Why do residents want to leave deprived neighbourhoods?
- The importance of residents' subjective evaluations of their neighbourhood and its reputation

Hans Skifter Andersen

Danish Urban and Building Research, Box 119, DK-2970 Horsholm, Denmark.
Center for Housing and Welfare, University of Copenhagen
E-mail: hsa@sbi.dk. Tlph. ++45 45865533, Fax: ++45 45867533

Abstract
It is one of the purposes of many area-based initiatives in deprived urban neighbourhoods to reduce the magnitude of residents that move away from the area. Especially it is often an objective to keep residents with jobs or with middle-sized incomes to stay to avoid a further concentration of poor people and social problems in the neighbourhood. This paper is based on a study of how residents in 12 deprived urban areas in Denmark evaluate their neighbourhood and of the connection between this and their wishes to move away or stay. The purpose is to expose the importance of residents' subjective evaluations of the neighbourhood and its reputation for their inclination to stay or move away. Based on the results some conclusions are made on what could be important tasks in area-based initiatives that will make efforts to reduce mobility.

The study shows a strong connection between residents' perception of the reputation of their neighbourhood and their plans to move, but also that a number of other factors have great importance. Dissatisfaction with social problems and crime are the most important reasons for moving from deprived neighbourhoods, especially among residents in employment. Strong social relations inside the neighbourhood significantly reduce intentions to move.

Key words: Deprived Neighbourhoods, neighbourhood dissatisfaction, plans to move away

1. Introduction

Most European countries have had experiences with special problems that have emerged in certain more or less well-defined parts of the cities called deprived or depressed urban neighbourhoods. Many governments have initiated programmes with area based initiatives to fight against problems in deprived urban areas.

Judging from the research literature there seem to be very different views on what are the core problems in deprived urban neighbourhoods and even more on what are the main reasons why they appear. It can be argued (Skifter Andersen 2003 and in 2002a) that it is appropriate to understand deprived urban neighbourhoods as 'excluded places'. This exclusion is caused by self-perpetuating social, cultural, financial and physical deterioration in the areas, which increasingly make them diverge from the rest of the city. The development in these areas tends to make 'ordinary' people flee to other parts of the cities making room for an increasing concentration of low-income and socially excluded groups and thus increasing the spatial division of social groups. This effect is even more serious when looking at the segregation of ethnic minorities where the forces in work are much stronger because many from the native population tend to avoid neighbourhoods with high concentrations of ethnic minorities.

That is why it in many area-based initiatives has been a central purpose to influence the flow of people in and out of the areas (Skifter Andersen 2002b). It has often been a critical objective to reduce the number of residents that move away from the neighbourhood, especially residents who have employment. It has also

been important to be able to attract these groups to move into the area. Knowledge about which reasons are most important to the groups of people, one wants to keep back in or attract to these areas is therefore important as guidance for area-based initiatives.

There have only been a limited number of studies on the connection between neighbourhood conditions and mobility (Clark and Ledwith 2005, Feijten and van Ham 2007) and only little attention has been paid to the possible effects of a negative neighbourhood reputation (Permentier et. Al. 2005). Even fewer studies have focused solely on why residents move away from deprived neighbourhoods (Kearns and Parkes 2003).

In this article is reported a study of the connection between residents' wishes to stay or move away in 12 deprived urban areas in Denmark and explaining factors as their personal situation, their social connection to the neighbourhood and their subjective evaluations of conditions in the neighbourhood – especially if they think that the neighbourhood has a bad reputation among outsiders. Two main questions have been examined in this study:

1. What are the main reasons for why residents in a deprived neighbourhood think that it has a poor reputation among outsiders – especially the connection between dissatisfaction with area conditions and perceived poor reputation?
2. What determines if residents have plans to move away - especially the importance of their evaluation of reputation of their neighbourhood and of different conditions in the neighbourhood? What is the importance of tenure and affiliation to the area?

It is normally expected that residential mobility and plans to move to a great extent are determined by personal mobility factors and housing situation, as described in the literature on residential mobility, and that neighbourhood conditions only play a minor role. It is, however, possible that this is different in deprived neighbourhoods where dissatisfaction with nuisances from anti-social behaviour, physical decay and bad reputation can be of much greater importance. It is also possible that social relations in the neighbourhood have importance. Residents that have tight social relations in the area, as family and friends, or who in other ways are involved in the neighbourhood, may be less declined to leave the area. This often is connected to the length of residence where residents, who have stayed longer, tend to have stronger social ties to the neighbourhood.

The article starts with a short discussion of the results of some other studies of causes of residential mobility and explanations of neighbourhood dissatisfaction. Studies of neighbourhood dissatisfaction have seldom focused on deprived neighbourhoods, but they can to some extent be used to formulate some general hypotheses for the empirical investigation of deprived neighbourhoods in the Danish study. These general hypotheses, and some special hypotheses concerning deprived neighbourhoods, are formulated and tested by use of data from a survey in the Danish neighbourhoods.

In the first place is examined the connection between residents' evaluation of problems and their opinion on the reputation of the neighbourhood. Secondly the formulated hypotheses explaining residents' inclinations to move away from or stay in deprived neighbourhoods are tested.

2. Neighbourhood satisfaction, image and reputation

Dissatisfaction with dwelling or neighbourhood is in the literature seen as an important basis for the mobility process, but there are many different understandings of this concept and of what elements are contained in housing and neighbourhood satisfaction or dissatisfaction. As stated by Burrows and Rhodes (1998) dissatisfaction will always be a function of both objective realities and sometimes highly subjective evaluations. Personal domestic well being is as strongly influenced by our perceptions of material phenomena as by the material phenomena it self.

In many studies residential satisfaction has been measured by putting forward one single question to the residents: are you satisfied/dissatisfied with your dwelling/neighbourhood. As stated by Parkes, Kearns and Atkinson (2002) there are good reasons to question if such a simple measure of satisfaction is usable in trying to understand residents' relationship to their environment and as a basis for prediction of their actions, for instance moving away. It is a well-known fact from many studies that people most often express a high degree of general satisfaction with their residence. There are, however, often other reasons for this than a high positive evaluation of dwelling and neighbourhood. People that do not have a possibility to move away will always tend to be positive if they don't want to acknowledge that their life has failed (Lu 1999). It has also been shown in mobility studies that dissatisfaction with negative conditions will be reduced during the course of time, as residents get accustomed to them (Speare, Goldstein and Frey 1974). Furthermore a low general

dissatisfaction can reflect a lack of concern about the neighbourhood because the dwelling is seen as just a place to sleep and actual life and social relations is taking place in other parts of the city (Ærø 2001).

As a consequence of the above-mentioned problems in measuring general satisfaction, it cannot always be expected that there is a direct connection between residents' evaluation of different specific conditions and their general appreciation of the residence. People are more disposed to express dissatisfaction with some of the specific conditions in the neighbourhood than to make a general devaluation of their neighbourhood. Moreover, different people do not put the same weight on different qualities and properties in the neighbourhood. Thus Burrows and Rhodes, in their effort to construct a composite measure of area dissatisfaction, analysed the connection between general expressed dissatisfaction and residents' evaluation of 17 different problems in the neighbourhoods. They found it difficult to construct a specific combination of problem evaluations that produced good predictions of the general dissatisfaction.

Residential satisfaction is often split up into housing and neighbourhood satisfaction. But there is evidence that the two are not independent. The study of Parkes, Kearns and Atkinson (2002) and Dekker et. al. (2007) thus showed that there was a connection between the two kinds of satisfaction - people dissatisfied with their house being much more likely to be dissatisfied with their neighbourhood. One explanation could be, as mentioned above, that people who have decided to move - and have the possibility to do so - in general have created a negative evaluation of both dwelling and neighbourhood. Housing dissatisfaction and plans to move could therefore make a contribution in explaining neighbourhood dissatisfaction.

