



Viewpoint

Comparing deconcentrating poverty policies in the United States and the Netherlands: A critical reply to Stal and Zuberi [☆]

Manuel B. Aalbers, Wouter P.C. van Gent ^{*}, Fenne M. Pinkster

University of Amsterdam, Department of Geography, Planning and International Development Studies, Nieuwe Prinsengracht 130, 1018 VZ Amsterdam, The Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 13 August 2010

Accepted 17 August 2010

Available online 28 September 2010

Keywords:

Urban renewal

Bijlmermeer

Moving to Opportunity (MTO)

Urban poverty

Neighborhood effects

Comparative urban studies

ABSTRACT

This paper is a critical reply to an article by Stal and Zuberi, in which they compare two policies which deconcentrate poverty in the US and the Netherlands. By drawing lessons from a renewal program in the Netherlands, they suggest several ways to help break the 'cycle of poverty'. We distinguish at least three fundamental flaws in their argument. After discussing these flaws, we discuss renewal in Dutch cities and issues related to displacement and social networks. We conclude with a reflection on the nature of comparative urban research.

© 2010 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Introduction

In a recent article in this journal, [Stal and Zuberi \(2010\)](#) discuss two policy programs targeting areas of concentrated poverty and argue that a multifaceted approach to socio-spatial integration policies can provide significant social benefits to the poor. They base their claim on a comparison of the Moving to Opportunity (MTO) program in the United States and the urban renewal program of the Bijlmermeer in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. In their article, they make several thought-provoking points with regard to the theory of neighborhood effects (pp. 4–5). Also, they make the important point that MTO programs should also focus on those left behind (p. 9).

Nevertheless, there are several problems with their conclusions. We believe that there are at least three fundamental flaws in the comparison made by Stal and Zuberi. First, it is not really clear what the authors try to compare: three types of comparisons seem to be mixed in a rather confusing manner. Second, the comparison of the two programs is problematic because they are entirely different in nature and embedded in different policy contexts, which makes transfer of the urban renewal program to the American context rather difficult. Third, from a Dutch perspective there is insuffi-

cient evidence to support the claim that urban renewal in the Bijlmermeer is a success. After discussing these three flaws, we will discuss some issues related to displacement and social networks. By way of conclusion, we reflect on the nature of comparative urban research.

What is the object of comparison?

Our first problem is with the comparison of different types of policies. Stal and Zuberi have chosen to compare the relocation program MTO in the US to the renewal of the Bijlmermeer in Amsterdam with the objective of evaluating policies and drawing lessons, while making several comments about neighborhood effect studies. Their case selection seems to be based on the condition that both policies seek to deconcentrate poverty.

The renewal of the Bijlmermeer has displaced some of its residents regardless of their income or ethnicity. However, there is no data presented on these dispersed residents. Consequently there is no comparison between those who are dispersed by the MTO program and those who are dispersed by the renewal program of the Bijlmermeer. Furthermore, the authors put a lot of effort into discussing and evaluating the renewal program. However, the Bijlmermeer renewal program tries to accomplish a place-based change in terms of physical appearance and social composition (see [Van Gent, 2010](#)), while the MTO program aims to alter poverty at the individual level. This key difference complicates a comparison of MTO and the Bijlmermeer renewal: both the objectives (i.e. renewal vs. dispersal) and the objects of the policies (i.e. neighborhood vs. individuals) are quite different.

[☆] Stal, G. Y., & Zuberi, D. M. (2010). Ending the cycle of poverty through socio-economic integration: A comparison of moving to opportunity (MTO) in the United States and the Bijlmermeer revival project in the Netherlands. *Cities*, 27 (1), 3–12.

^{*} Corresponding author. Tel.: +31 (0)20 525 2363; fax: +31 (0)20 525 4051.

E-mail addresses: M.B.Aalbers@uva.nl (M.B. Aalbers), W.P.C.vanGent@uva.nl (W.P.C. van Gent), F.M.Pinkster@uva.nl (F.M. Pinkster).

