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Introduction

Over the past decades, the urban geography of many Western cities has fundamentally changed. Many cities, including Amsterdam, have witnessed a transformation from working class-dominated spaces of industrial production to middle class-dominated spaces of services and consumption (Lees et al., 2008). This transition is linked to demographic changes such as postponing marriage and childbearing (Bondi, 1991, 1999) and to structural economic transformations such as the professionalisation of the work force, the transition to a service-based economy (Butler et al., 2008; Hamnett, 1991), and the reorientation of capital towards central cities (Smith, 1996a). There is a common understanding that these transformations should be linked to changes in social class structure, which has led to the emergence of new urban geographies of class in major urban centres across the world (Atkinson and Bridge, 2005; Bridge, 1995, 2001a; Butler and Hamnett, 2009; Butler et al., 2008; Butler and Robson, 2003b; Savage et al., 1992).

The concept of gentrification has come to symbolise many of these transformations. Although gentrification is clearly associated with reinvestment in urban cores and the closing of rent gaps, the main agents of gentrification are the gentrifiers. Drawing on the work of Bourdieu (1984, 1999, 2005), several scholars argue that gentrification is part of the distinction strategies of ‘new’ middle classes which set them apart from the ‘old’ middle classes and are reflected in various aspects of consumption, including housing (Bridge, 2001b; May, 1996; Watt, 2005). Living in the inner city has become part of a particular lifestyle and the fulfilment of a particular self image, and it is linked to particular middle-class habituses (Bridge, 2006; Butler and Robson, 2003a, b; Ley, 1994, 1996; Rérat and Lees, 2010).

Although it is debated whether gentrifiers constitute a new middle class, there is a common understanding that urban middle classes are the agents of gentrification. Some studies have extended the concept of gentrification beyond the urban (Bridge, 2003; Phillips, 1993; Smith, 2002), but generally, gentrification is very closely associated with the transformation of urban neighbourhoods, often in large metropolitan areas. Correspondingly, gentrifiers are argued to ‘possess’ a metropolitan habitus (Butler, 1997; Butler and Robson, 2003a). The urban geography of western metropolises and the formation and reproduction of specific middle-class groups are thus intrinsically connected.

The specific urban habitus of the new middle classes, however, is challenged by events in the life course. In demographic literature, the transition to parenthood is typically associated with residential mobility, and more specifically, with moving to spacious dwellings in suburban areas (Bell, 1968; Rossi, 1955). When urban middle classes have children and settle down, many suburbanise or move to the countryside, while only a minority remains urban. The differentiation of
the residential practices of gentrifiers when they become parents are associated with various time-space trajectories and strategies for the reproduction of class in various life stages (Bridge, 2006). The residential practices of new middle classes could thus prove to be only temporarily distinct from those of the traditional middle classes in the suburbs. Butler and Robson (2003) connect this differentiation of residential practices with specific habituses within the middle class and, more specifically, with how various middle-class households assume different positions in the fields of consumption, education, employment and housing. Therefore, the main question of this dissertation is as follows:

How do residential practices of urban middle classes change when they have children and how are their residential practices informed by their habitus?

Theory

To address these questions, this dissertation integrates perspectives on class with perspectives on the demographic transition to parenthood. It makes use of four key concepts: field, capital, habitus and practice, which are derived from the work of Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 1984, 1990, 2000, 2005) and of scholars that have used and developed his concepts (i.e. Bridge, 1995, 2000a, 2002; Butler, 1997; Butler and Robson, 2001; Calhoun, 1993; Ley, 1996; Robson and Butler, 2001; Savage et al., 1992; Savage et al., 2005). This study focuses on what middle-class households actually do when they have children: the main subject of study is, therefore, their practices. More specifically, it focuses on those practices that are directly and indirectly associated with their place in space: their residential practices.

(residential) Practice

Following Bourdieu’s theory of practice (Bourdieu, 1977, 1990), this study looks at the behaviour of households when they become parents for the first time. Rather than merely analysing attitudes, intentions or preferences, the aim here is to focus on how having children affects the behaviour of middle-class new parents in various aspects of their lives. The term “residential practices” refers to residential mobility and to practices in other aspects of life that are directly and indirectly related to how the place of residence structures daily spatial routines.

Practices should, however, not be mistaken for rational action on the part of agents who wittingly and willingly choose the directions of their lives. Parents are the main actors in this study, but their practices are only partially the products of their own making and even less of their own choosing. To a large extent, the structural contexts of their existence determine their choices and their imagined alternatives. Furthermore, their practices are also the outcome of previous experiences, which have been embodied and become part of one’s social nature.
Practices are thus often habitual and are carried out unconsciously. This is not to say that practices cannot be reflexive. Nonetheless, even if behaviour is conscious and reflexive, it is still informed by an embodied scheme of making sense of the world. This practical sense is rooted in what Bourdieu calls the ‘habitus’.

**Middle class** Habit/Capital

Although the concept of habitus has been criticised for various reasons (Calhoun, 1993; Jenkins, 2002), it is still a useful concept to transcend ongoing discussions of structure and agency. Maintaining that it is the mechanism through which structure and agency are brought together and reconciled, the habitus is both structure ‘at work’ and the social production of structure. For Bourdieu, the habitus is the set of embodied dispositions that have been formed during previous experiences. The habitus is “the active presence of the whole past of which it is a product” (Bourdieu, 1977: 56). Although these historical experiences could encompass nearly everything, Bourdieu’s own analyses often emphasise how the habitus has been shaped by the context of social class. Even though the habitus should be understood more broadly, it is often interpreted as an expression of class position and, simultaneously, a vehicle for class reproduction.