2.1 Elements in neighbourhood satisfaction
The elements explaining neighbourhood satisfaction have been classified in different ways in the literature. The elements used in four different studies is in figure 1 classified in five groups.

Figure 1. Classification of elements in neighbourhood satisfaction

	Physical environment	Location and services	Social environment	Housing	Reputation /status
Johnston (1973)	'Impersonal environment'	Locational attributes	'Interpersonal environment'		
Basolo and Strong (2002)	Physical environmental conditions	Locational characteristics and services/facilities	Sociocultural environment		
Galster et. al. (2002)		Business and employment	Social disadvantage. Crime rates.	Housing and tenure type. Housing vacancy	Prestige
Parkes et. al. (2002)	Environmental features	Quality of neighbourhood facilities Access to neighbourhood facilities	Positive social features Negative social features	Housing satisfaction	

Johnston (1973) suggested, as a result of a study, that neighbourhood preferences are based on three underlying evaluative dimensions, which are invariant with area of residency in the city:

1. The 'impersonal environment', composed mainly by the physical attributes of the neighbourhood
2. The 'interpersonal environment' composed mainly of the social attributes of the neighbourhood
3. The locational attributes of the neighbourhood in relation to the city and its services

Knox (1995) refers to a study from U.S.A. where Johnston's methodology was used. The conclusions were that there was some evidence that similar neighbourhoods evoked similar cognitive responses, but that they were far from identical in different kinds of neighbourhoods.

Basolo and Strong divided determinants of neighbourhood satisfaction into individual characteristics of residents and neighbourhood characteristics. The latter was composed of

1. Physical environmental conditions,
2. Locational characteristics,
3. Local services/facilities and
4. Sociocultural environment

Galster et. al. (2002) in a principal component analysis of indicators of neighbourhood quality in six American cities identified six factors that explained two-thirds of the total variation:

1. Social disadvantage (female headship rate, teen birth rates, welfare usage, share of black people)
2. Housing and tenure type (share of single-family homes, owner-occupied).
3. Prestige (share of college degrees, share in managerial, professional and technical occupations, median home values)
4. Business and employment (number of businesses and jobs)
5. Crime (violent crime rates)
6. Housing vacancy (residential vacancy rates, units lacking minimal plumbing)

Moreover, Parkes, Kearns and Atkinson (2002) organised their variables in 6 different types:

1. Positive social features (friendly neighbours, community spirit)
2. Negative social features (crime and safety, bad neighbours)
3. Environmental features (general appearance of the area, leisure facilities, noise)
4. Quality of neighbourhood facilities (schools, public transport, street lightning)
5. Access to neighbourhood facilities (supermarket, post office, corner shop)
6. Housing satisfaction.

Many studies have found that fear of crime or lack of safety are very important for neighbourhood satisfaction, where high incidents of crime can considerably reduce the usually high neighbourhood satisfaction among residents without plans to move. There are not always a direct connection between actual crime rates and the perceptions of local crime among residents (Basolo and Strong 2002). The perceived crime is found to be more important to satisfaction than the actual. As stated by Ærø (2004) and Costa Pinho (2000) the feeling of safety is not only connected to observed crime but also to conflicts between residents or groups of residents. These conflicts can sometimes be grounded in experiences with other residents not acting in accordance to what is felt as usual norms and behaviour. This is an argument for that a social and ethnic heterogeneous neighbourhood has a higher probability of neighbourhood dissatisfaction.

Parkes, Kearns and Atkinson (2002) found in their study of ordinary neighbourhoods that the most important factor explaining neighbourhood satisfaction, besides housing satisfaction, was physical conditions expressed as "general appearance of the neighbourhood". Other important factors were noise, friendliness of neighbours, 'community spirit' and safety. Also Basolo and Strong (2002) concluded that physical conditions were important - like cleanliness and traffic. They moreover found that social relations were of great influence on satisfaction. Also in other studies (Carp et al. 1982 and Franscescator et. al 1987) it has been found that physical problems, like lack of maintenance, litter, graffiti. noise and pollution, and social relations have a great effect on peoples satisfaction with the neighbourhood.

One should, however, be careful to conclude from the high importance of the physical appearance of the neighbourhood that aesthetics is one of the most important dimensions of neighbourhood satisfaction. Physical problems of an area can also be interpreted as visible signs of low status and social problems (Skifter Andersen 2003).

2.2 Individual factors explaining differences in neighbourhood dissatisfaction among residents
Parkes, Kearns and Atkinson (2002) suggest that individual resources are a very important factor in explaining area dissatisfaction, because it is essential to the individual's possibility to choose another dwelling or neighbourhood if wanted. This argument can be true, as argued above, when looking at general measures of dissatisfaction and also of wishes to move, but are not necessary of great importance to the evaluation of specific conditions of the neighbourhood.

Other individual variables, which have been used in studies of satisfaction, are age, unemployment, education and extent of social networks.

The study of Parkes, Kearns and Atkinson did not show that socio-demographic background variables were good predictors of neighbourhood satisfaction in ordinary neighbourhoods. Burrows and Rhodes found in their study of deprived neighbourhoods that important variables were employment situation, social class and single mothers, while age and income were not. Dekker et. al. (2007) found in some post-WWII large housing estates that age was the most important variable – older people were more satisfied than younger. They also showed that homeowners are generally more satisfied than tenants. Friedrichs and Blasius (2005)

also have found that homeowners perceive les deviant behaviour in deprived neighbourhoods than tenants do.

A greater satisfaction is also expected among those who have lived longer in the neighbourhood. Kasarda and Janowitz (1974) have proposed that satisfaction depends more on social factors linked to the individual's length of residence, the social stability of the neighbourhood, the presence of family and friends and the amount of social interaction. In a Danish study based on the same data material from deprived neighbourhoods as this article (Skifter Andersen 2004), it was shown also that older people tend to be more satisfied with different aspects and young people less and that this cannot be explained by their length of residence. It also showed that social affiliation to the neighbourhood only had little importance for dissatisfaction. A much more significant variable was if residents had plans to move away within two years. This confirms an assumption that residents, who do not consider moving away, tend to be more positive towards their neighbourhood.

2.3 The importance of image and reputation
The meaning of neighbourhoods as places is socially constructed and different groups give these places different meanings. Perceptions on the geographical extent of a certain neighbourhood can also be different among groups. It has thus been shown that middle class residents hold a more comprehensive image of neighbourhoods than lower-class residents covering a much wider territory and including a larger number of and greater variety of elements (Knox 1995, pp. 262).

There has been a divide between literature made by planners/geographers and sociological literature on the definition and meaning of places. In the first there has been an emphasis on the physical boundaries and aspects, while the latter mostly finds that a place is defined by its use and social practices (Giddens 1984, Massey 1995).

A concept that has been used in some studies of residential satisfaction is the 'image' of the neighbourhood. A possible definition of image is 'the set of meanings by which an object is known and through which people describe, remember and relate to it. This is a net result of the interaction of a person's beliefs, ideas, feelings and impressions about an object' (Rijpers and Smeets 1998). Thus the image is a simplified generalised picture that summarises all the good and bad conditions in a neighbourhood. It is also assumed by the individual that other people has the same or a very similar image of the neighbourhood

Rijpers and Smeets (1998) identified three types of images: 1. 'The internal image', which was the one that was common among residents of the neighbourhood, 2. 'The External image' according to people living outside the neighbourhood and 3. 'The self-reflecting image', which was the image residents believed, was found among outsiders. Their study found some differences between what conditions in the neighbourhood were important in these three different kinds of images. The internal image was mostly influenced by the social composition of residents, the visual quality of the build environment, social inconveniences and accessibility of facilities. The external image was mostly explained by social inconveniences (like vandalism, safety and behaviour of residents) and by quality of buildings (appearance of the neighbourhood, types of dwellings, maintenance, diversification of buildings). Finally the self-reflecting image was somewhat similar to the internal image, but social inconveniences and visual qualities were more important. It was thus shown that the external image did not coincide with the residents' perception of it – the so called self-reflecting image.