Frankly, it appears somewhat odd to seek learning lessons from a renewal program for a dispersal program – and *vice versa*. In our opinion, it would have made more sense either to compare the renewal of the Bijlmermeer with renewal in the US HOPE VI program, or to compare outcomes of the poor dispersed residents from the renewal with the participants of the MTO program. The former option implies a comparison of renewal policies and their social outcomes, which may lead to statements about neighborhood effects for those who are allowed to remain *in situ*. The latter, comparing dispersed or displaced residents, would make some sense when the objective is to study socio-economic outcomes and possible neighborhood effects of dispersed poor people in two different contexts. The form and objectives of the policy that brought about dispersal would then be less relevant. A third option could have been a comparison of the protest and resistance against the policies – a point brought up several times. However, the authors grossly overstate the involvement of ‘the community in all aspects of the renewal’ (p. 10). Residential involvement was only introduced after protest and could merely make small and ‘cosmetic’ changes to the renewal plan (Aalbers, Van Beckhoven, Van Kempen, Musterd, & Ostendorf 2004; Dukes, 2007; Van Gent, 2008). The presented data to make such assertions are sorely lacking in Stal and Zuberi’s paper.

In sum, it seems to us as if the authors were ambitiously trying to accomplish three different types of comparison (area-based policies, individual outcomes, resident protests) for two different types of research goals (evaluating policy, contributing to debates on neighborhood effects), which has resulted in a rather confusing argument.

Is the Bijlmermeer comparable to disadvantaged neighborhoods in the US?

Our second concern with the comparison is with Stal and Zuberi’s lack of appreciation for the actual importance of differences in urban and institutional contexts. The authors do not really grasp the differences in depth and scale of poverty in Dutch or Western European cities compared to those in the US. Context is extremely important in understanding poverty and social exclusion (Van Kempen, 2001). Several authors have outlined how social and political urban context in Western Europe structure the social differentiation and policy responses thereon (e.g. Häussermann & Haila, 2005; Kazepov, 2005; Le Galès, 2002; Van Kempen & Murie, 2009; Wacquant, 2008). Important elements are the strong influence and support of the interventionist state, the process of welfare state reform, the meaning of ethnicity and immigration, regional variations in economic restructuring after deindustrialization, and the legacy of public-owned, -regulated or -funded housing. These are important factors in explaining both the meaning and mechanisms of poverty neighborhood formation, as well as in understanding policy responses.

Indeed, the Bijlmermeer is a high-poverty neighborhood by Dutch standards. However, anyone studying neighborhoods in the Netherlands should be aware that even in the poorest neighborhoods in the three largest cities, the share of middle-income households outnumbers the share of poor households (Pinkster, 2006). Similar statements cannot be made for US cities. This dissimilarity is extremely relevant when assessing policies which seek to deconcentrate poverty. It raises the point of whether deconcentration has the same meaning, urgency and implication in the Netherlands as it has in the US. Perhaps a US deconcentration policy would be considered successful when it reached the lower levels of poverty concentration that exist in “high” poverty neighborhoods such as the Bijlmermeer. Unfortunately, Stal and Zuberi do not consider this. Rather, by citing mostly the work of

Kruythoff (2003), they continue to equate the Bijlmermeer with US high-poverty neighborhoods (on p. 7). However, Kruythoff’s characterizations of the neighborhood as an “enclave” refers to the Dutch context and should not be taken at face value when doing an international comparative study. Also, the casual assertion that there is a ‘culture of poverty’ (p. 7) is objectionable for its stereotyping (see Wacquant, 2007). Such a statement should at least receive further investigation, contemplation and citation.

So, how disadvantaged is the Bijlmermeer? In the year 2000, about 90% of the housing in the Bijlmermeer consisted of social rented housing.¹ This is a lot, but one should not forget that 55% of all housing in Amsterdam in that year was social housing and that there were many city neighborhoods that consisted of more than 75% social housing. This implies that social housing in Amsterdam is not a residual sector that only houses the poorest residents. Rather, social housing in Amsterdam accommodates the majority of low- and middle-income households as well as some high-income households. This stands in sharp contrast to the situation in the US, where only about 2% of the population lives in social housing (although the numbers are significantly higher in many cities). In the Netherlands, social housing was, and to some extent still is, built for the masses. In the US public housing is, and has always been, a residual sector, only meant to accommodate a small fraction of the lower classes (see e.g. Harloe, 1985), mostly the non-working poor, although in some US cities, part of the working poor do also live in public housing. This implies that an American neighborhood with a large share of public housing, by definition, has a high degree of poverty, while in the Netherlands, neighborhoods with a large share of social housing usually have merely a slight overconcentration of low-income households. Of course, some neighborhoods with a large concentration of social housing are considered the least attractive by local residents and will have a relatively strong concentration of poverty – i.e. relative to other Dutch neighborhoods.