Class reproduction is associated with the positions that people occupy and their possibilities of maintaining these positions through the deployment of capital. For Bourdieu, class is an advantaged position in social space, which is ‘materialised’ in various forms of capital. He defines four different main types: symbolic, social, economic and cultural capital. In defining social space, however, economic and cultural capital are considered the most important. It is the total quantity of capital and its orientation on a cultural-economic axis that constitutes one’s position in social space: social class. This capital orientation is often expressed through occupation. In *Distinction* (1984), social space on the basis of capital is mapped through the various positions that people occupy in the labour market and how this is associated with their incomes and cultural consumption.

Bourdieu divided social space into three vertically positioned strata: the working classes at the bottom, the bourgeoisie on top and the petit-bourgeoisie as a middle stratum. The terms he used to describe these strata do not always translate well to other contexts. Although British understandings of social class, on which this dissertation draws heavily, also use employment status as a primary indicator of class, they often divide social space into working/lower classes, middle classes and an aristocracy that is not always explicit. What is referred to as middle class in British class literature (Bridge, 1995; Butler and Robson, 2003a; Devine et al., 2005; Savage et al., 1992) appears to encompass Bourdieu’s concepts of the bourgeoisie and the petit-bourgeoisie simultaneously, in which the bourgeoisie coincides with the upper middle class and the petit bourgeoisie with the lower middle class. In the Dutch context, understandings of class tend to differ again from both the Bourdieuvian and British classifications. In common discourse,
the Dutch concept of middenklasse is often juxtaposed with both ‘the poor’ and ‘the elite’. Although Dutch social stratification studies also apply occupational status (Güveli et al., 2007), social class is often measured by income levels and educational attainment.

In this (Dutch) study, middle-class position is defined by the interaction between economic capital (income) and cultural capital in institutionalised forms (level of education) and embodied forms (taste). It defines the middle class according to its intermediary position in terms of total quantities of capital between the lower and upper classes. Within the middle classes, a differentiation is made between relatively high volumes of economic capital versus relatively high levels of cultural capital and between the upper and the lower.

**Figure 1.1. Class position and orientation of capital**

Based on Bourdieu’s ideas of social space, the various orientations of capital produce different practices. Only practice generates the social interactions in which certain dispositions (the habitus) acquire meaning. Capital and its value are thus only established meaningfully in the interaction between habitus and field.

**Field**

The concept of field refers to a relatively autonomous social world. Fields are battlegrounds on which actors compete for the specific forms of capital that are at stake in that field. Fields have their own specific logic and symbolic forms of capital. Nevertheless, fields are interconnected. In the first place, the habitus translates into practices in fields that are, in Bourdieu’s words, homologous. This means that although fields have different rules and function differently, the social position one occupies in the field of power (class) still operates in various fields. Cultural and economic capital are useful resources in many social contexts.
Middle classes share a similar (homologous) position on the vertical axis of social space, but they are differentiated by their orientations in, for instance, the fields of housing, employment, education and consumption.

Because these fields are also connected, practices in one field have consequences in another. The chart below shows how this study conceptually approaches these interactions: in interaction with a field, the habitus produces practices (1), which, in turn, inform the habitus (2) and shape the contours and rules of the field (3); eventually, these factors produce new practices together (1). This continuous feedback loop presents a conceptual model that can make it difficult to separate cause and effect. The habitus, however, is like a super oil tanker: it changes course very slowly.

In this study, the habitus is treated as a relatively stable factor: by and large, it remains the same over time. The transformations of becoming a parent and the new experiences contribute to a slight reformation of the habitus. However, the reformation of the habitus is not the primary subject of this study. The main topic of this study is how the residential practices of urban middle-class households change when they have children and how the interactions of habitus and field are altered in this new stage of life.

Following the work of Butler and Robson (Butler and Robson, 2003a, b), this study will analyse how the residential practices of middle-class households are related to four fields: the field of consumption, employment, education, and housing.

Middle-class families in the field of consumption
One of the crucial aspects of contemporary studies of social class is the focus
on consumption as a defining variable. The ‘new’ middle classes are defined according to their distinctive consumption practices, which does not only set them apart from working classes, but also from ‘traditional’ middle classes (Devine et al., 2005). To a large extent, the consumption practices of the new middle classes are associated with their urban character, or at least, the spatial concentration of particular forms of consumption in cities. This includes consumption at high-threshold facilities such as theatres, cinemas, or delicatessens and the symbolic aspects of consumption of specific material goods and services (Bell, 1968; De Wijs-Mulkens, 1999; Zukin, 1998). Furthermore, apart from consuming services or goods in urban space, the consumption of urban space is also an aspect of the repertoire of distinctive practices. Therefore, urban middle classes seek distinction through two dimensions of consumption (Zukin, 1987, 1995, 1998).

However, when people have children, these patterns of consumption are altered. In particular, activities such as dining out or clubbing are generally much less important for parents than they are for singles or couples. Due to the lack of time and logistical constraints, young families are more geographically bound to their homes and their direct residential environments. In addition to changes in the consumption of services and goods, the relationship with the residential environment as such may also change. Some families remain urban, but for others, the consumption of urban space may not be as important as it previously was (Karsten, 2007). Therefore, both the meaning of the consumption of particular goods and services and the consumption of urban space itself that may differentiate the residential practices of middle-class households when they become parents.