Another concept used in the literature is 'reputation'. Reputation in many ways is a similar concept as image. A possible definition is 'The beliefs or opinions that are generally held about someone or something' (Permentier et. al. 2007). This underlines the collective character of reputation. It is a widely shared belief, shared by certain groups. Reputation does not depend on objective neighbourhood attributes, but rather on the composite 'brand' or 'name' of the area.

Reputation is often seen as an 'outside view of the area' (Koopman 2007). Permentier et. al. (2007) also argues that the concept of reputation most often has been used when studying the attitudes and behaviour of non-residents while there hardly has been any research carried out on the effects of residents' perception of negative reputation of their own neighbourhood.

Related to the concept of reputation is the concept of status (Permentier et. al. 2007). Status refers to the individual level while reputation refers to the neighbourhood level. But neighbourhood reputation can be used as an indicator of the status of residents. Poor reputation and low status connected with deprived neighbourhoods can thus be perceived as an important problem for the residents and a motive for moving to another neighbourhood. In this context it is residents' believe in what is the reputation among outsiders that has importance. This corresponds to what above has been called the self-reflecting image. It is not directly determined by residents' perception of good and bad things in the neighbourhood, but opinions on poor reputation can to some extent be attributed to their dissatisfaction with concrete problems in the area. Rijpers

and Smeets (1998) conclude that the self-reflecting image to some extent is a mirror of the internal image putting more weight on social problems, than the external image, and less weight on physical problems.

An earlier Danish study based on data from 500 social housing estates with social problems (Skifter Andersen 2002a) showed that the most important social factors explaining poor reputation was share of ethnic minority groups, social conflicts, noisy residents and problems with vandalism. Furthermore, larger estates, with bad location, many small dwellings and bad maintenance were more vulnerable to having a poor reputation. Moreover, it showed that the risk for this was relatively larger in smaller towns and cities. In the same study it was shown that poor reputation was a major factor in explaining mobility out of the estates.

3. Neighbourhood satisfaction, reputation and mobility

Residential dissatisfaction is in the mobility literature seen as an intervening variable between mobility and background variables, such as individual characteristics. Mobility studies, going back to the pioneering work of Rossi (Rossi 1955), has explained the process of residential mobility by stages as:

1. Dissatisfaction with the current dwelling and/or its neighbourhood is acknowledged by the individual
2. A wish to move and demands to another dwelling or neighbourhood are formulated
3. Information on alternative dwellings are obtained
4. A decision to move is taken

It is well-known facts from the comprehensive literature on residential mobility that for every household, greater barriers against mobility are build up during the course of time. As formulated by Speare, Goldstein and Frey (1974):

> "Many empirical studies note another aspect of mobility in the social and economic bonds a community resident or potential mover forms with the immediate environment.… as a result of a gradual assimilation process.… relation between the bonds on the one hand and mobility on the other will be inverse and mobility will be inhibited by ties to the immediate neighbourhood or area. The greater in magnitude and intensity the bonds for an individual at his current residence, the higher his tolerance for dissatisfaction will become, everything else being equal"

One of the dominant theories called the stress-threshold theory (Wolpert 1965, Brown and More 1970) explains mobility as a product of that changes occur in the housing needs of households during the course of time, which cause 'stress' in the housing situation, and that barriers against mobility are build up. When stress exceeds barriers the household will move. Changes in the household situation like marriage, divorce, birth of children, major income changes etc. are thus important reasons for mobility, while dissatisfaction alone more seldom leads to moving. Families in certain phases of the life cycle are more mobile than other regardless of their housing situation. Some of the most important background variables explaining mobility are thus age, family situation and job career. Rossi (1955) developed a successful index of mobility combining an index of 'potential mobility', containing such variables, with another index of dissatisfaction with the current dwelling and neighbourhood.

While the importance of personal mobility factors and changes in housing needs has been shown to be very important determinants of mobility there has been less focus on the importance of the neighbourhood and the results from the few performed studies on this aspect has been very different.

It is to be expected that wishes to move be connected with dissatisfaction with different conditions in dwelling and neighbourhood and the subjective evaluation of theses conditions among individual residents. It is also to be expected that subjective evaluations of the neighbourhood might be better in explaining moving behaviour than so called 'objective' data (Permentier et. al. 2007). It must also be expected that the evaluation of properties and qualities by the neighbourhood that are most important to the quality of life of individual residents also will be most important in determining dissatisfaction and wishes to move.

Lu (1998) showed a strong connection between moving intentions and neighbourhood satisfaction. Clark and Ledwick (2005), however, found in a study among households in Los Angeles that in general the additive effects of neighbourhood variables, beyond the structural effects of age and housing needs on moving intentions, are quite small. The neighbourhood variables used stemmed from interview questions on safety, general satisfaction with the neighbourhood and if it was a so-called 'Close-knit' neighbourhood. As stated above it is doubtful whether general satisfaction or dissatisfaction is a useful variable.

Kearns and Parkes (2003) have reported a study of the connection between area dissatisfaction and plans to move in some British urban neighbourhoods. Only ten per cent of the respondents in their survey were residents in poor neighbourhoods. The study showed that moving intentions were related to dissatisfaction with the dwelling, its immediate surroundings and the whole neighbourhood in the quoted order. Conditions included in the surroundings were: Disorder (burglary, safety, vandalism/graffiti), environmental (among others rubbish and litter, general appearance, conditions of open spaces, traffic and noise) and social (close neighbours, privacy). Neighbourhood conditions consisted of access (work and transport), facilities (shopping, public services) and people (people, family). Especially the variables in "disorder" and dissatisfaction with people in the neighbourhood were shown to be good predictors of plans to move.

The reputation of a neighbourhood can influence plans to move. As discussed above residents can have a perception of the reputation among outsiders that are not closely determined by their satisfaction and dissatisfaction with elements in the neighbourhood, but for instance can be a result of a bad press. A poor reputation can be experienced by the residents as having a negative influence on their own social status. Some earlier studies (Skifter Andersen 1998, Tsfati and cohen, Davison, 1983 – both referred in permentier et. al. 2007) point to that perceived reputation has a separate importance for moving behaviour. Tsfati and Cohen showed that people, who thought that outsiders were more influenced by media coverage of the area than themselves, showed stronger intentions to move.

Some researchers argue that it is not neighbourhood characteristics per se that influence residential mobility, but neighbourhood change (Lee et. al. 1994) or expectations about future change. The study by Kearns and Parkes showed that neighbourhood decline - the perception of things getting worse - had great importance. This was also shown in a Dutch study (Feijten and van Ham 2007) in different neighbourhoods where there was a higher propensity to move among residents who perceived a decline in their neighbourhood.

Others point to that tenure and tight social relations in the neighbourhood influence intentions to move and actual moves in a way that interferes with neighbourhood variables. As discussed above it can be expected that home ownership and 'close knits' have a positive influence on neighbourhood satisfaction. At the same time they tend to decrease mobility. This was shown by Clark et. all. (2005). It was also shown in a study by Friedrichs and Blasius (2007) in a deprived neighbourhood in Cologne that owners have a lower propensity to move out of the area than renters.