This also explains why, in 2000, 18% of the Bijlmermeer residents were unemployed, compared to 11% for the City of Amsterdam (O+S, 2000). This is a worrisome figure by Dutch standards, but if unemployment rates in public housing dominated neighborhoods were less than twice as high as the city average, this would probably have been considered a success in the US. Or perhaps this would have been considered impossible in the US because public housing would, by its very nature, accommodate a very high share of unemployed residents. In 1999, 40% of the Bijlmermeer residents were considered low- to moderate-income; in the city at large, this was 30%. The Bijlmermeer also accommodated 13% high-income people, while city-wide, this was 20% (Stedelijke Woningdienst, 1999). The average annual disposable income per inhabitant in the Southeast district (65% of which is comprised of the Bijlmermeer) was only slightly lower than in the city at large (respectively 9100 and 10,500 euro), while the average annual disposable income per household was almost equal (19,400 euro for the Southeast district compared to 20,000 euro for the City of Amsterdam) (CBS, 1998), due to the relatively high rate of female participation in the labor market in the Bijlmermeer. In sum, the City of Amsterdam did not really need to deconcentrate poverty in the Bijlmermeer – it was already a mixed-income neighborhood in 2000.

In addition, even though frequently referred to as a ghetto in the Dutch media, the Bijlmermeer is not comparable to the blighted areas characteristic of many American cities. If we look at key publications on US ghettos (e.g. Hannerz, 1969; Jargowsky, 1997; Massey & Denton, 1993; Wilson, 1987), we can see many differences between the Bijlmermeer and its supposed US counterparts:

¹ We have chosen to focus on the data from 1999 and 2000 because these data give a better impression of the Bijlmermeer prior to most of the renewal plans than more recent data.

in the Bijlmermeer there are no absentee landlords; there are no buildings which are completely falling apart; there is no sub-standard housing; there are empty lots only if old housing has been demolished to make way for new construction; there are no bars blocking access to the windows of flats or shops; there are more supermarkets than liquor stores; and cash checking facilities exist along with bank branches. Also, because of the Dutch welfare state tradition, the poor are generally less poor and receive better and more regular health care. In other words, the Bijlmermeer and its residents appear less badly off than their American counterparts (Aalbers, 2011).

Is the Bijlmermeer renewal a success?

In order to support their claim about the success of the Bijlmermeer, the authors refer to a limited number of sources. Based on these, they claim that the Bijlmermeer renewal is a success because residents were included in the planning process, developers hoped it would be a success, and the marketing as a multi-ethnic neighborhood worked well (Stal & Zuberi, 2010, p. 9). However, very few of these papers actually evaluate the renewal plan (only Bodaar, 2006; Bruijne, 2002; Helleman & Wassenberg, 2004). To address this shortcoming, the authors refer to a Dutch study from the City of The Hague from 2003, hypothesizing that the findings can be transferred to the Bijlmermeer (on p. 8). However, this ‘review’ of the Dutch literature refrains from any critical discussion of the findings that are reported and – more importantly – is far from complete, ignoring much of the recent literature. In fact, the success, or lack thereof, of Dutch urban renewal programs is a hot topic of debate amongst Dutch academics.

As mentioned above, unemployment rates in the Bijlmermeer were considerably higher than the city-wide average. Although the City of Amsterdam likes to stress that the situation has improved as a result of the renewal, we should be careful with this conclusion for at least four reasons (Aalbers, Van Beckhoven, Van Kempen, Musterd, & Ostendorf, 2003). First, the decline in unemployment was slightly lower than the city average. Second, there is an increased concentration of unemployment within the Bijlmermeer in the non-renovated high-rise estates. Third, like many other immigrant areas, the Bijlmermeer still accommodates a significant amount of *sans-papiers* (undocumented immigrants), people without a legal residence status in the Netherlands who are therefore not recorded in most city statistics. Most *sans-papiers* are concentrated in the Bijlmermeer’s non-renovated high-rise buildings. Some move from one building to the other and can be considered “revitalization nomads”. Many of them find low-paid and insecure work through informal networks.