Middle-class families in the field of employment
The rise of the middle classes in urban areas around the world is strongly associated with changes in the labour market. The rise of the service economy and the decline of industrial production in most Western urban centres have changed the social makeup of these cities. It is the change in employment sectors that has made scholars reason that the new employees of inner cities constitute a new middle class. It is argued that many new occupations, such as consultants, IT-personnel, and fashion designers, do not belong to the elite or working classes, but they do not fall into traditional middle-class positions either. Drawing on Weberian perspectives on class, scholars such as Butler, Robson, Savage and Bridge have used Bourdieuvian methodologies of class to define the new social class hierarchies. Although they are aware of some of the disadvantages of using employment as an indicator for class, Butler and Robson use employment categories as a way of marking the transformations in London’s class structure. They emphasise that occupation should not be seen as an independent variable that determines consumption patterns; the choice of a particular occupation is informed by previous dispositions that are learned in middle-class education.
Employment should therefore be seen as a field in which the habitus produces particular outcomes and in which new experiences are accumulated.

The field of employment is a site at which skills and knowledge are ‘transformed’ into economic capital. The position in the labour market largely determines the degree to which households can afford various forms of consumption, including those of housing and private education. Furthermore, employment is a powerful source of identity and an important factor that shapes daily routines. The location and conditions of a job have an impact on the time-space budget through commuting time and the possibility of combining various activities in multi-purpose trips (Jarvis, 2005; Karsten, 2003). The concentration of particular types of employment in cities, notably financial services and creative and knowledge-intensive jobs, binds many members of the middle class to urban regions, although not necessarily inner-city areas (Bontje and Musterd, 2005).

Furthermore, the positions of households in the field of employment are related to the division of paid and unpaid work within households.

Having children often has repercussions for the new parents’ positions in the labour market. In most Western contexts, having children provokes a starker contrast between male and female practices. Perhaps the most important transition is the gendering of the division of work within households. In many countries, new mothers tend to become concerned with ‘the private’ and ‘the home’, while men continue in the public sphere of work (Elshtain, 1981). In the Netherlands, new mothers generally start working fewer hours or quit altogether, while men work even more hours when children are born. Among middle-class couples with children, the division of labour is less gendered, but among these same couples, men tend to be the primary breadwinners (SCP, 2008). However, the Dutch context of part-time work allows for a much wider range of possible arrangements for the division of labour. Particularly among the middle classes, it is also quite common for men to work part-time.

Middle-class families in the field of education

The educational system is particularly crucial for the middle classes in maintaining and legitimising class differences (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977; Reay, 2001). For the middle-class family households in this study, two related but quite distinct aspects of the educational system are important: for themselves, higher education, and for their children, primary education.

Institutions of higher education and cities are intrinsically linked. The rise of middle classes in inner cities is closely associated with the simultaneous trend toward professionalisation of the labour market and the growth in tertiary education (Hamnett, 1994b). Many scholars have indicated the importance of students in the pioneer stages of gentrification (Clay, 1979; Gale, 1980; Ley, 1996; Smith and Holt, 2007). Moreover, students are the high-skilled workers of the
future. The professionalisation of the labour market has created a demand for more highly educated workers, which are delivered by universities, colleges and polytechnics. Both high-skilled work and tertiary education facilities tend to be concentrated in cities.

In addition to the qualifications that university graduates acquire through their study, their study period is also an important phase in the accumulation of other forms of capital. In many ways, studying at university is grooming for a position in the urban middle class. The social networks established in this period, the durable relationships that are formed, and the building up of a relationship with the city all contribute to the development of what is referred to as a metropolitan habitus (Butler and Robson, 2003a).

When members of the middle classes become parents, their own educations have usually been completed. This does not mean that they no longer assume a position in the field of education. Many scholars view the struggle to find suitable primary and secondary education for children as central to the residential practices of urban middle classes. Butler and Robson (2003a) describe how the middle classes use a mix of economic, cultural and social capital to gain access to good schools in what they call an almost frantic manner. In the context of London, this is primarily achieved through the deployment of large sums of money, either to buy into the right catchment area or by paying high fees for private schools. As other scholars have also shown, other forms of capital can also play an important role in access to schools. The middle classes, for example, use their social capital to inquire about schools and gain access to good schools (Ball and Vincent, 1998). In addition, cultural capital in the form of taste influences outcomes in the field of education. The preferences of specific middle-class families for diverse school contexts and a focus on specific learning methods (for instance, Montessori, Steiner) also leads to differentiation in school choices (Ball et al., 1996).

Middle-class families in the field of housing

Housing plays a key part in the transformation of the geography of cities. Classic urban social ecological studies reserved a crucial role for housing as they sought to understand who is sorted into which areas (Park et al., 1925; Wirth, 1938). The key variables for most social-ecological studies are demand, which is primarily associated with income, ethnicity, and life phase, and supply, which includes the price, size and tenure of housing (Michelson, 1977; Robson, 1975). Although these key factors still play an important role in the housing choices of the urban middle classes, other dimensions of housing also play an important part. Various scholars have shown that housing, like other types of consumption, has symbolic dimensions and can be used for distinction. This applies to the aesthetics of housing and to its location and tenure. (Bridge, 2001b; De Wijis-Mulkens, 1999; Jager, 1986). Furthermore, living at a particular location shapes the use of time-space as it structures the pathways of everyday life (Hägerstrand, 1970).
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represents an anchor in time and space, structuring the routines and rhythms of everyday life but is also follows the tides of the life course. Positions in the housing field change over time, but they are also contingent upon previous positions, leading to the development of housing pathways (Clapham, 2005).

