Marginality and stigmatization: identifying with the neighbourhood in Rotterdam

Laura Van Duin, Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam
Ioannis Tzaninis, Universiteit van Amsterdam
Erik Snel, Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam
Flip Lindo, Universiteit van Amsterdam

Abstract

The reformation of capitalist economies due to deindustrialization has given rise to joblessness and fragmentation, reshaping traditional working class suburbs into reservoirs of poverty and social deprivation. Such elements of marginality give birth to a discourse about problematic areas, parallel societies and even ghettoes developing within wealthy western countries. This stigmatization and hierarchization of neighbourhoods impacts on people's perception of these areas. However, the way the residents deal with this stigmatization is dependent on the characteristics of the neighborhoods. Areas with a lot of social activity on the street level allow their residents to become attached and care about their neighbourhood. Consequently, what promotes attachment with the local environment is the facilitation of socializing with people, namely having a large social network (friends and family) in close distance.

Introduction

There is an increasing debate concerning the potential deterioration of European urban neighbourhoods due to the assumed concentration of poverty. The current dynamics of the population composition within the largest European cities are employed to bring forth a general debate on neighbourhood 'liveability', safety and other abstractions. The main characteristic of these dynamics is the concentration of 'non-western' immigrant persons in areas which are conceived as deprived and decaying. Such dynamics are translated into a discourse which consequently gives rise to concerns of emergent 'parallel societies' and 'ghettoes'. This discourse is strongly contributing to the stigmatization of certain city neighbourhoods.

The largest Dutch cities are certainly no exception to the aforementioned processes. Neighbourhoods in The Netherlands constantly change places in a perceived hierarchy, fuelled by the national debate on the segregation of immigrants, the concentration of socio-economic deprivation and the physical deterioration of the built environment (Musterd and Ostendorf 2009). This 'hierarchization' of residential areas has a central place

in the urban social life and an acute impact on the residential composition of the cities (Ouwehand and Laan Bouma-Doff, 2007). The more affluent income-groups (dominated by white natives) avoid living in stigmatized areas, blaming their aversion on supposed criminal activity, drug use, noise and so on. A prominent example is the city of Rotterdam which has been scoring highest in all the 'wrong lists' and from which there has been an unprecedented 'white flight' for the past 15 years (from 65% of the total population in 1996, the native Dutch are currently around 50%) (Tzaninis, 2009).

Traditionally a port city, with a substantial working class population, Rotterdam underwent several construction phases after WWII (housing, inner-city renewal, economic regeneration) and is holding a central place in the public debate. The profile of the traditional working class has changed due to de-industrialization, while comprising increasingly persons with non-native Dutch background. The stigmatization of several neighbourhoods in Rotterdam is a bleak consequence of the public debate, marking certain areas almost as 'no-go' places, either for residing or simply for social activities (Laan Bouma-Doff, 2007).

Rotterdam and "all the wrong lists"
The bulk of Dutch ship-building industry has traditionally been concentrated in Rotterdam, the city with the largest port in Europe, and consequently its population has always been predominantly working class. The processes of global economic reshaping have been rather acute in Rotterdam due to its traditional economic structure. The transition to a service-based, post-fordist economy has been difficult and its impact has been felt intensely (Snel and Egbersen, 2009). For the past two or three decades unemployment has risen, remaining steadily higher than Amsterdam's, while the generally low education levels of the population remain an obstacle to entrance into the post-industrial labour market. We should note that a large portion of Rotterdam's inhabitants are 'non-western' former immigrants (first and second generation), with additional difficulties in getting access to labour in the new economic structures due to often poorer Dutch language skills, and because of discrimination on the job market. The latter group is generally perceived as attracting problems and, especially since the discourse by the anti-Islam, anti-immigration party of Pim Fortuyn, the areas where non-westerners are the majority are often considered problematic.

Rotterdam's local government has been very active in developing area-based policies aimed at the integration of immigrants, 'social cohesion' and neighbourhood 'revitalization', but also against crime and anti-social behaviour. There has been a vast amount of investment in the construction of middle-class, owner-occupied housing in disadvantaged urban neighbourhoods with many low-cost social rented dwellings (Uitermark et al, 2007: 125). In addition, the Rotterdam-Law[1] (*RotterdamWet*) excludes persons of low income to rent a (social or private) house in a 'problematic' neighbourhood (van der Laan Bouma-Doff, 2007). Apart from the *Wet*, there are initiatives aimed at social cohesion such as 'behind the front door' (*Achter de voordeur*), which involved intervention *inside* the homes of supposedly problematic households (SEV Programma, 2009). Even after the labour party came into power again, the political

---

[1] Officially "the law on exceptional measures concerning inner-city problems" was expanded throughout the country after its supposed success in Rotterdam.

agenda has not changed since Fortuyn's Leefbaar Rotterdam initiated the discourse (Engbersen and Snel, 2009).