Fourth, it is hard to measure the effects of the prospering economy of the 1990s and part of the early 2000s in combination with the physical renewal of the Bijlmermeer. Residents who lived in the estates that were or are now torn down were and are still forced to move, and many move out of the Bijlmermeer. The question is: has the Bijlmermeer renewal “artificially” lowered unemployment levels by “exporting” unemployed individuals and households depending on social benefits to other areas in the city? Based on the available data, it is impossible to answer this question, but what we do see, for example, is that the influx of Bijlmermeer residents in certain parts of Amsterdam-North comes with an increase of individuals depending on unemployment and social benefits (Dignum, 2002). We cannot, however, commit to an empirical fallacy and conclude that the declining unemployment in the Bijlmermeer is a consequence of the outflow of unemployed individuals.

The renewal of the Bijlmermeer appears to be very successful, transforming it from a stigmatized high-rise area with social hous-

ing into a “normalized” low- and mid-rise area, where owner-occupied housing is mixed with social housing. Even though degeneration has been “planned out,” it is not an unqualified success (Aalbers, 2011). The residents complain about the area’s drug users and homeless population. Even though city-wide research shows that the Bijlmermeer is no longer the least popular area of the city and is slowly climbing up to the lower end of the averagely appreciated areas (Van der Veer, Noyon, & Van Trijp, 2004), a resident survey (Aalbers, Musterd, & Ostendorf, 2005) shows that a large share of Bijlmermeer residents is dissatisfied, in particular with the level of drug use, garbage on the streets, crime, and lack of safety. Most residents do acknowledge the improvements made by the renewal initiatives; however, they also find them to be insufficient. Not surprisingly, 22–62% of the Bijlmermeer residents (depending on the estate) want to move within 2 years. These percentages are higher for people who live in the old high-rise units than for people who live in the renovated or new buildings (Aalbers et al., 2005; Van Heerwaarden, Nauta, Rietveld, & Van Soomeren, 2004).

Renewal: displacement, limited social benefits and broken networks

The physical and social transformation of the Bijlmermeer has been quite persuasive and from a territorial point of view, even successful. The neighborhood as a whole is ‘doing better’, which is not surprising considering the fact that the program has radically changed the built environment and social composition. However, does this imply that the ‘socio-spatial reconfiguration’ has worked for everyone? In other words, did all residents benefit socially from the renewal? Residents who moved to the higher priced owner-occupied dwellings appear to be somewhat satisfied (Aalbers et al., 2005), but how about the other residents?

As mentioned above, the renewal restructured the housing market and lowered the amount of low-income housing. This means that not all of the old residents could return to their neighborhoods. Consequently, some level of displacement is unavoidable (see e.g. Bolt, Van Kempen, & Van Weesep, 2009; Kleinhans, 2005; Musterd & Ostendorf, 2005). Research on displacement through urban renewal has shown that as much as 46% of residents prefer to return to the old neighborhood (Slob, Bolt, & Van Kempen, 2008). In the case of the Bijlmermeer, findings indicate that a much smaller share of displaced residents stays in the neighborhood² (Van Paassen, 2008). This is not only related to the 2-year residence criterion mentioned by the authors (p. 8), but also to the fact that demolition often precedes the construction of alternative housing and social housing residents are only allowed to move into the new dwellings if they have not had nuisance complaints or rent arrears. In other words, even if alternative dwellings are available, the “least desirable” renters are excluded. When the most marginalized households are excluded from returning, they tend to end up in “weak” neighborhoods (Bolt et al., 2009; Musterd & Ostendorf, 2005), i.e. other neighborhoods that have relatively high shares of low-income people and that are often considered the least attractive neighborhoods within the city. The position of these displaced households is unlike the MTO participants, who are deliberately placed in “better neighborhoods” (although MTO participants may not be the most marginalized residents either; see Clampet-Lundquist & Massey, 2008). So there is reason to be skeptical about the argument for desegregation through forced dispersal and renewal. Rather, displacement may amount to nothing more than the

² In Amsterdam, of those who were forced to move because of renewal between 2004 and 2006, 31% returned to their own neighborhood and 39% ended up in an adjacent neighborhood; in Bijlmermeer-Oost, about two-thirds ended up outside the area (Van Paassen, 2008).

relocation of individual and neighborhood problems. However, there is still insufficient research about the subsequent employment and educational trajectories.

