (6x); negative about NBO (5x).
• Groups with 6-9 codes:
  Zero (-). Positive about NBO (9x).
• Groups with more than 9 codes:
  Moving out (10x); Social reason (10x).

Network tree guide
In the network trees there are three different codes illustrates: single codes; codes that form a
  group; and groups that form a concept. All codes that form a group have the same, random, colour.
  Figure below show all three types of codes, groups and concepts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🌟</td>
<td>Only text = a single code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🔗</td>
<td>#_ plus group name = code group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🏁</td>
<td>* plus capital letters = theoretical concept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code are connected by arrows that can have different meanings, for example, “is part of” or “is
  associated with”. In all network trees the theoretical concept is centred in the middle, surrounded
  by the code groups and the outer edge is formed by the single codes. In a lot of codes Neerbosch-
  Oost is shortened to NBO.
3.1. Network trees of stayers.

Network tree: Ecological approach.

In this network tree the central theoretical concept is the “ecological approach” and is formed by three groups: resistance (8x); invasion (6x); and succession (3x). In total there are 17 single codes that connect to the ecological approach. The single codes that are most used are: experience change of population in NBO (8x); followed by have to get used to cultural differences (3x). The other single codes occur two or one times.
Network tree: Behavioural approach.

This network tree is based around the theoretical concept of “behavioural approach”. This concept exists out six groups: activities and networks (9x); connected to NBO (9x); decrease social networks (4x); experience of mixing cultures (3x); neighbours (2x); and old boys’ network (1x and could have been named differently). In total there are 28 single codes that are connected to the behavioural approach. The single codes that are most used are: having children leads to more contacts (6x); good contact with neighbours (6x); network of volunteers that knows each other (3x); feels connected to the neighbourhood (3x); terrace for meeting people (3x); experience of decrease of social cohesion (3x); different groups/networks know where to find each other.
other (3x). See also network tree that is bases around ‘diversity, experiences and perceptions’ that is providing a detailed description of the element of ‘contagion’ (lack of a better word), interaction between different groups of residents of Neerbosch-Oost.
Network tree: Diversity, experience and perceptions.

In this network tree the main concept is experiences and perceptions that relate to diversity (migrants). This network tree is relating to a large extent to the behavioural approach and in specific to the element, within the behavioural approach, ‘contagion’. There are five groups: interaction between cultures (11x); locally specific experiences (5x); communal activities (5x); differences (5x); and language (4x). In total there are 30 single codes that are linked to diversity, experiences and perceptions. The single codes that are most used are: gets along with people with a migration background (4x); friendly contact with people with a migration background in their street; loud language of Moroccans (3x); and have to get used to cultural differences (3x).
This network tree is based around the theoretical concept ‘institutional approach’. There are four groups that are part of the theoretical concept: ideas and plans (7,5x); housing associations (6,5x); allocation policy (6,5x) and government (1,5x). There are two single codes that have a connection with other codes of groups. Therefore, they are not grouped. In total there are 22 codes that have a connection with the institutional approach. The single codes that are most common are: change of elderly policy to complex (4x); vulnerable people influence their environment (4x); years of residence and allocation system (3x); questioning allocation system of vulnerable people (3x).
The central concepts in this network tree is housing associations, perceptions and experiences and relates to a large extent to the institutional approach, the only difference is that this tree solely focus on housing associations. There are five groups: renovation (8x); experience development housing organisations (8x); negative experiences (5x); positive experiences (2x); and policy and regulations (2x). In total there are 25 codes that are connected to the experiences and perceptions of housing associations. The most single codes used are: change of elderly policy to complex (4x); questioning allocation system of vulnerable people (3x); social housing attract a certain kind of people (2x); negative about waste in combination with housing associations (2x); created a “living room” for meeting people that live in a certain complex (2x); positive about recent renovation of complexes of Talis (2x); and big difference between tenants leads to problems (2x).
In this network tree the concept of reputation, perceptions and experiences is shown. The concept is split into 6 groups; response to reputation (8,5x); newspaper and media (6x); reactions outsiders (4x); reputation from the past (3,5x); positive experience (3x); and negative experience (3x). There are two single codes that relate to multiple groups: newspaper was also in the past writing negative about NBO and perceive that they are treated differently by the newspaper. Therefore, they are not groups and have a white tint. In total there are 28 single codes that are linked to the perceptions and experiences of reputation. The most common single codes are: bad reputation is something of the past (6x); what happens in NBO it is direct news (3x); do not experience the reputation of newspaper article (6x); outsiders do not understand why you want to live in NBO (5x); people reacted angry about negative article of newspaper (3x); and if something happens in NBO it is direct news (3x).
This network tree is based around the concept of residential mobility. There are five groups: moving (11x); social reasons (8x); life cycle reasons (5x); ecological reasons (4x); institutional reason (4x). In total there are 42 single codes that are linked to residential mobility. The single code that are most used are: moved within the neighbourhood (10x); does not want to move outside NBO (3x); moved to NBO with parents (3x); higher turn-over leads to less contacts (2x); decline of social contact a reason to move (2x); bigger house due to children (2x).
3.2. Network trees of in-movers.