The aforementioned debate has reinforced the stigma on certain areas where most of the problems seem to concentrate; high crime rates, high unemployment, street violence and noise, and in general low 'liveability'. There is talk of 'parallel societies' and even 'ghettoes' developing within the Dutch city on the local level.

In our research we examine three neighbourhoods of the city; Afrikaanderwijk, Westpunt and Schiemond. These three areas have (or had) a central place within the city's urban reshaping plans for the past decades. They all have sizeable former immigrant populations of non-western origin but they are in different stages regarding the urban policies. They also differ in reputation, albeit they are all still generally perceived as undesirable places to live. As we will see, Westpunt is being promoted as an attractive neighbourhood and has drawn persons with middle and higher incomes, whereas Schiemond is currently in the process of renewal and retains its former stigma. Afrikaanderwijk is probably the most ill-reputed neighbourhood of our cases, possibly of the whole city.

Afrikaanderwijk

Afrikaanderwijk was build at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. Its name was inspired by the fighting in the 2nd Boer-war in South Africa which took place from 1899 until 1902. Afrikaanderwijk still has a relatively large amount of houses built before 1930. In the 1980s and 1990s new houses were constructed in the neighbourhood and these account for 46% of the total housing stock now. The neighbourhood was originally built as a workers district for all the workers from Brabant and Zeeland who were working in the harbour of Rotterdam while it was expanding very rapidly at that time on the south side of Rotterdam. It has been one of the first neighbourhoods in The Netherlands with a majority of 'allochtonen' (migrants) because a lot of guest- workers, mainly Moroccans, Turks and South-Europeans, moved in since the 1970s to work in the harbour. Landlords were taking advantage of the guest-workers by asking high rents, while the natives were waiting for houses for years. The neighbourhood got international media attention in the 1970s when riots took place for three days between original inhabitants and guest workers. The native residents felt mistreated because homeowners were renting their houses to the guest-workers while they had to wait long because of the scarcity of social housing. The natives saw the guest-workers as responsible for the lack of housing availability. These developments had a detrimental impact on the reputation of the neighbourhood.

The Afrikaanderwijk is one of the northern neighbourhoods on the south side of Rotterdam. The river De Nieuwe Maas separates the south and the north side. In 1996 Afrikaanderwijk became more closely connected to the city centre due to the construction of the Erasmus Bridge. The composition of its current population is mainly non-western, of Turkish background by more than 30%. It is novel in a notorious way: it scored as the worst neighbourhood in The Netherlands in a list of 643 made by the 2000 Johan Remkes, secretary of the ministry of Housing, (Musterd and Ostendorf, 2009). It is no surprise that it is in the focus of several urban regeneration projects (40 *Vogelaarwijken* in 2007, *Pact op Zuid* - ongoing) and often discussed in the media. In terms of ethnic

background, around a third of the residents are of Turkish origin (the largest group in the area) and fewer than 15% are native Dutch. In fact the 'white flight' in Afrikaanderwijk has been impressive: from more than 2500 native Dutch residents in 1996, there are fewer than 1500 left[2].

The image of the area is colourful and multicultural. There is a one of the largest Dutch outdoor markets on its main square where a great variety of goods can be purchased. Its housing stock, not as colourful but still an interesting mix, is an array of pre-WWII as well as modern (1980s onwards) buildings. Regarding their tenure, 89% is rental (mostly social) and only 11% is owned, although there is a clear trend in the latter increasing since 2000, when it was only 1%. This is a result of the physical restructuring of the housing in the area, part of the aforementioned policies.

Afrikaanderwijk's safety index[3] (*veiligheidsindex*) is low enough (5.1 out of 10) for the authorities to give the status of 'threatened' (*bedreigd*) to the neighbourhood. This measure is dependent on people's opinions, and therefore should be considered carefully. The total working population is large, given also that a great share of the residents is young, in their twenties and thirties. Lastly, unemployment and welfare claims are still quite high, although the former is decreasing the past few years.

Afrikaanderwijk has acquired its notoriety the last two decades and most of the concern is misplaced. It is a vibrant neighbourhood, with active residents from different ethnic backgrounds and it has a lot of small-scale entrepreneurship. However, there are elements which cause tensions and may hinder smooth everyday life. The dynamics which have emerged lately (e.g. the flight of the most affluent residents) may contribute to the reputation of Afrikaanderwijk worsening even more. This danger makes crucial the understanding of the residents' perception on the neighbourhood, given that a lot of the tensions are constructed due to the public attention given to it.