Following the work of Butler and Robson (2002a), this dissertation proposes that housing should be understood as a field with particular investment costs, notably economic capital, while simultaneously providing various benefits, including aspects of the dwelling itself, such as the number of rooms and the outdoor space, and aspects of the location of the dwelling, as they provide access to jobs and other amenities. To dwell at a particular location is an expression of taste and serves as the stage for the accumulation of various forms of capital: symbolic capital, social capital through the local networks that are accessed, and economic capital through returns on housing value.

It is argued here that when members of the middle classes have children, their positions in the field of housing change. Some aspects of housing, such as size, may become more important, while other aspects, such as access to urban amenities (bars, cafes, etc.), may be considered less important. A vast number of studies show that the transition to parenthood for middle classes in most western countries is associated with residential mobility, and more specifically, with the tenure transition into home ownership and moving from the city to a suburb (Bell, 1968; Mulder, 1996, 2006; Rossi, 1955). However, a substantial group of middle-class families stays in the inner city.

This study considers the interaction between the middle class habitus and its various forms of capital and the field of housing as crucial for an understanding of who stays in the city and who moves out. It is the combination of what housing provides and costs in an economic, social, and symbolic sense, as well as the management of time-space, that is expected to determine which middle-class families stay and which move.

Connecting the fields

As the previous paragraphs may have made clear, the fields of consumption, employment, education, and housing are highly integrated. Changes in one field may affect the positions in another. For example, housing influences access to schooling, shapes consumption patterns and affects commuting times and job access. Occupations and divisions of paid work within households determine purchasing power and thus influence housing access and consumption. This interconnectedness between the fields exacerbates differences in practice between middle classes. Urban middle classes may appear to have relatively similar practices in the various fields in the period before they become parents. However, the transition to parenthood may emphasise and exacerbate existing differences within the middle class. Having children may trigger a differentiation of the residential practices and, hence, of the time-space trajectories they choose between
middle classes with different orientations of capital and habitus.

Moreover, the rules of these fields and the way in which they are connected to each other are specific in both time and space. Many of the interactions of these fields, the positions of the middle class families and their responses to the transition to parenthood are specific to the Dutch and the Amsterdam-based context of the research period. The following section will discuss the most relevant specifics of the four fields in the context of Amsterdam.

Amsterdam Case

Amsterdam’s Employment Field
As a second-tier global city, Amsterdam has some important control functions in the international economy (Taylor, 2005). This is reflected in the concentration of headquarters of international corporations in the city and its region and its high proportion of expatriates. To some extent, Amsterdam’s labour market shows signs of social polarisation associated with these control functions: a growth of both high-skilled and low-skilled jobs takes place (Burgers and Musterd, 2002). However, middle-skilled jobs have not disappeared and still comprise an important segment of the labour force.

The vast majority of the Amsterdam labour force works in the service sector. Its largest sectors include finance and other business services, ICT, higher education, healthcare and retail (Musterd and Deurloo, 2006). Jobs in industry have largely disappeared from the city, yet in the region of Amsterdam, some areas still have concentrations of industrial jobs. Another characteristic of the Amsterdam labour market is its (inter)national position as a centre of creative industries (Kloosterman, 2004; Peck, 2011). Although strictly speaking, approximately 20% of the workforce works in what Florida (2002) calls the creative core, if knowledge workers are included, a more substantial part (approximately 40%) of the Amsterdam labour force works in these sectors (Trip, 2007).

A second important characteristic of the labour market is its flexibility, which is related to the fact that a significant part of the workforce is self-employed (11%)—in the central areas, it rates as high as 19% (O&S, 2011)—and to the fact that a very high proportion works part-time. In the Netherlands, approximately 75% of all working women work part-time (32 hours or less), along with approximately 25% of all men (SCP, 2008). In Amsterdam, these figures are somewhat less gendered. Furthermore, a large number of women in Amsterdam (66%) have paid work. The high female participation and the large share of part-time jobs and the self-employed create a labour market that is both flexible for employers and allows for a wide variety of labour market arrangements and divisions of labour between partners, particularly within family households.
Amsterdam’s Consumption Field

Recent comparative studies on various forms of consumption in the four largest cities in the Netherlands (DROAmsterdam, 2011) have confirmed earlier research that Amsterdam has maintained and even strengthened its position as the consumption capital of the Netherlands (Musterd and de Pater, 1992). Restaurants, hotels, bars and cafés are strongly overrepresented in Amsterdam, and the performing arts, as displayed in concert halls, theatres and museums, are clearly concentrated in Amsterdam.

This supply of consumption spaces results in a large stream of short-visit (inter)national tourists. It also contributes to the attractiveness of the city as a place of residence for specific types of households. According of the Atlas of Municipalities, Amsterdam ranks first on the list of most attractive cities in which to live in the Netherlands, mainly because of its wide range of consumption possibilities (Marlet and Van Woerkens, 2011). As studies on the middle classes in Amsterdam have suggested, the consumption of various services and goods and the consumption of Amsterdam’s urban space itself are among the most important factors that make specific areas of Amsterdam attractive for middle-class households. From a consumption perspective, it is logical that gentrification processes in the Netherlands have materialised most clearly in the inner-city boroughs of Amsterdam. (De Wijs-Mulkens, 1999; Vijgen and Engelsdorp Gastelaars, 1991, 1992; Wagenaar, 2003).