Several studies have found marked differences between plans to move and actual moves (Lu 1998, Clark and Ledwick, 2005, de Groot et. al. 2007, Kearns and Parkes 2003). De Groot et. al. found that only one third of individuals with intentions to move actually had moved two years later. The study by Kearns and Parkes also showed differences between intended and actual moves. 48 per cent of those who planned to move actually had left their home five years later, while 14 per cent of those who planned to stay had moved. It was concluded that residential perceptions of the dwelling and neighbourhood had less influence on actual moves than on earlier moving intentions irrespectively of when the move was done. But it was still found that dissatisfaction with the surroundings had importance - especially crime, safety and vandalism. One must, however, keep in mind that the vast majority of respondents did not live in deprived neighbourhoods.

The greatest difference between plans and actual moves in the study by Kearns and Parkes were found among homeowners. This has also been found in other studies (McHugh et. al. 1990).This point to that tenure is an important variable in explaining moving plans and actual moves, where owner-occupation can reduce intentions of moving away from the neighbourhood and also reduce execution of moves.

3.1 Hypotheses on factors explaining plans to move away from the neighbourhood
Based on the mobility literature we expect that plans to move away from the neighbourhoods will depend on the following factors:

a) **Individual mobility factors**: age, family situation etc. Younger people - especially singles have a greater potentiality for moving, while elderly people and families with children seldom wants to move
b) **Opportunities on the housing market**: Economic resources. People with lower incomes and fewer possibilities on the housing market will be more inclined to accept their housing situation and more seldom have plans to move. Residents with higher income and longer education are expected more often to have plans to move from deprived neighbourhoods. In Denmark ethnic minorities to a great extent has been concentrated in social housing, partly because of discrimination in private housing (Skifter Andersen 2006). They have fewer opportunities on the housing market than Danes. It is thus expected that ethnic minorities be less inclined to move.

c) **Housing situation**: Housing quality, housing space and housing type. Families in smaller dwellings and lacking modern facilities will more often have a wish to change their residence. When they have decided to do so they will also be more critical to the neighbourhood and look for other locations. It is a frequent wish among Danes to live in owner-occupied detached housing, for which reason residents in blocks of flats and in social housing could be more inclined to move

d) **Social relations in and affiliation to** the neighbourhood. We expect that residents with close social ties to family and friends in the neighbourhood more seldom have plans to move. We also expect that residents that have been living in the neighbourhood for longer time more seldom plan to move.

e) **Reputation and social status** of the neighbourhood. When residents thinks that their neighbourhood has got a very poor reputation it will be embarrassing for them to tell other people where they are living and there are examples that people living in such areas have difficulties in getting bank credits and get insurance. A poor reputation will therefore increase residents plans to move

f) **Dissatisfaction with area conditions**: Dissatisfaction with conditions like social problems and safety, social life and activities, physical appearance and nuisances. We expect that dissatisfaction with visible and embarrassing social problems and especially crime and safety will be very important factors. Dissatisfaction with physical nuisances could also be important in severe cases. Physical decay that signals a social comedown could be important. Aesthetic properties of buildings, streets and squares are important to some people, not to other. Also dissatisfaction with social life and activities is expected to have a smaller importance for plans to move.

4. Data from the evaluation of area-based initiatives in 12 Danish deprived neighbourhoods

As a part of an evaluation (Skifter Andersen and Kielgast 2003) of a special Danish area regeneration programme, called "Kvarterloeft", data was collected in 12 Danish neighbourhoods that participated in the programme. In the first part of the programme that ran from 1997 to 2003 seven neighbourhoods were involved, while the second part consisted of five other urban areas. In Table 1 is shown some characteristics of the neighbourhoods.

(Table 1. Characteristics of the 12 neighbourhoods studied)

As can be seen from the table many different kinds of neighbourhoods were included in cities of different size. Seven are located in the Greater Copenhagen Area, five in smaller and middle-sized cities in the provinces. Four areas are located quite near the city centre, four in the suburbs and four in between in Copenhagen City. Most of the areas have from 5.000 to 16.000 residents. Also the degree of deprivation differs much between the neighbourhoods. Though, in general Danish neighbourhoods have not reached the same extent of deprivation as has been seen in many other European countries.

As part of the evaluation of the first seven neighbourhoods, data was collected both at the start of the regeneration in 1998 and at the end in 2002. The data consists of both interviews with residents on their evaluation of different conditions and problems in the neighbourhood and on their plans to move or stay, and data from public registers on the interviewed persons and on the whole neighbourhood. For the areas in the second phase the same kind of data was collected at the beginning of the initiatives in 2002. For each of the three data sets 1800 residents was selected and about 1000 participated in the interviews. Thus, in total about 3.000 respondents are included in the data.

Residents were asked if they planned to move away within two years. Respondents who planned to move were asked about the reasons divided into the following reasons: 1. Housing, 2. Neighbourhood and 3.Forced moves. The respondents who planned to stay were asked for what reasons divided into housing and neighbourhood. Moreover, residents were asked for reasons why they moved to the neighbourhood.
The conditions in the neighbourhood evaluated by the residents were:

1. *Physical conditions*: Aesthetic appearance of buildings, streets and squares, Lack of green areas, Complaints over traffic and noise, Complaints over dirt, litter, physical decay and graffiti
2. *Social problems and safety*: People that behave badly, People drinking in the streets, Drug users, Theft and burglary, Vandalism, Violence and street fights, Domestic disturbances and noise from neighbours, Feeling of safety
3. *Social relations and affiliations:* General relations to other residents, Engagement in local activities, Moved to area because of having friends and relatives there, Will stay in area because of social relations and engagement

4. *Social life, activities and services:* Public institutions, Meeting places and haunts, Social life and activities, Feeling of community spirit in the neighbourhood

The residents were also asked to give their evaluation of the reputation of the neighbourhood. People that thought it to be bad or not very good were asked to give the main reason for this.

Data from public registers provided information on housing, demographic variables, income, welfare payments, employment, education and ethnic origin for every resident in the neighbourhoods and for the respondents in the survey.

4.1 Statistical method
The statistical method used in the study is logistic regression where the dependent variable is logic - either true or false. The results of the analyses are shown as odds ratios, which indicate the relative increase in the probability that the dependent variable is true when an independent variable is increased by one unit. Odds ratios above 1 indicate a positive influence of the independent variable while odds ratios below 1 points to a negative connection. The size of the odds ratios can only be compared for independent variables having comparable units. This means that they can only be compared in the tables for logic variables only having the value 0 and 1. Only statistical significant results are shown. The predictive efficiency of the found regressions models is measured by the per cent of cases where the model has predicted the right outcome of the dependent variable and by Nagelkerke R^2.

5. Explaining causes of poor reputation

In the survey respondents were asked about their opinion on, whether the neighbourhood had a good or poor reputation and the reasons for a possible poor reputation. In Table 2 are shown the average answers for all three data sets.

(*Table 2. Residents' evaluation of the reputation of the 12 Danish neighbourhoods, and of the reasons for poor reputation (per cent).*)

The answers on reputation in this survey can be interpreted as what above is called 'The self-reflecting image' - the image residents think is common among people not living in their neighbourhood. In average half of the residents think their neighbourhood has a bad or not so good reputation. This covers great differences between averages in the areas from 12 to 77 per cent. As can be seen social problems in the neighbourhoods are the most common mentioned reason for poor reputation, while physical problems and appearance does not have much importance. In some areas a bad press sometimes is mentioned as a cause of poor reputation.

We expect that poor reputation have a connection with dissatisfaction with social problems and lack of safety, but it is also possible - as shown in Table 2 - that complaints over physical nuisances in some cases can be a reason for a negative image.