Westpunt

Westpunt is the western-most part of Hoogvliet-Noord (the northern part of the borough Hoogvliet). The borough has a history of a typical working class neighbourhood, built after WWII. Hoogvliet was a village in the southwest of Rotterdam and when in the 1930s the construction of the harbour created a demand for housing, Rotterdam annexed Hoogvliet with the intention of turning the village into a working-class suburb (Uitermark et al, 2007: 129). Modern apartment blocks were built (70% social housing) to house the workers and by the 1950s it was completed as a working class neighbourhood. In the 60s and 70s, a large part of the population working at the harbour and living in Hoogvliet became guest-workers from South Europe and North Africa.

---

[2] We should note that the Turkish-Dutch population has not increased since 2002.
[3] This is done using data from police and municipal records and the opinion of locals about the safety of their neighborhood. In 2009 16,000 locals were interviewed. They gave their opinion on matters such as theft, drug nuisance, violence, burglary, vandalism, traffic and cleanliness. Their opinions count for 2/3 and then the data is combined into an index on a scale of 1 to 10. Neighborhoods and boroughs are then divided in five categories: unsafe (below 3.9), problematic (from 3.9 to 5.0), threatened (from 5.0 to 6.0), attention (from 6.0 - 7.1) and safe (above 7.1).

During the recession of the 1980s, the industrial activity in the area stagnated. High structural unemployment struck the residential areas and Hoogvliet's decline took place rapidly. "As an extensive informal and illegal economy of clandestine bars, drug dealing, and other types of criminal activity emerged, the idea took hold that Hoogvliet might be turning into a `ghetto'" (Uitermark et al, 2007: 130).

In the 1990s decisive action was taken by the local government and a massive restructuring took place, as a potential solution to the problems. By the next decade or so the neighbourhoods in Hoogvliet were physically transformed. Currently most of the restructuring is completed.

Unlike our other neighbourhoods, in Westpunt the native Dutch residents are the majority. They comprise slightly more than half of the population while the largest non-western group are persons with Surinamese background. The tenure in Westpunt is mixed; almost half the residences are occupied by the owners (a major change in the last ten years, with 22% home-ownership in 2000 rising today to 45%). In addition, 40% of the housing stock has been constructed since 1990, making the physical image of the neighbourhood quite new. A large share of the residents is between 30 and 50 years old, while unemployment and welfare claims are much lower than in our other cases. The safety index is rather high for this area, higher than the city average, and in fact has increased substantially the last five years, signifying possibly a concurrent gradual loss of stigma on the neighbourhood.

Schiemond

Schiemond is the most recently built neighbourhood in the research, as it has predominantly been built in the beginning of the 1980s. It is situated in the outskirts of the city at the west side of Rotterdam build on a released harbour terrain where Wilton-Feijenoord was situated. On the east side of Schiemond is the harbour, on the south side the river Nieuwe Maas and on the west side the harbor terrains of the IJsselharbour. In the 1980s and 1990s it received a large number of low-income and non-western households and quickly acquired a bad reputation. The decision by the Rotterdam authorities to designate a prostitution area ("tippelzone") on November 1st 1994 just a kilometre away from Schiemond did not help improve its reputation. In fact by 2000 Schiemond was discussed as a problematic neighbourhood; emphasis was given on persons with a disadvantaged position living there and concerns about its liveability.

Schiemond was by then among the most stigmatized areas in Rotterdam. This resulted in 2000 in a project by the local housing corporation together with other institutions to develop a plan to improve the neighbourhood with a focus on the liveability (Koopman, 2006). In 2008 Schiemond was mentioned as the most child-unfriendly neighbourhood in The Netherlands concerning indicators such as health conditions, youth crime rates, youth unemployment, youth care, child-abuse, education, public playgrounds and teenage motherhood in the neighbourhood (Steketee et al, 2008). As is often the case in The Netherlands, physical restructuring and investment were employed to 'revitalize' the neighbourhood (as well as improved tram connection to the centre), while in this case social cohesion was also promoted. Schiemond is currently in the midst of such projects, the impact of which has not yet fully developed.

Like in Afrikaanderwijk, there has been a 'flight' of affluent households in Schiemond. In fact, apart from the native Dutch, many persons with Surinamese background have been moving out of the area for the past fifteen years. The groups of Antillean and Turkish background have been increasing in size while the persons of Moroccan background are five times more than fifteen years ago. There is a large share of younger residents in this neighbourhood, both teenagers and children. Regarding house tenure, the grand majority of the housing stock in Schiemond are rentals; in total 95% of the households rent their home. The safety index has increased substantially the past five years, becoming almost as high as in Westpunt. Lastly, unemployment and welfare claims in Schiemond are as high as in Afrikaanderwijk.