Amsterdam’s Educational Field

The Amsterdam educational context differs significantly from most other urban regions across the western world. Partly due to the fact that private education is practically nonexistent, in Amsterdam, fees do not determine access to schools. This greatly reduces the direct role of economic capital. Furthermore, in the Netherlands, parents have free school choice, which means that officially, no school catchment areas exist; therefore, the need to buy oneself into a particular neighbourhood is less urgent than in the UK. One might expect that in this context, it is less necessary to bring a neighbourhood and school into correspondence and, thus, that school choice is less of an issue than, for instance, in the UK.

There are, however, two important aspects of the Amsterdam field for (primary) education that ensure that the issue of schooling is connected to residential choices. 1) Amsterdam has witnessed an increasing interconnection between school and neighbourhood because schools increasingly adopt policies that prioritise children from the neighbourhood, and 2) middle-class parents appear to be increasingly concerned with the social, and particularly with the ethnic, composition of schools.

Debates about so-called ‘black’ schools in popular media and among parents are often concerned with negative socialisation and issues of ‘school atmosphere’.
In Amsterdam, as in other multicultural urban contexts, class is often mediated by race (Byrne, 2006, 2009). Obviously, school populations tend to reflect the population of the neighbourhoods in which they are located. Living in an area with many highly educated parents also increases the possibility of having access to schools with high performance scores (Karsten et al., 2006; Karsten et al., 2003). The ethnic composition of the neighbourhood is also directly related to issues of school choice. The fields of housing and education are therefore strongly connected to one another.

In the intertwined contexts of education and neighbourhood, economic means do play a role. Affluent households may not be able to directly buy good educations for their offspring, but indirectly, by being situated in more expensive areas, schools are primarily accessed through sufficient monetary means. Moreover, making use of other forms of capital may compensate for the less-powerful role of economic capital. The selection of specific types of education (Montessori, Dalton or other special learning methods) or ‘mixing’ schools to transform local schools into middle-class schools emphasising cultural forms of capital are among the strategies that members of the middle classes in Amsterdam use to obtain access to education.

Amsterdam’s Housing Field

The Amsterdam metropolitan housing market is characterised by a large social rental sector in the municipality and a relatively high level of owner-occupied housing in the suburban fringes of the region. Although a similar suburban-urban dichotomy exists in most other urban regions in Europe and the US, Amsterdam’s case is extreme. In Amsterdam, despite recent significant deregulation of the social housing sector, state-owned housing associations still own and allocate approximately 50% of all Amsterdam dwellings (Van der Veer and Schuiling, 2005), which are largely inaccessible to middle-class family households because of their excessively high incomes.

On the other hand, processes of gentrification and other forms of neighbourhood upgrading commonly occur in the central boroughs of Amsterdam, mainly in areas in which the private sector is large (Teernstra and Van Gent, 2012). Correspondingly, most of the centrally located private housing is or is becoming relatively expensive, particularly when measured per square metre. Dwellings in the central city of Amsterdam are often small and only rarely have a garden. Family housing in the owner-occupied or private rent sector in the central boroughs is expensive and is concentrated in the (upper)middle-class districts. Most of the larger affordable family dwellings are situated in the suburban areas of the municipality, which are generally considered less attractive by middle-class households, and in the region containing a wider variety of suburban milieus.

This housing context requires that family households that wish to stay in the inner city but also want to own and live in a relatively spacious dwelling command
considerable economic capital. Households that do not have these forms of capital may have the opportunity to access housing in another way (i.e., inheriting, connections, or cheating). However, the majority of these families will need to choose between moving to spacious homes in cheaper (suburban) areas or content themselves with less space in a more central location.

**Time frame**

The fieldwork for this study took place in the period between 2008 and 2010. However, the housing conditions of the respondents were also shaped by the years preceding 2008. The year 2008 represents a watershed between the economic prosperity before 2008 and the years that followed the biggest economic crisis since the 1930ties. The impact of what began as a real-estate crisis in the US had not yet been felt directly in Amsterdam at the beginning of this study. However, insecurity in the housing and job market has increasingly cast a shadow over the context of this study. The Amsterdam housing market has stalled as banks have become increasingly reluctant to provide mortgage loans. This might have affected the residential mobility of the respondents negatively in the period of this research. However, considering the strong position of most households in the housing market, the impact of the crisis has been relatively low.

**Data and Methods**

**Research design**

This research was designed to answer the main research question: *The overall research design focuses on two aspects: 1) how the transition to parenthood affects the residential practices of urban middle-class households, and 2) how these changes in practice are related to the habitus.*

To answer this question, this study makes use of longitudinal survey and interview data that were collected over a period of two years, from 2008 to 2010. This longitudinal design consisting of two waves of data collection allows a detailed analysis of the way the practices in various fields change when urban middle-class families become parents for the first time. Furthermore, this dissertation analyses the various aspects of the habitus of these households in depth to investigate how the residential practices of the urban middle classes change when they become parents.

**Self-collected data**

To study the impact of becoming a new parent, this research has sampled urban middle-class households that were expecting a first child. The respondents were required to meet the following criteria: at least one of the future parents had
completed higher education (HBO or University) and the household had at least
an income of 30,000 Euro annually. Furthermore, all of the households had to live
in the area that was defined as central Amsterdam (see Figure 1.3). This group was
sampled by approaching pregnant women at 14 midwife clinics\textsuperscript{1} in the central parts
of Amsterdam to fill out a questionnaire. Two of the 14 midwife clinics did not
participate in this study, but their catchment areas overlapped with those of other
clinics.