(*Table 3. Odds ratios for variables explaining differences in residents' evaluations of the reputation of their neighbourhood and the reasons for poor reputation.*)

The regression analyses look at the connection between residents' evaluations of the reputation and their evaluations of different conditions in the neighbourhood. In the first analysis the dependent variable is, if the respondent thinks that the reputation is either bad or not so good. In the two following analyses we look for explanations of why residents think that either social or physical problems are reasons for poor reputation. The used dependent variables are:

– The reputation of the neighbourhood is evaluated as bad or not very good
– Social problems are seen as the main reasons
– Physical nuisances are seen as the main reasons

As independent variables was used the above described perceptions of conditions and problems in the neighbourhood. Moreover have been used data on the responding residents and their housing situation. Finally data on length of residence and personal affiliation to the area are included.

The results of the logistic regressions are shown in Table 3. It can be seen from the table (Nagelkerke R2) that the explanatory power of these models is neither very good nor very bad.

5.1 Importance of personal background and housing variables
From the results of the regressions it can be concluded that residents perceiving a bad image is more common among more resourceful residents. Residents with longer education and who are in employment are more likely to perceive a poor reputation. There is also – as other studies have shown – an age effect, but it is not linear. The oldest and the youngest do not believe in a poor image, while the age group from 30 to 65 do. Ethnic minorities are more positive in their evaluation of the image than Danes.

Residents with a negative image of the neighbourhood can be assumed also to be dissatisfied with their housing situation, because they are more often living in dwellings with less housing space pr. person and in social housing. This is also in agreement with other studies.

Against our expectations, length of residence and affiliations to the neighbourhood (families and friends etc.) do not tend to produce a less negative perception of reputation.

5.2 Importance of neighbourhood satisfaction
The results show that negative evaluations of conditions in the neighbourhood are important for poor reputation in the following order:

1. Bothered by people who behave badly
2. Bothered by violence and street fights
3. Ugly buildings, streets and squares
4. Bothered by vandalism
5. Bothered by drug addicts
6. Dissatisfied with social life
7. Bothered by domestic disturbances
8. Dirt, physical decay and graffiti
9. Negative feeling of safety

As expected dissatisfaction with antisocial behaviour is very important in explaining bad reputation, but it can be seen that also physical problems have importance. If social problems have been stated as the reason for poor reputation (second column) complaints over violence, peoples' behaviour, drug addicts and negative feeling of safety has a greater importance. If physical reasons are stated as reason social problems are not at all significant, but ugly buildings etc. and physical nuisances have great importance.

The evaluation of quality of local public institutions also influences residents' opinion on the reputation of the neighbourhood. It can be assumed that this especially relates to the schools.

There are some differences between residents explaining bad reputation as a result of social problems compared with those putting weight on physical problems. Residents that put weight on social problems are more often Danes, in employment, less than 65 years old and – somewhat surprisingly – without children. Physical problems as cause of bad reputation are most often stated by men, families with children, elderly and young people.

6. Explanations for plans to move from the neighbourhood

Table 4 shows the average answers from all the neighbourhoods concerning if respondents planned to leave the neighbourhood within the next two years and the most important cause for doing so.

(*Table 4. Share of residents (per cent) that planned to move away from the neighbourhood within two years and their causes for moving.*)

In average 27 per cent of the respondents planned to move away from their neighbourhood within two years. This is not much taking in consideration that in average 17 per cent of the Danish population changes residence every year, but perhaps some of the respondents, who not wanted to leave the area, wanted to move inside the neighbourhood.

It is seen from the table that 27 per cent of the potential movers wants to leave the area because of lack of suitable dwellings in the neighbourhood - it could be detached or semidetached houses, which are uncommon in these neighbourhoods. Other 19 per cent are also not dissatisfied with the area but just want to live in another kind of neighbourhood. Only 25 per cent want to leave because of a general dissatisfaction with the neighbourhood. Moreover, 17 per cent want to leave because of either bad schools or bad conditions for children.

In the following regression analyses we have looked at what factors can explain the wish to move, if the reason is dissatisfaction with the neighbourhood, and if there are differences between different groups of residents. The dependent variables are:

– Plans to move – all residents
– Plans to move because of dissatisfaction with neighbourhood – all residents
– Plans to move among employed residents
– Plans to move among families with children
– Plans to move among ethnic minorities

The independent variables can be divided into:
– *General mobility factors*: age, couples? children?, number of years since moving in
– Other *individual characteristics*: Women?, ethnic minorities?, income, length of education
– *Housing situation*: Social housing?, owner-occupied?, housing space per person, lacking facilities (like bath and central heating)?, blocks of flats?
– *Social relations* to the area: Have affiliations to family or friends in the neighbourhood?, have good relations to neighbours?
– Bad or not so good *reputation*?
– Complaints over social problems, crime, safety and social life
– Complaints over physical nuisances

The results of the logistic regression analyses are shown in Table 5. Especially the first model is relatively good at explaining the variation in plans to move.

(*Table 5. Odds ratios for variables explaining variations in plans to move away from the neighbourhood within two years*)

It can be seen from the table that background factors like age, education and housing situation, as expected, are important for plans to move. The model also shows that perception of poor reputation and dissatisfaction with some conditions in the neighbourhood have a quite significant importance. Moreover, affiliations to family and friends in the neighbourhood and relations to other residents have great importance.
    In the following we discuss to what extent the results confirm our hypotheses formulated above.

Individual mobility factors
Plans to move decrease, as expected, very significantly with age.

Opportunities on the housing market.
This hypothesis is confirmed by the result that higher education promotes moving plans - especially when caused by dissatisfaction with the neighbourhood. Income is not significant. Ethnic minorities, who in general have fewer opportunities on the housing market, do not, however, significantly differ from the Danes in their plans to move.

Housing situation.
As expected housing conditions are important. Residents with less housing space tend more often to have plans to move away from the neighbourhood. As expected owner-occupiers more often plan to stay. In social housing plans to move are more frequent and very significantly because of dissatisfaction with the neighbourhood. Fewer people somewhat unexpectedly want to move away from blocks of flats. This can, however, be explained by interaction between this variable and the variables on living in social housing or owner-occupied housing. If these two variables are omitted from the model, the variable on living in blocks of flats will be insignificant.

Social relations in and affiliation to the neighbourhood.
Affiliation to the neighbourhood (family and friends) and good relations to neighbours very significantly reduce plans to move.

Reputation of the neighbourhood.

Poor reputation is very significantly correlated with plans to move. More than 70 per cent of the residents, which planned to move, also thought that the neighbourhood had a bad or not so good reputation, while only 45 per cent of those, who planned to stay, did.

Dissatisfaction with area conditions
A general problem with some of these results is that some of the variables are correlated with poor image as shown above.

Dissatisfaction with different social problems has great importance for plans to move while dissatisfaction with crime – somewhat unexpectedly - only play a minor role in these neighbourhoods, but this result could also be caused by strong interaction with the variable bad reputation. The most significant variables are dissatisfaction with domestic disturbances, drug addicts, people that behave badly and vandalism.

Dissatisfaction with violence has the wrong sign, which also could be a result of a strong correlation between this variable and poor reputation. Correlation with other variables is also an explanation of why the feeling of safety does not seem to have importance. If the analyses are conducted without the variables on crime and on reputation, negative feeling of safety comes out with a significant odds ratio of 1,262.

The most important dissatisfaction with physical nuisance is dirt, physical decay and graffiti, but there is also some significance of traffic and noise and of lack of green areas. Dissatisfaction with the aesthetic appearance has not significant importance. Nor have dissatisfaction with social life, but public institutions have.