The three neighbourhoods in the urban planning

Our three cases are in different stages of urban and social reshaping. Westpunt has already mostly gone through extensive physical restructuring and it is actively promoted by the government as an attractive area for persons with middle and high economic status (Uitermark et al, 2007). Moreover we can see in the analysis of Uitermark et al (2007) that key actors in the neighbourhood (i.e. association of home-owners) are becoming contentious towards "less adapted people" (131). The reshaping of Westpunt's image has been a process which lasted several years and appears almost complete; in the last ten years home-ownership has doubled, welfare claims are halved and unemployment has dropped by one third.

On the contrary, Afrikaanderwijk is currently undergoing through (limited) restructuring and as we noted, it has a notorious reputation. There are governmental measures taken to counter its supposed deterioration. The native Dutch have left the neighbourhood in large numbers and the residents are in their great majority of non-western background. It is often portrayed as an ethnically segregated area.

Lastly, in Schiemond physical renewal is currently taking place extensively. Even though, similarly to Afrikaanderwijk, the native Dutch are moving out, there is an impression promoted by the media that the neighbourhood is doing better; moreover the safety index has increased a lot and the residents' satisfaction is improving (Koopman, 2005). Nevertheless, it is still unclear whether the state-desired regeneration has taken place.

Theory

The recent economic development and growth of de-industrialized capitalism has given rise to joblessness and polarization. The effects of de-industrialization, parallel to the existence of an increasing non-western, less affluent population, have had an impact on urban areas. Such a phenomenon is manifest often at the local level, where whole neighbourhoods, boroughs and even cities feel the impact of loss of job opportunities. Traditional working class neighbourhoods, with formerly consistently employed persons in the industry, have transformed into areas of high unemployment, excessive crime rates and poverty. Such 'advanced marginality' is evident in many advanced capitalist countries and with far reaching consequences (Wacquant, 1996).

Once residential areas start deteriorating due to joblessness a vicious circle starts taking place. These areas become ill-reputed and the affluent residents move out simply because they can afford it. The ones left behind are the more disadvantaged, while others as disadvantaged as the stayers move in (Laan Bouma-Doff, 2007). Such a process may cause the stigmatization of such neighbourhoods and bring them to the attention of the public and the authorities. Area-based approaches may then be pursued by governments regarding urban neighbourhoods which are deemed as problematic, deprived and deteriorating.

In the urban environment, categorization on the basis of neighbourhoods is becoming increasingly common. A *hierarchization* of urban areas is extended to the entirety of The Netherlands (like the aforementioned list of 643 neighbourhoods). It appears to foster certain phenomena: on the one hand, there is a power relation between the residents of these neighbourhoods and the institutions feeding this external categorization; on the other hand, social categorization of this type may affect a group's identity and even become internalized by the relevant group (Jenkins, 2003).

The neighbourhood as a determinant of individuals' behaviour has been examined exhaustively by scholars (Musterd et al. 2003; Pinkster 2007; Bauder 2002; Andersson et al. 2007 - just to name a few constrictions). The academic debate on the impact of such effects, and whether they even exist, is inconclusive. In general there are indications that neighbourhood matters in certain circumstances (Semyonov and Kraus, 1982), but the way they matter is contested (Musterd, 2005; Pinkster, 2009; Sampson et al 2002). Castro and Lindbladh (2004) provide us with a useful scheme in order to operationalize the discursive behaviour of residents in a stigmatized neighbourhood. They recognize four discursive strategies which the residents of a stigmatized area may employ in order to deal with the stigma. In our research two of the discourses are mostly relevant. '*Identification* is basically concerned about linking one's identity to the neighbourhood… It conveys a sense of belonging that was predominant in industrial working-class communities' (265). Alternatively, 'the *detachment* discourse is basically a way of disconnecting one's identity from a negatively perceived social environment… the problems are acknowledged as being severe and degrading, and there is a conscious rejection of belonging to the place'.

Our aim is to examine the implications of neighbourhood stigmatization on people's perceptions and behaviour and how they deal with it. Does the demonization of disadvantaged areas make their residents want to disassociate themselves from these areas? How do they experience this demonization? Do people identify with their local environment and defend it or do they detach themselves from their neighbourhood?

The GEITONIES dataset

Our data comes from the European project GEITONIES, a research project funded by the European Union's 7th Framework programme. For our paper we conducted 571 interviews with residents of the three Rotterdam neighbourhoods. Our research areas are in all three cases real neighbourhoods; that is, the boundaries we defined to delimit the dwellings to include in our inventory for sampling are the same boundaries that the residents of the area, and for that matter all inhabitants of Rotterdam, identify as the boundaries of the neighbourhoods that go under these names.