\textbf{First wave}
I collected most of the questionnaires personally by approaching all of the
pregnant women in the waiting rooms of the clinics (with a research assistant).
Nearly all the women who were approached complied (approximately 95%). Some
questionnaires were completed by acquaintances of the respondents who also
met the criteria. In total, a sample of 468 questionnaires was completed. Most of
these questionnaires were filled out by women who were expecting a first child,
but a considerable number (165) were pregnant with a second or third child. These
women were removed from the sample. Other households were also removed from
the sample because they did not meet the criteria of either not being middle class
or not living in the central boroughs of Amsterdam. Eventually, a sample of 291
households was collected for the first wave (see Table 1.2).

At the end of the first questionnaire, the respondents were asked whether
they would like to participate in an in-depth interview. Of the 291 respondents,
122 indicated that they agreed to participate. Of these 122 households, 36 couples
were selected and approached for an interview; 28 such interviews were performed
in 2008. The interviews took place at the homes of the respondents, except for
one, which took place in a café. The interviews were conducted with both partners
simultaneously, except for one in which only the mother participated. Most of
the interviews lasted approximately 90 minutes, ranging from one hour to almost
three hours.

\textsuperscript{1} Midwife clinics are the principal system in the Netherlands for overseeing pregnancies. For medical reasons,
pregnant women may be transferred to hospitalised care, but nearly all pregnant women (initially) attend
a midwife from the early stages of pregnancy. These clinics have a particular geographical catchment area
based on postal code. Although it is possible to choose another clinic, the majority of women visit the clinic
in her neighbourhoods. This made it possible to make a first selection of women that lived inside the inner-
ring road.
Second wave
The second wave of questionnaires was collected by contacting the respondents of
the first wave via the contact details they had provided in the first questionnaire.
Of the 291 households, 254 could be contacted via email or phone; the rest had not
provided (working) contact details. Eventually, 234 (92% of 254; 80% of 291) of the
first-wave respondents completed a second electronic questionnaire.

After two years, the same 28 couples were approached for a second interview.
One couple had divorced and did not participate again; two more couples also
discontinued. The second interviews were somewhat shorter. Again, the interviews
took place at the respondents’ homes except for one; this time, all interviews were
held with both partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.1.</th>
<th>Response questionnaires and sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First wave (2008)</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second wave (2010)</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representativity of Sample

The exact size of the population of Amsterdam cannot be established, as educational levels and income census data are not available on the required level. Nevertheless, the population can be estimated as follows: in the municipality of Amsterdam, 5459 first children were born in 2008. Of these children, approximately 1365 were born in the three-month period of the data collection.
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Of these 1365 children, it was estimated that 867 were born in the research area of central Amsterdam. Based on SSB data, 50% of these children were born to middle-class parents. This would imply that the population of first-born children of middle-class parents in central Amsterdam would be 433. Although the research mainly sampled women in the final stages of their pregnancies (32-40 weeks) with the result that the difference between births and pregnancies is relatively small, the number of children is actually greater than 433. However, it can be concluded that the 291 households collected in the first wave of 2008 could be expected to represent a considerable segment of the population. The very low level of non-response makes it likely that the sample is representative of the population of members of the urban middle classes who became first-time parents in Amsterdam during that period. The second wave of the sample had a response rate of 80%. An analysis of the non-response showed that no bias should be expected compared to the first wave.

Sub questions and data

To answer its main question, this dissertation addresses five sub questions that deal with the various aspects of residential practices. Together, the answers to these sub questions will be synthesised in the conclusion, where the main research question will be addressed. Table 1.2 summarises the research questions and shows what data are used to address them.

The first sub question focuses on the general patterns of family households and housing in Amsterdam:

What spatial patterns and trends in middle-class family settlement can be identified in Amsterdam neighbourhoods in the period 1995–2007 and how can these patterns and trends be explained? To identify the scale and scope of middle-class families in Amsterdam, this dissertation draws on statistical neighbourhood data from CBS and O&S Amsterdam and on data from the Living in Amsterdam Survey (WIA). The WIA survey, which is conducted every two years by the Statistical Office Amsterdam among randomly selected adults (N=14,019, 2007), contains data on educational levels. Data from 1995 to 2007 have been recalculated to provide data on the spatial patterns and trends of middle-class families in Amsterdam.

The second sub question is concerned with the relationship between residential environment, housing and practices in the field of employment:

How does the division of paid work correlate spatially within an urban context and how can we explain these patterns?

2 Of the total of 10,650 children, 63.5% were born in the research area. Because no data on whether they were firstborn exist at the neighbourhood level, the same proportion was used.
The second question is addressed by making use of register data from the 2005 and 2006 Social Statistical databases (SSB) and survey data from the Dutch Labour Force Survey (EBB, 2006). Among other things, the EBB dataset (n=82,697) contains national data on working hours and income. This allows for the construction of data on the division of paid work between spouses within family households with at least one working partner. The SSB dataset contains register data on work, income and residential areas, which allows for a detailed division of the data at the level of the neighbourhood.

The third sub question focuses on the roles of various forms of capital that provide access to housing:

How do middle-class households use various forms of capital to find a home in different housing fields?