What about the old residents who have remained in the Bijlmermeer? Perhaps for them, the renewal is experienced as an improvement, mostly as a result of living in better dwellings and the changes in the built environment, but did they also benefit socially from their new middle class neighbors? Even though Dutch renewal policy strives for this (Musterd & Ostendorf, 2008; Van Gent, Musterd, & Ostendorf 2009), research has indicated that there is limited exchange and contacts between groups that share large differences in terms of income, interests or culture – not only in the Netherlands, but also in the US (Blokland, 2002; Cole & Goodchild, 2001; Galster, Andersson, Musterd, & Kauppinen, 2008). Usually, contact and social capital exchange are limited to a few idealistic members of the new middle class (Van der Graaf & Veldboer, 2009). However, the wider social benefits of a middle class presence for marginalized households, as professed by renewal policy, are insufficiently supported by research evidence (see Galster, 2007; Pinkster, 2009).

Lastly, both for those who were forced to move away and those left behind, the radical transformation may even have negative effects when their local support networks have been affected and decimated. As their reluctant middle class neighbors are less likely to help, at least initially, poor households will have fewer network opportunities to find (low-wage) work and help with babysitting, education, dealing with bureaucracies, etc. (e.g. Blokland, 2003; Gans, 1991; Hartman, 1974; Pinkster, 2007; Young & Willmott, 1957).

In sum, the social benefits of urban renewal in the Netherlands are not as obvious as Stal and Zuberi state in their title. Urban renewal is by no means the most effective and reliable way to end the 'cycle of poverty'.

Conclusion

This article sought to correct, amend and add to the claims made in Stal and Zuberi's article. In addition, we would like to make two more general points with regard to comparative urban studies. First, it may seem somewhat obvious, yet it is important to stress the importance of taking context into account when doing comparative research. Social processes and policy interventions are embedded in social context, which generates social outcomes and social change. Thus, understanding social change through policy is only possible when the context is taken into account sufficiently (see Pawson & Tilley, 1997; Rose, 1991). Stal and Zuberi (2010) do recognize the existence of 'differences in socio-economic status, social infrastructure and population densities' (p. 5) and the complications of direct comparison, but argue that they can draw lessons nevertheless. We agree with the suggestion that lessons can be learned. However, the authors merely recite the importance of context and have failed to take the implications into account in their appraisal of the renewal, lamentably leading them to come to conclusions too quickly.

Our second point is related to the previous point but refers to the conduct of research and the treatment of theory. In short, 'some terms do not travel well' (Mollenkopf, 2009, p. 272), implying that concepts used in an American setting may not apply to, or be useful in, a Dutch setting. We have already noted the problematic use of 'poverty', 'urban poverty neighborhoods' (Stal and Zuberi, 2010, p. 10), and 'high-poverty neighborhoods' (ibid, p. 4), when comparing the Bijlmermeer to the US. Similarly, the terms 'ethnic minority population' (p. 5), 'socio-spatial segregation' (p. 7) and 'community' (notably p. 8–9) have a different scale, meaning and application in the Netherlands. For instance, the concentra-

tion of ethnic minorities in neighborhoods is related to different mechanisms in the two countries. In particular, the important differences with regard to the role of the state, the status of public-funded housing, and the meaning of race, 'blackness' and minorities (see Wacquant, 2008), make it almost impossible to use the same concepts in both countries. This is not to say that urban researchers on both sides of the Atlantic should stop talking to each other and go their own way; rather this is a plea to reflect on the use of concepts in international urban comparative research.