Primary characteristics
In Afrikaanderwijk our respondents are 200 persons, in Westpunt they are 198 and in Schiemond 173. Concurrently with the composition in the neighbourhoods, in Afrikaanderwijk and Schiemond most of our respondents are of immigrant background and in Westpunt it is the reverse (Table 1). Concerning our respondents' sex, there are generally more women in our data, especially in the case of immigrant persons (Table 2); this is due to the interviews having been completed within the persons' homes, comprising often housewives.

Regarding age, our native Dutch respondents are generally older than the ones with an immigrant background (Table 3). This contrast is especially evident in Schiemond where most of the natives are older than 65 and most of the immigrants younger than 34. The education levels (Table 4) of the persons with an immigrant background are higher than the native Dutch. Only in Westpunt the two groups have similar levels of education. Lastly, concerning the duration of stay in the neighbourhood (Table 5), most respondents have been living there for at least 10 years or moved in rather recently, especially the immigrants in Schiemond and native Dutch in Afrikaanderwijk.

Methodology
In our research we try to explore and contextualize how stigmatization has an effect on residents in the way they identify with their neighbourhood. We do this by getting a view on what are the important explaining factors in the feeling of identification with the neighbourhood. Identification with the neighbourhood is used as the dependent variable in this case and will be explored for each neighbourhood separately using the GEITONIES data of Rotterdam which includes the neighbourhoods Afrikaanderwijk, Westpunt and Schiemond.

Operationalisation
Dependent variable
Identification is measured as a Likert scale variable with 6 items; it is an interval variable with scores differing from not feeling identified at all with the neighbourhood to identifying very weakly, weakly, not strongly or weakly, strongly and very strongly.

Independent variables
As independent variables we take into account several individual characteristics: *age,* measured in years, *sex* and *background* as dummy variables, and *educational level* (which contains 8 categories). Besides these we take into account *duration of stay in the neighbourhood,* excluding the respondents who are living there since their eighteenth birthday (see table 6), because our questionnaire did not include such information for persons who lived in the neighbourhood before they became 18. Lastly, *having children* and *having interethnic contacts* are included as dummy variables.

We are using two attitudinal variables which are *identification with the city of residence* (Rotterdam) and *identification with the country of the majority* (The Netherlands). The factors we use in this analysis as independent variables are the *social network in the neighbourhood,* the *perception of how people get along in the neighbourhood* and the *feeling of safety in the neighbourhood.* For creating the factors which we will use in our

analysis, principal component analysis is used. Afterwards we use the factors besides the other independent variables in a regression analysis for each of the neighbourhoods. The explanation of the factors we created follows here with the component loading behind each variable which need to have at least the value of .364 concerning our sample size in each neighbourhood (Field, 2009:644).

Factor Social Network in Neighbourhood

A scale is used with 7 items ranging from score 1 is all of them to score 7 is none of them.
Created out of five variables which are:
- The share of the global social network living in the neighbourhood and important for the respondent concerning seeking help *(component loading .828)*
- The share of the global social network living in the neighbourhood and important for the respondent concerning advice seeking *(component loading .857)*
- The share of the global social network living in the neighbourhood and important for the respondent concerning spending free time *(component loading .841)*
- The share of the most important contacts of the respondent with whom the respondent usually meet in the neighbourhood *(component loading .480)*
- The share of the most important contacts of the respondent currently living (at the moment of the interview) in the neighbourhood *(component loading .828)*

Factor Perception of how people get along in the neighbourhood

A Likert scale is used with 5 items ranging from 1 = disagree strongly to 5 = agree strongly.
Created out of three variables which are:
- People in this neighbourhood hardly know each other *(component loading -.495)*
- People in this area are welcoming to new people moving in *(component loading .579)*
- People in this neighbourhood pull together to improve it *(component loading .620)*

Factor Feeling Safe in the neighbourhood

A Likert scale is used with 5 items ranging from 1 = disagree strongly to 5 = agree strongly.
Created out of three variables which are:
- The people in my neighbourhood make me feel safe here *(component loading .647)*
- This is a safe area with low crime rates *(component loading .687)*
- I don't feel threatened because of the behavior of people in the neighbourhood *(component loading .621)*

Model

For the analysis with which we try to get a better view on how identification with the neighbourhood is formed and which predictors are important in feeling identified to a certain extent, we use forced entry multiple regression analysis. For our analysis it is the most efficient way to test it, because we would like to get a view on what predictors are important in relation with identification with the neighbourhood. The regression analysis

(Table 2) will show what factors are significant in predicting somebody's identification with the neighbourhood in Afrikaanderwijk, Westpunt and Schiemond.

Analysis and Results

The regression model is executed for all three neighbourhoods with the same predictors. Our focus in the analysis and concerning the results will be the one of Afrikaanderwijk which is the most interesting model, but we analyze the findings in Schiemond and Westpunt, although we will need to explore more in the future.