Moving plans because of *general dissatisfaction with the neighbourhood* are more common among singles and among families with children. It is more seldom found among the residents that have been for a longer time in the neighbourhood. This reason for moving is mostly found in social housing and is even more often connected to a perception of the neighbourhood as having a bad image. Affiliations to the neighbourhood reduce this reason for plans to move but not as much as for all reasons. Dissatisfactions with social problems like drug addicts, domestic disturbances and people that behave badly are all more important factors connected to this reason, but also lack of green areas are.

6.1 Causes for plans to move among different groups of residents
The reasons for having plans to move are not the same for different groups of residents. This can be seen from table 5 that shows the results of three different regression analyses for respondents respectively 1. In employment, 2. Ethnic minorities and 3. Families with children.

There are some marked differences between the results for people *in employment* and the results for all respondents shown in Table 5. Among residents in employment people with higher education are somewhat more likely to move away. And plans to move to a greater extent decrease with age. Moreover, the duration of residence comes in as a significant factor.

Employed residents living in social housing tend to be relatively more determined to move, while it does not have any significance if they live in owner-occupied housing or blocks of flats. Affiliation to the neighbourhood (family and friends) to a greater extent reduces mobility for this group while good relations to neighbours have less importance. Dissatisfaction with reputation is a significant reason for plans to move, but not to the same extent as for all respondents. Some complaints over physical and social nuisances do not have significant importance. That applies to traffic and noise, people that behave badly and violence. But instead the feeling of safety in general has more importance. Moreover, complaints over dirt, physical decay etc., lack of green areas and vandalism have more importance for employed people than in general. They seem to be more concerned with the maintenance of the physical environment.

Ethnic minorities is a very diverse group and make up only 12 per cent of the respondents, which is a somewhat lower percentage than their share of the total population in the areas. It is a general experience that it is more difficult to get these groups to participate in surveys, partly because of language problems. In this study ethnic minorities have reasons for moving, which are quite different from Danes. The only important housing reason is lacking facilities. It is surprising that housing space is not a significant factor since it is well known that ethnic minorities in Denmark have much less housing space than Danes. Affiliations to the area (family and friends) and especially good relations to neighbours are very important factors explaining wishes to stay in the neighbourhood. This is in accordance with other studies of housing choices of ethnic minorities (Skifter Andersen 2006). Ethnic minorities seem to be even more sensitive to bad reputation than Danes. Important complaints are traffic and noise and people that behave badly, while lack of green areas, physical decay and vandalism do not seem to have significant importance.

Families with children is the last group examined in Table 5. Education and age have a greater effect on plans to move in this group than for all respondents. Housing conditions are not significant except for owner-

occupation, which to a greater extent reduces potential mobility than for other residents. Also affiliation to the neighbourhood and good social relations to neighbours has a stronger effect in reducing mobility than for all residents. Complaints over physical problems are not significant, while bad reputation and some social problems have a stronger effect - the significant variables are vandalism, domestic disturbances and drug addicts.

8. Conclusions

An important objective for area based regeneration of deprived urban neighbourhoods is to reduce the flow of people leaving the neighbourhoods to reduce the risk of empty dwellings, to avoid social instability and to stop a development where socially well functioning residents are replaced by more residents with social problems. It is therefore important to gain knowledge on causes that increase residents' intentions to move away. Especially, it is important to uncover causes relevant to the kinds of resident one wish to keep in the neighbourhood.

Two main questions has been examined in this study:

1. What are the main reasons for why residents in deprived neighbourhoods think that it has a poor reputation among outsiders – especially the connection between dissatisfaction with are conditions and perceived poor reputation?
2. What determines if residents have plans to move away - especially the importance of their evaluation of reputation of their neighbourhood and of different conditions in the neighbourhood? What is the importance of tenure and affiliation to the area?

8.1 What determines poor reputation?
While satisfaction with a neighbourhood refers to the residents' own evaluation, the reputation of a neighbourhood refers to what the residents think is a common evaluation among outsiders. Reputation is much about the social status of a neighbourhood. This is also shown here to be the case in deprived neighbourhoods since one third of the respondents and two thirds of those, who think there is a poor reputation, emphasises social problems as the main cause. Only a minority pointed to bad press as a main cause.

It is also shown that negative evaluations of conditions in a deprived neighbourhood are very important for residents' perception of reputation. Complaints over crime, safety and antisocial behaviour have most importance, but physical appearance and physical nuisances also count. It is therefore probable that residents' own experience of social visible problems and anti-social behaviour in the area make them believe that it has a poor reputation among outsiders. The evaluation of local public institutions also influences residents' opinion on the reputation of the neighbourhood. It can be assumed that this especially relates to the schools.

It has been found in earlier research that length of stay and affiliation to the neighbourhood has importance for residents' satisfaction with their neighbourhood. It was expected that these factors also would reduce complaints over poor reputation. But this does not seem to be the case. The analyses showed that length of stay and affiliation to the neighbourhood did not have a separate influence on the perception of reputation.

Respondents of a negative reputation can also be assumed to be dissatisfied with their housing situation, because they more often live in dwellings with less housing space pr. person. They are also more often live in social housing or in detached housing.

Complaints over poor reputation are more often found among the groups of residents one often wants to keep back in deprived neighbourhoods: residents between 30 and 65 years, in employment or with longer education. Ethnic minorities very seldom find that their (deprived) neighbourhood has a poor reputation.

8.2 What determines plans to move away from the neighbourhood?
In other studies of mobility it has been shown that dissatisfaction with the neighbourhood only has a small importance for plans to move. In this study of deprived neighbourhoods a considerable share of residents (40 %), who want to move away, give dissatisfaction with the area or the conditions for children as the most important reason.

Perception of the area as having a poor reputation among outsiders is the most important reason for plans to move away. It can thus be assumed that perceived low personal status by living in deprived neighbourhoods is a very important reason for leaving the areas. Antisocial behaviour in the neighbourhood also – as expected – has a very strong influence on wishes to move away. Physical nuisances like too much

traffic and noise has some importance, but especially important are dirt, graffiti and run-down buildings and free spaces. These circumstances can be seen as physical signs of social decay.

Length of residence is shown to be a factor that reduces plans to move as has been shown in other mobility studies. What is of special interest her is that even when compensated for length of residence the study shows that affiliation to the neighbourhood and especially good relations to neighbours very significantly reduces plans to move. In this way the study confirms other research that social relations and social capital in ordinary neighbourhoods also have great importance in deprived neighbourhoods.

Furthermore tenure also has a special importance in deprived neighbourhoods – as it has been shown in studies of ordinary neighbourhoods - as homeowners, all other things being equal, tend to be less inclined to move. On the other side tenants in social housing more often wants to move.

This general pattern of factors explaining plans to move for all residents is different for different groups of residents. For residents in employment it does not have any significance if they live in owner-occupied housing or blocks of flats. Affiliation to the neighbourhood means more to this group while good relations to neighbours have less importance. The feeling of safety in general has more importance. Moreover, complaints over dirt, physical decay etc., lack of green areas and vandalism have more importance for employed people. They seem to be more concerned with the physical environment.

Families with children are more inclined to move from deprived neighbourhoods - especially if they have higher education. Poor reputation and some social problems have a stronger effect on plans to move - the significant variables are vandalism, domestic disturbances and drug addicts. Only families that are homeowners want more often to stay. Also affiliation to the neighbourhood and good social relations to neighbours has a stronger effect for families in reducing mobility.