This question is addressed by making use of the interview data from the first and second waves of the self-collected sample of urban middle-class families. Additionally, data from 20 interviews conducted for my master thesis in Copenhagen are used. A total of 75 interviews (from 49 different households) were analysed to determine the ways in which the middle classes navigated the Amsterdam and Copenhagen housing markets.

The fourth research question addresses the relationship between habitus, housing and the field of education:

How does the meaning of diversity change for urban middle-class households when they orientate for primary schooling for their children?

What are the socio-spatial strategies for school choice of white middle class parents in the context of Amsterdam and how are they informed by their habitus?

These questions are answered with the use of longitudinal interview and survey data from the self-collected sample. The interviews are first analysed to determine how the respondents’ attitudes towards diversity changed and how this is related to issues of school choice. Secondly, information from the interviews is combined with data from the questionnaires to establish which socio-spatial strategies middle class families use when dealing with urban diversity.

The fifth sub question addresses the relationship between the orientations of capital and residential mobility:

How can the residential mobility of urban middle-class households be explained by the orientation of their capital when they become parents for the first time?

This question synthesises insights from previous chapters by combining longitudinal data from the questionnaires of the self-collected sample and neighbourhood characteristics (data from CBS or O&S) in a multi-level regression analysis.
Table 1.2. Research questions and data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions and data</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub question 1: What spatial patterns and trends in middle-class family settlement can be</td>
<td>WIA data, 1995-2007; CBS data, several</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identified in Amsterdam neighbourhoods in the period 1995–2007 and how can these patterns</td>
<td>years; O&amp;S data, several years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and trends be explained?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub question 2: How does the division of work correlate spatially within an urban context</td>
<td>SSB and EBB data, 2005, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and how can we explain these patterns?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub question 3: How do middle-class households use various forms of capital to find homes</td>
<td>Interview data, fieldwork Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in different housing fields?</td>
<td>2008-2010 and Copenhagen 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub question 4: How does the meaning of diversity change for urban middle-class households</td>
<td>Interview data, fieldwork Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when they orientate for primary schooling for their children?</td>
<td>2008-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the socio-spatial strategies for school choice of white middle class parents in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the context of Amsterdam and how are they informed by their habitus?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub question 5: How can the residential mobility of urban middle-class households be</td>
<td>Own survey data, 2008-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explained by the orientation of their capital when they become parents for the first time?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main question: How do residential practices of urban middle classes change when they have</td>
<td>all data used for sub questions +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children and how are their residential practices informed by their habitus?</td>
<td>additional analyses of own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interview and survey data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reading guide

The chart below specifies how the relationships between habitus, the various fields and residential practices are conceptualised and which chapters of this dissertation address the various aspects of these relationships.

Figure 1.5. Conceptual scheme of relationships and corresponding chapters
This dissertation will first take an introductory approach by considering the spatial patterns of urban middle-class families in Amsterdam and determining what trends can be identified. Chapter 2 addresses the relationship between habitus and residential practices without looking into the various fields. It provides an answer to the sub question What spatial patterns and trends in middle-class family settlement can be identified in Amsterdam neighbourhoods in the period 1995–2007 and how can these patterns and trends be explained? Because the empirical work for Chapter 2 was carried out in 2008, this chapter is followed by Box 1, which presents some of the updated findings for the period 2007-2011.

Chapter 3 analyses the relationship between habitus and specific residential practices that are related to the field of employment. It addresses the sub question How does the division of work correlate spatially within an urban context and how can we explain these patterns? This chapter is followed by Box 2, which connects the findings from Chapter 3 with the results from my own sample. This Box shows how the division of labour among the couples in the self-collected sample is organised.

Although all the chapters cover practices in the field of housing, Chapter 4 specifically looks into the relationship between middle-class habitus, the field of housing and residential practices. The sub question here is How do middle-class households use various forms of capital to find a home in different housing fields? Again this chapter is followed by an addendum (Box 3) that provides additional information about the housing situation of households in the self-collected sample.

The fifth chapter addresses the relationship between middle-class habitus, the field of education and residential practices. More specifically, this chapter provides an answer to the following questions: How does the meaning of diversity change for urban middle-class households when they orientate for primary schooling for their children? What are the socio-spatial strategies for school choice of white middle class parents in the context of Amsterdam and how are they informed by their habitus?

The final empirical chapter (Chapter 6) provides an integrated analysis of practices in the four fields simultaneously. Apart from the practices in the other three fields, it also takes the field of consumption and its relationship with residential practices into account. This chapter answers the sub question How can the residential practices of urban middle-class households when they become parents be explained by their orientation of capital? Therefore, this chapter prefaces the conclusions that will integrate the findings of the chapters of this thesis with existing theories and findings from the literature.
As a final supplement, Chapter 6 is followed with Box 4, which provides some additional information on the consumption patterns of the families in the sample.

The final chapter (Chapter 7) presents an integrated perspective on the differentiation of middle-class residential practices in the various fields and describes how this is not related only to orientations of capital but also to other variations in middle-class habitus. The findings from this dissertation are connected back to the literature. Finally, the study concludes with an agenda for future research.
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Introduction

Most middle-class households will one day have children, but for many (future) parents the city does not seem to be the most attractive environment in which to bring them up. The (perceived) inconveniences of urban living and lack of suitable and affordable family housing on the one hand, and on the other the idea of space, the quiet, and green of the suburbs make many parents decide to leave the city for suburban milieus.