Schiemond

The regression model of Schiemond has an R Square of .131 which has 13.1% explained variance with the predictor sex (1 = female) with a significance of 0.67 two-tailed and .034 on the one-tailed test and a Beta value of .173 which shows us a positive relation between sex and identification with the neighbourhood in the case of Schiemond. Women in Schiemond tend to identify more with the neighbourhood than men. Besides sex the factor social network in neighbourhood has a significance of .037 and a Beta value of -.197 what means that the respondents who have a larger share of their social contacts in the neighbourhood tend to identify more with the neighbourhood, because the scale of the component leads from score 1 = almost all to score 7 = none of them.

Westpunt

The regression model of Westpunt has an R Square of .217 which is an explained variance of the included predictors on identification with the neighbourhood of 21.7%. The predictor background (1 = native) has a significance of .076 two-tailed and 0.038 one-tailed and a Beta value of .193 which shows us a positive relation between background and feeling identified with the neighbourhood; natives in Westpunt tend to identify more with the neighbourhood than migrants. Besides background, duration of stay is a significant predictor at the level p < 0.1 with a significance of 0.087 and a Beta value of -.169 which means that in Westpunt the longer people live in the neighbourhood they tend to identify less with the neighbourhood. The factor social network in the neighbourhood has a significance of .002 and a Beta value of -.281 which is the strongest predictor in the model and means that the larger the share of the social network is related to the neighbourhood in the sense spending free time, seeking advice, seeking help in order to the global network and the share of the most important persons whom the respondent usually meets in the neighbourhood and the share of most important persons who currently (at the moment of the interview) live in Westpunt. The predictor having children coded as a dummy variable with 1 = yes has a significance of 0.002 and a Beta value of -.280 what means that people in Westpunt without children tend to identify more with the neighbourhood than people with children.

Afrikaanderwijk

The regression model of Afrikaanderwijk has an R Square of .320 which is an explained variance of the included predictors on identification with the neighbourhood of 32%. Of all background characteristics age is a significant predictor with a significance of 0.001 and a Beta value of -.318 which means that in Afrikaanderwijk the younger the respondent is the more she tends to identify with the neighbourhood. Duration of stay is a significant predictor with a significance of 0.039 and a Beta value of .275 which shows a positive relation between duration of stay and identification with the neighbourhood; the

longer the respondent lives in the neighbourhood the more she tends to identify with Afrikaanderwijk. The predictor social network in the neighbourhood has a significance of 0.043 and a Beta value of -.167 what means the larger the share of the social network relates to the neighbourhood, the more somebody tends to identify with the neighbourhood.

Three attitudinal variables are significant in the model regarding predicting identification with the neighbourhood, which are identifying with the city of residence (Rotterdam), identifying with the country of the majority (The Netherlands) and the perception of how people get along with each other in the neighbourhood according to the respondent. Identification with the city of residence has a significance of .039 and a Beta value of -.175 what means the more a respondent identifies with Rotterdam the less she tends to identify with the neighbourhood. Identification with the country of the majority has a significance of .000 and a Beta value of .361 which means that the more somebody identifies with The Netherlands, the more somebody tends to identify with Afrikaanderwijk. The predictor of the perception of how people get along in the neighbourhood according to the respondent has a significance of .016 and a Beta value of .178 what means the more somebody has a positive perception about how people get along in the neighbourhood in the sense of knowing each other, pulling together to improve the neighbourhood and being welcome when new residents are moving in, the more they tend to identify with Afrikaanderwijk.

Regression model

Model	Afrikaanderwijk		Westpunt		Schiemond	
	Beta	Sign.	Beta	Sign.	Beta	Sign.
(Constant)		.000		.000		.001
Sex (1 = Female)	.012	.872	.059	.530	.173	.067*
Age in years	-.318	.001***	-.037	.714	-.025	.815
Background (1 = Native)	-.008	.928	.193	.076*	.031	.763
Educational level	.008	.915	-.041	.643	-.147	.119
Identification with the city of residence (Rotterdam)	-.175	.039**	-.088	.314	-.078	.398
Identity country of majority (The Netherlands)	.361	.000***	-.005	.955	-.021	.826
Duration of stay in neighbourhood	.275	.001***	-.169	.087*	-.090	.378
Feeling safe in the neighbourhood	-.029	.704	-.040	.679	-.072	.432
Social network in neighbourhood	-.167	.043**	-.281	.002***	-.197	.037**
The perception of how people get along in the neighbourhood	.178	.016**	.068	.444	.145	.114
Having interethnic contacts (1 = yes)	.036	.648	-.089	.378	.006	.952
Having children (1 = yes)	-.036	.660	-.280	.002***	-.066	.521

Table 2
    a.   Dependent Variable: [Neighbourhood identity]
    b.   ***p < 0.01; **p < 0.05; *p < 0.10.