8.3 Consequences for the design of area based regeneration in deprived neighbourhoods
In this study some factors explaining if residents plan to move away from deprived neighburoodst or stay have been uncovered. We know from other studies (Kearns and Parkes 2003) that planned moves not always result in actual moves. It has also been revealed that reasons for actual moves are not quite the same as reasons for planned moves and that dissatisfaction with area conditions plays a minor role in actual moves. These studies have, however, been conducted in ordinary neighbourhoods were social problems, safety and physical nuisances are much smaller problems. This study has shown that in deprived neighbourhoods it must be expected that dissatisfaction with area conditions is much more important for actual moves and that factors explaining plans to move also will have influence on actual moves.

It must also be remembered that the social development of a neighbourhood is not only determined by people moving away but just as much by the social composition of newcomers. An earlier study in deprived social housing estates (Skifter Andersen 2002a) indicates that the factors influencing the composition of newcomers are not the same as the determinants of why residents are moving away from the neighbourhoods.

From this study it is still, however, possible to draw some conclusions on what could be important for preventing a further negative social development of deprived neighbourhoods, based on the produced knowledge on why different kinds of residents want to move out of the areas.

Essential causes of dissatisfaction in deprived neighbourhoods are visible social problems and crime, which causes feelings of insecurity among residents. Area based initiatives should therefore first of all take action against these problems. From Denmark there are good experiences with activities and job programs for youngsters doing criminal acts. Also drop-in centres for offenders, drug addicts and alcoholics has been good measures to stabilise their problems and make them less visible and troublesome to other residents.

Dissatisfaction with physical conditions in general has not as much importance for moves out of the areas. It could, however, have an influence on newcomers. But physical nuisances that mirror social problems - like vandalism, bad maintenance, litter, and graffiti - has importance because they are the visible signs of social decay. Good outdoor maintenance and fight against such appearances are thus important tasks in area based initiatives.

For families with children problems in local schools could be an important reason for moving away. It is important to tackle such problems.

Residents' perception of the reputation and social status of the neighbourhood also seem to be important for moving. These perceptions vary much among residents and are created on the basis of feelings and more or less on accidental experiences. They are very much subject to influence. A strategy for area regeneration could therefore be to try to change residents' (and potential newcomers) image of the neighbourhood. Not only by reducing the problems that are the roots of a poor reputation but also by giving information with a more just picture, and by conscious building up a better image.

The shown very significant importance of social ties for stability in the neighbourhood points to that area based initiatives also should be concerned with social capital. Support of social activities that creates social networks and establishment of meeting places and facilities for this are thus important measures.

The study show, that owner-occupation in general reduces plans to move from the neighbourhoods. The question is if this can be accepted as an argument for establishing mixed tenure areas by transforming social housing to owner-occupied dwellings. It is, however, only for the groups without work that homeownership has importance for plans to move, while it is insignificant for residents in employment. So it does not seem to be of importance for the groups one is most interested in keeping back. Moreover other studies (Atkinson and Kintrea 1998, Beekman et. al 2001) show that the social coherence is weaker in mixed tenure neighbourhoods. The most important advantage by mixed tenures could be a change in the general image and poor reputation of neighbourhoods (Cole and Shayer 1998).

References

Atkinson, R. and K. Kintrea (1998) *Reconnecting Excluded Communities: The Neighbourhood Impacts of Owner Occupation.* Research Report 61. Edingburgh: Scottish Homes.

Basolo, V, and D. Strong (2002) Understanding the Neighborhood: From Residents' Perception and Needs to Action. *Housing Policy Debate* 13, iss. 1, 83 - 105.

Beekman, T, F. Lyons, & J. Scott (2001) *Improving the Understanding of the Influence of Owner-occupiers in Mixed Tenure Neighbourhoods.* Report 89. Edingburgh: Scottish Homes.

Burrows R. and D. Rhodes (1999): *Unpopular Places? Area disadvantage and the geography of misery in England*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Carp, F, Zawadski, R. and Shokron, H. (1976) Dimensions of Urban Environmental Quality. *Environment and Behaviour*, 8: 239-265.

Clark, W. A. V and Ledwith, V. (2005). Mobility, *Housing Stress and Neighbourhood Contexts: Evidence form Los Angeles.* California Center for Population Research. On-line Working Paper Series.

Cole, I and S. Shayer (1998). Tenure Mix as Social Fix? Community Diversity and Social Networks on Mixed Housing Estates. *Paper to ENHR conference, Cardiff 7-11. September 1998*.

Costa Pinho, T. (2000): Residential contexts of social exclusion: Images and identities, *Paper for ENHR Conference, Gävle 2000*.

Dekker, K., Musterd, S. and van Kempen, R. (2007) Explaining differentials in housing and neighbourhood satisfaction in post-WWII large housing estates in European cities. *Paper for ENHR Conference 2007, Rotterdam*.

Feijten, P. and van Ham, M. (2007) Neighbourhood change .. reason to leave?. *Paper for ENHR Conference 2007, Rotterdam.*

Franscescato, G., S. Wiedemann and J. R. Anderson (1987) Residential Satisfaction. In Vliet, W. van (et al.) (eds) *Housing and Neighbourhoods. Theoretical and Empirical contributions*, pp 43-58. New York/London: Greenwood Press.

Frierdrichs, J. and Blasius, J (2006) Attitudes of Owners and Renters in a Deprived Neighbourhood. *Paper to ENHR conference 2006 in Ljubljana.*

Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the theory of structuration.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Galster, G., C. Hayes and J. Johnston (2002). *Identifying Robust, Parsimonious Indicators of Neighborhood quality of Life.* Wayne State University.

De Groot, C., Manting, D. and Mulder, C. H. (2007) Intentions to move and actual moving behaviour in the Netherlands. *Paper for ENHR Conference 2007, Rotterdam.*

Johnston, R. J. (1973). Spatial patterns in suburban evaluations. *Environment and Planning A*, 5: 385-395.

Kasarda, J. D. and M. Janowitch (1974). Community attachment in mass society. *American Sociological Review*, 39, 328-339.

Kearns, A. and A. Parkes (2003). Living in and Leaving Poor Neighbourhood Conditions in England. *Housing Studies* vol 18, no. 6: 827-852

Knox, P. (1995): *Urban Social Geography*. London: Longman.

Koopman, M. J. (2007) Looking from the inside out or from the outside in: Differences and associations between neighbourhood push and pull. *Paper for ENHR Conference 2007, Rotterdam.*

Lee, B. A., Oreposa, R. S. and Kanan, J. W. (1994) Neighbourhood context and residential mobility, *Demography*, 31(2): 249-270.

Lu, M. (1998) Analyzing migration decision making: relationship between residential satisfaction , mobility intentions and moving behaviour. *Environment and Planning* A 30: 1473-1495.

Lu, M. (1999). Determinants of residential satisfaction. *Growth and Change*, 30, pp. 264-287.

Massey, D. (1995). The conceptualisation of space. In D. Massey and P. Jess (eds.), *A place in the world*. Oxford: University Press.

McHugh, K., Gober, P. and Resid, N. (2005) Determinants of Short and Long Term Mobility Expectations for Home Owners and Renters. *Demography 27: 81-95.*

Parkes, A., A. Kearns and R. Atkinson (2002). What Makes People Dissatisfied with their Neighbourhoods? *Urban Studies* Vol 39, no. 13: 2413-2438.

Permentier, M., van Ham, M. and Bolt, G. (2007) *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment (forthcoming).*

Rijpers, B. and Smeets, J. (1998) Haousing Challenge: Mangaing neighbourhoods image. *Paper to ENHR conference, Cardiff 7-11. September 1998.*

Rossi, P. H. (1955). *Why families move*. Illinois: The Free Press.