In this network tree is the theoretical concept of the behavioural approach is shown. It exist of five groups: contact with neighbours (7x); Life cycle (4x); Experience of neighbourhood change (4x); Decline of community (3x); Connected to NBO (2x). In total there are 20 single codes that connect to the behavioural approach. The most common single codes are: Speak each other about waste (3x); Contact with elderly neighbours (2x); limited contact with neighbours (2x); Better living than before (2x); Living career depending on life course (2x); Experience also depending on peoples life course (2x).
This network tree shows the experiences and perceptions relating to diversity and is connected to the behavioural approach. There are four groups: Social networks and diversity (6x); Negative experiences (6x); Other perceptions of diversity (5x); Positive experiences (4x). In total there are 21 single codes that link to perceptions and experiences of diversity. The single codes that are most used are: Not bad experiences with people with a diverse (migrations) background; and Experiences of cultural differences (2x).
In this network tree the theoretical concept institutional approach is shown. There are two groups: housing associations (7,5x) and government (5x), and some single codes (3,5x) that cannot be classified specific as government or housing associations. In total there are 16 single codes that are part of the institutional approach. The single code that is most common are: limitations by allocation policy (3x); Moved to NBO by allocation system (2x); and increase of people with problems in maisonettes. In network tree: experience and perceptions of housing associations will provide a more detailed description of the housing associations.
Network tree: Experience and perceptions of housing associations.

This network tree illustrates the experience and perceptions of housing association. The tree is made up of four groups: Other experience housing association (5x); Experience of renovation (4x); Negative experiences (4x); and Positive experiences (4x). In total there are 17 single codes that relate to the experience and perceptions of housing associations. The single codes that are most used are: Contact with Talis is ‘correct’ (2x); Experience of housing association relating to the quality of life in the neighbourhood (2x); increase of people with problems in maisonettes (2x); multiple contact with housing association is not that good due to language difficulty (2x); good experience with Talis (2x). This network tree relates to network tree institutional approach experience by in-movers.
Network tree: Reputation, experiences and perceptions.

In this network tree the experiences and perceptions of reputations are shown. There are three groups: Reputation and actions (6x); Negative reputation (6x); positive reputation (5x); and there are also some single codes (2x) that are associate with multiple groups. In total there are 19 single codes that connect to the perceptions and experience of the reputation. The most common single used codes are: Reputations is bases on where you live within NBO (3x); Reputations of neighbourhood and role of municipality (3x); and Reputation is not experienced (3x).
Network tree: Residential mobility.

In this network tree the theoretical concept of mobility is shown. This network tree is solely existing out of single codes (9x). The most used single codes are: Wants to stay in NBO (3x); and Living career depending on live course (2x).
3.3. Network trees of out-movers.

Network tree: Ecological approach.

In this network tree the codes that are linked to the ecological approach are shown. Due to the relatively small tree it was not necessary to group the codes. Therefore, there are four single codes that “directly” to the ecological approach. The single code “experience change of populations the last 15 years in NBO” is coded twice and the other codes only once.
Network tree: Behavioural approach.

In this network tree the theoretical concept behavioural approach is shown. It exists out of four groups: social networks (5.5x); life cycle (2x); and diversity and culture (2x); connection with NBO (1.5x). There are total of 11 single codes that link to the behavioural approach. The single codes that are used the most are: Experience of more groups instead of one big group as it used to be (2x); good contact with neighbours (2x); divorce change the way she experienced NBO (2x); grew-up in NBO (2x).
The concept of diversity, experiences and perceptions is central. As mentioned before, this concept strongly relates to the behavioural approach and are discussed together in the result chapter. There are three groups: diversity (4x); positive experience (3x); and negative experience (2x). In total there are 9 single codes that have a connection with experience, perceptions and diversity. The single codes that are most common are: NBO is multicultural (2x); always had friendly contact with people with a migration background (2x); and experience the populations as many non-Dutch people (2x).
The theoretical concept of the institutional approach is shown in this network tree. There are two groups: government (3x); and public housing (2x). In total there are five codes that relate to the institutional approach. The single code that is most common is: experience that people do not know about waste regulations (2x), the other single codes are all coded one time.
Network tree: Residential mobility.

This network tree is based around the concept of residential mobility. It consists of five groups: social reasons (9x); moving out (9x); In-mover from (4,5); experience another neighbourhood (4x); ecological (2x); and institutional (1,5x). In total there are 30 single codes that relate to the concept of residential mobility. The single codes that are used the much are: unfortunately, no suitable single-family homes were available in NBO (3x); wanted to stay in NBO (3x); moved because they search a bigger home (2x); from in-mover to out-mover regarding NBO (2x); reputation did not influence their choice to move-out (2x); and bought a single-family home outside NBO (2x).
In this network tree the concept of reputation, experiences and perceptions are central. There are 5 groups: response to reputation (5x); experience reputation negative (3x); experience reputation positive (2x); outsiders and reputations (2x); and newspaper and media (1x). In total there are 13 single codes that relate to experience and perceptions about reputation. The single codes that used to most are: partly recognizes the reputation (3x) and reputation did not influence their choice to move-out (2x).