Discussion and conclusion

In our analysis we discovered several differences and one important similarity between the residents' attitudes and behaviours in the three neighbourhoods. Initially it becomes evident that the identification of residents with their neighbourhood has generally different features in Afrikaanderwijk, Schiemond and Westpunt; the three environments provide a different sense of belonging to their residents. Concerning Westpunt and especially Schiemond more research is required in exploring the identification as a mechanism to handle stigmatization. Nevertheless, there is one element which is common in all three areas in relation to identifying with it: *the size of the social network* within the neighbourhood. Therefore, we can argue that the number of people with whom we socialize in our local environment matters for becoming attached to that place.

For Afrikaanderwijk our model is more fruitful. Firstly we notice that identifying with the neighbourhood goes hand in hand with identifying with The Netherlands and *not* identifying with Rotterdam. In fact, the former appears highly significant; feeling 'Dutch' becomes important for feeling attached to the local environment. Regarding the reverse pattern of identifying with the city, it could be the result of not reasoning specifically in limited neighbourhood boundaries but the city itself. Afrikaanderwijk is close to Rotterdam's center and it is possible that some residents may want to disassociate themselves from it by feeling to belong to the city. On the contrary, other residents may prefer the more narrowed identity of the 'Afrikaanderwijker' in contrast to the more vague 'Rotterdamer'.

Secondly, we see that *time* matters; the older the residents are and the longer they stay in the neighbourhood, the more they identify with it. This signifies the high probability of Afrikaanderwijk becoming *home* in one's perception by growing up or living there for enough years. These observations demonstrate that Afrikaanderwijk is a place where people may feel an attachment given the opportunity to live there for some time.

Afrikaanderwijk has more possibilities for daily social activities, especially compared to the other two neighbourhoods. There are extended public and private facilities and services like a weekly outdoors market, shops, restaurants and cafes, but also schools and an active association of residents. The neighbourhood of Afrikaanderwijk possibly allows the locals to connect to it by being active in it; a person who grew up there, has many contacts there and feels a sense of belonging to The Netherlands is quite probable to feel attached to the neighbourhood.

Dealing with the stigmatization of the local environment is dependent exactly on the environment. If there is the opportunity to become familiar with the neighbourhood by making friends there and being close to family, it is possible to feel a sense of belonging to the neighbourhood. Moreover, by not being residentially mobile, one may grow up in and become attached to the *place* despite its stigma. Our analysis points to the importance of familiarity and "eyes on the street" (Jacobs, 1961) as a defense against bad reputation.

References

Andersson R. S. Musterd, G. Galster, T. M. Kauppinen, 2007, What Mix Matters? Exploring the Relationships between Individuals' Incomes and Different Measures of their Neighbourhood Context, Housing Studies, Vol. 22, No. 5, 637–660, September 2007

Bauder, H. (2002) "Neighbourhood Effects and Cultural Exclusion." Urban Studies 39(1): 85-93.

Castro Paula Bustos and Eva Lindbladh, 2004, Place, discourse and vulnerability—a qualitative study of young adults living in a Swedish urban poverty zone, Health & Place Volume 10, Issue 3, September 2004, Pages 259-272

Field, A. (2009). Discovering Statistics Using SPSS. London. Sage

Jacobs J., 1961, The death and life of great American cities, New York: Vintage books

Jenkins R, 2003, Chapter 4: Rethinking Ethnicity: Identity, Categorization, and Power, in John Stone and Rutledge Dennis (Eds.), Race and ethnicity: comparative and theoretical approaches, Wiley-Blackwell

Koopman, MJ (2005). When reputation and residential satisfaction diverge. In M van der Land & LGAJ Reinders (Eds.), Doing, thinking, feeling home: the mental geography of residential environments; International ENHR conference (pp. 1-16). Delft: Onderzoeksinstituut OTB.

Koopman, M.J. (2006). Leefbaarheid- of imagoprobleem?. Habiforum. Gouda.

Laan Bouma-Doff, W. van der (2007). Confined Contact. Residential segregation and ethnic bridges in The Netherlands, Urban Studies, 44, 5/6, 997-1017.

Musterd S., 2005, Social and Ethnic Segregation in Europe: Levels, Causes and Effects, JOURNAL OF URBAN AFFAIRS, Volume 27, Number 3, pages 331–348.

Musterd, W.J.M. Ostendorf, S. de Vos, 2003, Neighbourhood effects and social mobility : a longitudinal analysis in: Housing Studies, Vol. 18 (2003), p. 877-892

Musterd, S. & Ostendorf, W. (2009) Problemen in wijken of probleemwijken. Van Gorcum. Assen.