Speare, A. J, S. Goldstein and W. H. Frey (1974). *Residential Mobility, Migration and Metropolitan Change.* Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Skifter Andersen, H. (1999). *Virkningerne af Byudvalgets indsats i almene boligafdelinger 1994-97* (Effects of area-based initiatives on social housing estates in Danmark). SBI-report 321, Horsholm: Danish Building and Urban Research.

Skifter Andersen H. (2002a). Excluded places. On the Interaction between Segregation, Urban Decay and Deprived Neighbourhoods. *Housing, Theory and Society*; 19: 153-169

Skifter Andersen H. (2002b). Can Deprived Housing Areas be revitalised? Efforts against Segregation and Neighbourhood decay in Denmark and Europe. *Urban Studies* vol. 39, no. 4.

Skifter Andersen H. (2003). *Urban Sores. On the interaction between segregation, urban decay and deprived neighbourhoods.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Skifter Andersen, H. (2004). Residents' Understanding of Deprived Urban Neighbourhoods and its Significance for Plans to Move. *Paper to ENHR conference in Cambridge 2004.*

Skifter Andersen, H. (2006). Moving to and from enclaves. Housing choices of ethnic minorities in Denmark. *Paper to workshop on Minority Ethnic Groups and Housing: Perceptions and Perspectives, ENHR conference in Ljubliana, 2-5 July 2006.*

Ærø, T. (2001). *Boligpræferencer, boligvalg og livsstil* (Housing preferences, choice of dwelling and lifestyle). PdD. Thesis. Horsholm: Danish Building and Urban Research.

Ærø, T. (2004). Forebyggelse af normbrud og konflikter i boligområder (Prevention of violation of norms and conflicts in housing areas). In Skifter Andersen, H. and Andersen H. T. *Den mangfoldige by.* Horsholdm: Danish Building Research Institute.

Table 1. Characteristics of the 12 neighbourhoods studied

Name of neighbourhood	Name and size of city - no. of inhabitants	Location of area and year of construction	Size of area, no. of inhab.	Degree of deprivation
First phase 1997-2003				
Femkanten	Copenhagen, 1.7 mill	Outer parts of older city, 1920-40	6.500	Higher
Kgs. Enghave	Copenhagen, 1.7 mill	Outer parts of older city, 1920-40	13.500	Middle
Hombladsgade	Copenhagen, 1.7 mill	Near centre, before 1920	16.300	Lower
Avedøre Stationsby	Copenhagen, 1.7 mill	Suburb, 1970ties	5.900	Middle
Sydvestkvarteret	Kolding, 63.000	Near centre, mixed	5.400	Lower
Tøjhushaven	Randers, 63.000	Near centre, before 1920	1.000	Lower
Aalborg Øst	Aalborg, 163.000	Suburb, mixed, 1960- 70	14.500	Middle
Second phase 2001-2008				
Nordvestkvarteret	Copenhagen, 1.7 mill	Outer parts of older city, 1920-40	15.000	Middle
Nørrebro Park	Copenhagen, 1.7 mill	Outer parts of older city, 1900-20	16.000	Middle
Brøndby Strand	Copenhagen, 1.7 mill	Suburb, 1970ties	11.000	Lower
Vollsmose	Odense, 184.000	Suburb, 1970ties	10.000	Higher
Vestbyen	Horsens, 58.000	Near centre, before 1920	3.500	Lower

Table 2. Residents' evaluation of the reputation of the 12 Danish neighbourhoods, and of the reasons for poor reputation (per cent).

The reputation of the neighbourhood is:		Main cause for not very good or poor reputation is:	
Very good	12	Social problems	75
Reasonably good	35	Area is bleak and ugly	6
Not very good	29	Too much noise and pollution	1
Bad	20	Bad press	14
Don't know	4	Other	4
All	100	All not very good or poor reputation	100

Table 3. Odds ratios for variables explaining differences in residents' evaluations of the reputation of their neighbourhood and the reasons for poor reputation (Only variables included in the found statistical model have values).

	Reputation bad or not very good	Reason for poor reputation is social problems	Reason for poor reputation is physical problems
Average dissatisfied in area %	1,039	1,042	1,271
Income in 100.000 DKK			
Without work?	0,598	0,737	
Length of education	1,009		
Woman?			0,635
Have children?		0,793	1,940
Age over 65?	0,614	0,556	2,527
Age 18-30 years?	0,685		2,232
Couple?			
Ethnic minority?	0,330	0,458	
Number of years since moving in			
Housing space	0,993	0,993	
Lacking facilities?			0,496
Block of flats?	0,734	0,678	
Social housing?	*1,195		
Have affiliation to area?			
Good public institutions?	0,649	0,763	0,340
Ugly buildings, streets and squares?	1,438	1,273	4,468
Too much traffic and noise?			2,055
Dirt, physical decay and graffiti?	1,252		
People behave badly?	1,712	1,822	
Dissatisfied with social life?	1,306		1,920
Negative feeling of safety?	1,238	1,335	
Bothered by vandalism?	1,315	1,254	
Bothered by violence?	1,576	1,828	
Bothered by domestic disturbances?	*1,230	1,294	
Bothered by drug addicts?	1,316	1,576	
-2 Log likelihood	2830	2749	527
Chi-square	581	504	130
Nagelkerke R2	0,302	0,252	0,221

*) Significance between 0,05 and 0,10. All others below 0,05

Table 4. Share of residents (per cent) that planned to move away from the neighbourhood within two years and their causes for moving (Only variables included in the found statistical model have values).

	Share of all residents	Share of potential movers
Plans to move	27	100
Causes for moving		
Cannot find suitable dwelling in neighbourhood	7,3	27
Have to move away because of new job etc.	1,7	6
Rent is too high	1,7	6
Want to move children to new school	1,4	5
Not good for children to live here	3,2	12
Not dissatisfied with neighbourhood but want another	5,2	19
Is in general dissatisfied with neighbourhood	6,8	25

Table 5. Odds ratios for variables explaining variations in plans to move away from the neighbourhood within two yearsand the reasons for doing so.

	All house-holds	Reason for moving is dissatis-faction with area	Em-ployed	Ethnic minorities	Families w. children
Income in 100.000 DKK					
Without work?			-		
Length of education	1.010	1,016	1,015		1,014
Woman?					
Have children?		*1,455			-
Age	0,952		0,964	0,968	0,946
Couple?		0,658			
Ethnic minority?				-	
Number of years since moving in		0,955	*0,978	*0,935	
Housing space	0,99		0,983		
Lacking facilities?				*3,147	
Block of flats?	0,679				
Social housing?	*1,246	1,769	1,483		
Owner-occupied	0,516				0,283
Have affiliation to area?	0,725		0,668	*0,551	0,597
Have good relations to neighbours?	0,397	0,508	0,503	0,170	0,355
Thinks area has a poor reputation	1,628	2,927	1,527	2,521	2,147
Good public institutions?	0,792		0,706	*0,567	
Ugly buildings, streets and squares?					
Too much traffic and noise?	*1,214			3,617	
Dirt, physical decay and graffiti?	1,312		1,584		
Lack of green areas?	*1,247	1,630	1,35		
People behave badly?	1,363	1,446		*1,855	
Dissatisfied with social life?					
Negative feeling of safety?		*1,365	1,332		
Bothered by people drinking?					
Bothered by theft and burglary?					
Bothered by vandalism?	1,356		1,389		1,914
Bothered by violence	*0,756			0,352	0,55
Bothered by domestic disturbances?	1,419	*1,425	1,481		*1,529
Bothered by drug addicts?	1,363	1,835	*1,353		1,837
-2 Log likelihood	2324	502	1264	269	435
Chi-square	541	120	263	84	126
Nagelkerke R2	0,275	0,177	0,257	0,376	0,248

*) Significance between 0,05 and 0,10. All others below 0,05