References

- Aalbers, M.B. (2011). The revanchist renewal of yesterday's city of tomorrow. *Antipode*, 43, in press.
- Aalbers, M., Musterd, S., & Ostendorf, W. (2005). *Large housing estates in the Netherlands: Opinions and prospects of inhabitants in Amsterdam. Restate report 4e I*. Utrecht: Utrecht University.
- Aalbers, M., Van Beckhoven, E., Van Kempen, R., Musterd, S., & Ostendorf, W. (2003). *Large housing estates in the Netherlands; Overview of developments and problems in Amsterdam and Utrecht*. Utrecht: Utrecht University.
- Aalbers, M., Van Beckhoven, E., Van Kempen, R., Musterd, S., & Ostendorf, W. (2004). *Large housing estates in the Netherlands; policies and practices*. Utrecht: Utrecht University.
- Blokland, T. (2002). Neighbourhood social capital: Does and urban gentry help? Some stories of defining shared interests, collective action and mutual support. *Sociological Research Online*, 7(3). <<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/7/3/blokland.html>>.
- Blokland, T. (2003). *Urban bonds*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bodaar, A. (2006). Multicultural urban space and the cosmopolitan other: The contested revitalization of Amsterdam's Bijlmermeer. In J. Binnie (Ed.), *Cosmopolitan urbanism* (pp. 171–187). New York: Routledge.
- Bolt, G., Van Kempen, R., & Van Weesep, J. (2009). After urban restructuring: Relocations and segregation in Dutch cities. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Social Geografie*, 100(4), 502–518.
- Brujine, D. (2002). *Amsterdam southeast: Centre area southeast and urban renewal in the Bijlmermeer 1992–2010*. Bussum: Thoth.
- CBS (1998). Regionaal Inkomensonderzoek. Voorburg: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek.
- Clampet-Lundquist, S., & Massey, D. S. (2008). Neighborhood effects on economic self-sufficiency: A reconsideration of the moving to opportunity experiment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 114(1), 107–143.
- Cole, I., & Goodchild, B. (2001). Social mix and the 'balanced community' in British housing policy – A tale of two epochs. *GeoJournal*, 51, 351–360.
- Dignum, K. (2002). Doorstroming of verstoping: Dynamiek in De Amsterdamse Bevolking En Woningmarkt. O+S, Amsterdam.
- Dukes, T. (2007). Place, positioning and European urban policy discourse, examples of politics of scale in 'Brussels' and the Netherlands. *Faculteit der Maatschappij- en Gedragswetenschappen*. Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- Galster, G. (2007). Should policy makers strive for neighborhood social mix? An analysis of the western European evidence base. *Housing Studies*, 22(4), 523–545.
- Galster, G., Andersson, R., Musterd, S., & Kauppinen, T. M. (2008). Does neighborhood income mix affect earnings of adults? New evidence from Sweden. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 63(3), 858–870.
- Gans, H. J. (1991). *People, plans, and policies: Essays on poverty, racism, and other national urban problems*. New York: Columbia University Press/Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hannerz, U. (1969). *Soulside: Inquiries into ghetto culture and community*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Harloe, M. (1985). *Private rented housing in United States and Europe*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Hartman, C. W. (1974). *Yerba Buena: Land grab and community resistance in San Francisco*. San Francisco: Glide.
- Häussermann, H., & Haila, A. (2005). The European city: A conceptual framework and normative project. In Y. Kazepov (Ed.), *Cities of Europe: Changing contexts, local arrangements and the challenge to social cohesion* (pp. 43–63). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Helleman, G., & Wassenberg, F. (2004). The renewal of what was tomorrow's idealistic city. Amsterdam's Bijlmermeer high-rise. *Cities*, 21(1), 3–17.
- Jargowsky, P. A. (1997). *Poverty and place: Ghettos, barrios, and the American city*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kazepov, Y. (2005). Cities of Europe: Changing contexts, local arrangements and the challenge to social cohesion. In Y. Kazepov (Ed.), *Cities of Europe: Changing contexts, local arrangements and the challenge to social cohesion* (pp. 3–42). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kleinhans, R. (2005). *Sociale Implicaties Van Herstructureren En Herhuisvesting*. Delft: Delft University Press.
- Kruythoff, H. (2003). Dutch urban restructuring policy in action against socio-spatial segregation: Sense or nonsense? *European Journal of Housing Policy*, 3(2), 193–215.