Ouwehand A.,Wenda van der Laan Bouma-Doff, 2007, Excluding disadvantaged households into Rotterdam neighbourhoods: equitable, efficient or revanchist?, ENHR international conference 25-28 June, Sustainable Urban Areas, Rotterdam 2007

Pinkster, F.M. (2007), Localised social networks, socialization and social mobility in a low-income neighborhood in The Netherlands, Urban Studies 44 (13), p. 2587-2603

Pinkster, F.M. & B. Volker (2009), Local social networks and social resources in two Dutch neighborhoods, Housing Studies 24 (2), p. 225-242

Uitermark J. and Duyvendak J. W., 2007, Gentrification as a governmental strategy: social control and social cohesion in Hoogvliet, Rotterdam, Environment and Planning A 2007, volume 39, pages 125 ^ 141

Sampson, Robert J., Jeffrey D. Morenoff and Thomas Gannon-Rowley. 2002. Assessing Neighborhood Effects: Social Processes and New Directions in Research. Annual Review of Sociology 28:443-478.

Semyonov, Moshe, Kraus Vered, 1982 The Social Hierarchies of Communities and Neighborhoods , Social Science Quarterly, 63:4 (1982:Dec.) p.780

Snel, E. & Engbersen, G.B.M. (2009). Social reconquest as a new policy paradigm. Changing urban policies in the city of Rotterdam. In: K. De Boyser, C. Dewilde, D. Dierckx & J. Friedrichs. (Eds.). *Between the Social and the Spatial.* UK. Ashgate Publishing. 149-166.

Cornelissen Eefke, Taco Brandsen, 2009, HANDREIKING 'ACHTER DE VOORDEUR', SEV Programma 2009

Steketee, M., Mak, J. & Tierolf, B. (2008). Kinderen in Tel Databoek 2008. Verweij-Jonker Instituut. Utrecht.

Tzaninis, I. (2009), Residential Segregation in Rotterdam: The public debate, the policies and the spatial patterns of non-westerners and native Dutch between 1996 and 2008, Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Amsterdam: Amsterdam.

Wacquant Loïc J. D., 1996, The Rise of Advanced Marginality: Notes on Its Nature and ImplicationsAuthor(s): Source: Acta Sociologica, Vol. 39, No. 2 (1996), pp. 121-139

Appendix

Table 1 - respondents in the three neighbourhoods by background							
	Afrikaanderwijk		Westpunt		Schiemond		Total	
Immigrant	58%	116	38%	76	59.5%	103	52%	295
Native	42%	84	62%	122	40.5%	70	48%	276
Total	100%	200	100%	198	100%	173	100%	571

Table 2 - respondents in the three neighbourhoods by background and sex						
	Afrikaanderwijk		Westpunt		Schiemond	
	immigrant	*native*	*immigrant*	*native*	*immigrant*	*native*
Male	36%	40.5%	28%	40%	29%	34%
Female	64%	59.5%	72%	60%	71%	66%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 3 - respondents in the three neighbourhoods by background and age						
	Afrikaanderwijk		Westpunt		Schiemond	
	immigrant	*native*	*immigrant*	*native*	*immigrant*	*native*
25-34	26%	12%	20%	7%	41%	24%
35-49	45%	20%	47%	33%	28%	10%
50-64	16%	36%	22%	31%	22%	27%
65 and older	13%	32%	11%	29%	10%	39%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	116	84	76	122	103	70

Table 4 - respondents in the three neighbourhoods by background and education						
	Afrikaanderwijk		Westpunt		Schiemond	
	immigrant	*native*	*immigrant*	*native*	*immigrant*	*native*
ISCED 0-1	32%	39%	19%	14%	18%	39%
ISCED 2	25%	28%	27%	36%	35%	20%
ISCED 3	30%	11%	31%	26%	30%	17%
ISCED 4-6	13%	22%	24%	24%	17%	24%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	112	82	68	119	98	70

Table 5 - respondents in the three neighbourhoods by background and duration of stay in the neighbourhood						
	Afrikaanderwijk		Westpunt		Schiemond	
	immigrant	*native*	*immigrant*	*native*	*immigrant*	*native*
1-5 years ago	26%	33%	20%	24%	33%	27%
6-10 years ago	19%	7%	15%	8%	21%	8%
More than 10 years ago	55%	60%	64%	69%	47%	66%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	89	57	59	93	88	67

Table 6 - Sample size per neighbourhood					
		Neighbourhood			
		Afrikaanderwijk	Westpunt	Schiemond	Total
Sample size	Not Selected	63	52	21	136
	Selected	137	146	141	424
	Missings	0	0	11	11
Total		200	198	173	571