- Le Galès, P. (2002). *European cities; social conflicts and governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Massey, D. S., & Denton, N. A. (1993). *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mollenkopf, J. (2009). The Dutch orange and the big apple: A comparative commentary. In J. W. Duyvendak, F. Hendriks, & M. Van Niekerk (Eds.), *City in sight: Dutch dealings with urban change* (pp. 267–276). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Musterd, S., & Ostendorf, W. (2005). On physical determinism and displacement effects. In R. Van Kempen, K. Dekker, S. Hall, & I. Tosics (Eds.), *Restructuring large housing estates in Europe* (pp. 149–168). Bristol: Policy Press.
- Musterd, S., & Ostendorf, W. (2008). Integrated urban renewal in the Netherlands, a critical appraisal. *Urban Research and Practice*, 1(1), 78–92.
- O+S, Amsterdam Bureau for Research and Statistics (2000). *Amsterdam in Cijfers 2000*. Gemeente Amsterdam, Amsterdam.
- Pawson, R., & Tilley, N. (1997). *Realistic evaluation*. London/Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Pinkster, F. (2006). Inkomenssegregatie in Nederlandse Steden. In C. H. Mulder & F. Pinkster (Eds.), *Onderscheid in Wonen; Het Sociale Van Binnen En Buiten* (pp. 99–122). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Pinkster, F. M. (2007). Localised social networks, socialisation and social mobility in a low-income neighbourhood in the Netherlands. *Urban Studies*, 44(13), 2587–2603.
- Pinkster, F. M. (2009). *Living in concentrated poverty. Faculteit der Maatschappij – en Gedragswetenschappen*. Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- Rose, R. (1991). What is lesson-drawing? *Journal of Public Policy*, 11(1), 3–30.
- Slob, A., Bolt, G., & Van Kempen, R. (2008). *Na De Sloop. Waterbedeefcten Van Stedelijk Gebiedsgericht Beleid*. Den Haag: Nicis Institute.
- Stal, G. Y., & Zuberi, D. M. (2010). Ending the cycle of poverty through socio-economic integration: A comparison of moving to opportunity (MTO) in the United States and the Bijlmermeer revival project in the Netherlands. *Cities*, 27(1), 3–12.
- Stedelijke Woningdienst (1999). *Overzicht Urban-Projecten Sociaal-Economische Vernieuwing Bijlmermeer*. Amsterdam: Stedelijke Woningdienst.
- Van der Graaf, P., & Veldboer, L. (2009). The effects of state-led gentrification in the Netherlands. In J. W. Duyvendak, F. Hendriks, & M. Van Niekerk (Eds.), *City in sight: Dutch dealings with urban change* (pp. 61–80). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Van der Veer, J., Noyon, R., Van Trijp, R. (2004). *Wonen in Amsterdam 2003. Leefbaarheid*. Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam/Amsterdamse Federatie van Woningcorporaties.
- Van Gent, W.P.C. (2008). *The context of neighbourhood regeneration; A comparative study of nine neighbourhoods undergoing physical and social economic regeneration*. Gouda/Amsterdam: Habiforum/Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- Van Gent, W. P. C. (2010). Housing context and social transformation strategies in neighbourhood regeneration in western European cities. *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 10(1), 63–87.
- Van Gent, W. P. C., Musterd, S., & Ostendorf, W. (2009). Disentangling neighbourhood problems: Area-based interventions in western European cities. *Urban Research and Practice*, 2(1), 53–67.
- Van Heerwaarden, Y., Nauta, O., Rietveld, M., Van Soomeren, P. (2004). *De Bijlmer Monitor 2003*. Amsterdam: DSP-groep.
- Van Kempen, R. (2001). Social exclusion: The importance of context. In H. T. Andersen & R. van Kempen (Eds.), *Governing European cities: Social fragmentation, social exclusion and urban governance* (pp. 41–70). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Van Kempen, R., & Murie, A. (2009). The new divided city: Changing patterns in European cities. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Social Geografie*, 100(4), 377–398.
- Van Paassen, R. (2008). *Waterbedeefcten Van Herstructurering. Een Onderzoek Naar De Implicaties Van Stedelijke Herstructurering in Amsterdam*. Unpublished master thesis, Geography Department, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.
- Wacquant, L. (2007). Territorial stigmatization in the age of advanced marginality. *Thesis 11*, 91(1), 66–77.
- Wacquant, L. (2008). *Urban outcasts: A comparative sociology of advanced marginality*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged; the inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Young, M., & Willmott, P. (1957). *Family and kinship in east-London*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.