Despite the predominance of this trend in the last few decades, some middle-class families have always remained in the city, and it seems that a new orientation of middle-class families towards the city is taking place. The scale of this process seems limited and it cannot compare to suburbanization. However, studies of middle-class families in the city have indicated that urban living may be on the rise as a way of coping with the opportunities and constraints of today’s family life (Butler and Robson, 2001, 2003a; Karsten, 2003, 2007). Explanations for this phenomenon have been suggested from various perspectives: the rise of female employment (Bondi, 1991, 1999); increased commuting times for suburbanites; the increased importance of centrality in some sectors of the economy (Hamnett, 1994b); or a taste for urban life. Some aspects of this reorientation have been identified in several qualitative studies. Butler & Robson (2001, 2003) have provided a typological overview of different types of neighbourhood in London that are attractive residential milieus for different middle-class groups. However, not much is known about the scale, spatial patterns, or processes of middle-class family settlement in urban areas.

This paper fills some of the voids in this field of research by presenting recent data on the scale, patterns, and processes of urban middle-class families in Amsterdam over the last decade. The data and maps that are presented in this paper are used to formulate some new hypotheses on middle-class families in the city. The main question addressed is: What spatial patterns and trends in middle-class family settlement can be identified in Amsterdam neighbourhoods in the period 1995-2007 and how can these patterns and trends be explained? This question
breaks down into three sub questions: 1) What are the patterns, the scale, and location of middle-class families in Amsterdam? 2) What are the trends in middle-class family settlement? And 3): How can these patterns and trends be explained?

In this paper we first review the existing body of literature on middle-class families in the city. Second, we provide descriptive data on family households in the period 1995-2007 in Amsterdam. This information serves as a context for further analysis of the changes in the settlement patterns of middle-class families in certain Amsterdam neighbourhoods. Third, we profile the middle-class neighbourhoods and tentatively explain the patterns and processes by comparing our findings with the literature on this topic.

**Theoretical embedding**

A residential reorientation of middle-class families to the city should be put into two perspectives: 1) a general tendency in many western cities of a reorientation of the middle classes towards the city, as exemplified and symbolized by gentrification and urban renewal projects aiming at building for an ‘economically sustainable population’ (Lund Hansen et al., 2001); and 2) the role of place in balancing work, family, leisure, and social obligations in the everyday lives of (middle-class) families (Droogleever Fortuijn 1993; De Meester et al. 2007). This reorientation should be linked to the meaning of place in the organization of everyday life for households with children, as well as to the meaning of place in the processes of the (re)production of class and, moreover, the way in which the everyday practices of families and the production of class are interrelated. In order to understand a (re-)orientation of some middle-class families to the city, we need to understand why for decades suburbs were the natural habitats for middle-class families and why we may be witnessing a shift in this supposedly ‘natural’ choice of the suburbs in favour of inner-city areas.

Wendell Bell explained the preference of most middle-class families for a suburban residential location by connecting it to lifestyle. He found that middle-class households who have a ‘familist’ lifestyle chose a suburban location. By familism he meant “a high valuation of family living, marriage at young age, childcentredness and other such characteristics.” The suburbs offered a residential environment that could accommodate these preferences: more space, green areas, homogeneity, and safety for the children compared with the inner city. Furthermore, buying a house in the suburbs represented a long-term investment and an opportunity to create one’s own private domain within a homogeneous community (Bell, 1968; Gans, 1968). He contrasted these familist groups with other middle-class groups who were more oriented to the city because of their ‘careerist’ or ‘consumerist’ lifestyles. He stressed, however, that most of these
careerists and consumerists would become familists as and when they became parents. Hence his clear link of lifestyle to life stage.

Bell’s account connecting familism with the suburbs still holds for most middle-class families. For many, moving to a suburban area is still motivated by the advantages that Bell described: large dwellings on private grounds, lots of green and space; a homogeneous population consisting of other middle-class families; and an environment free from urban problems and dangers (Lupi and Musterd, 2006). For most families moving to the suburbs seems the most logical step to take once they have children.

Nevertheless, as Bell had already hinted, parts of the inner cities in many metropolitan areas in the western world have become popular among singles or couples with higher income and education levels. The return of both people and capital to the inner city, starting in global cities such as London and New York, has been described as gentrification (Gale, 1980; Glass, 1964; Ley, 1996; Smith, 1979). These middle-class households prefer the inner city for various reasons. The pull factors include: (cultural) consumption; the proximity of work; anonymity and tolerance (Lees, 1996; Rothenberg, 1995) (i.e. of gay and lesbian gentrification); and distinction (Caulfield, 1994; Ley, 2003). In fact, Bell had already identified some of these pull factors; he saw them as particularly relevant for careerist (work) and consumerist (consumption) lifestyles.

Much of Bell’s lifestyle explanation is based on choice and does not take into account the structural conditions that may have enabled and constrained the emergence of these lifestyles in the first place. The renaissance of inner-city areas as exemplified by gentrification is, according to Lees and others “nothing more than the neighbourhood expression of class inequality” (Lees et al., 2008). Most scholars now agree that gentrification is the interplay of production and consumption. Gentrification can be explained as the logical consequence of disinvestment in inner cities (N.Smith, 1979, 1996b); changing demand (Ley, 1996) and the professionalization of the labour market (Hamnett, 1991, 1994a, b); and demographic changes such as the postponement of childbearing, the rise of single households, and female emancipation (Bondi, 1991). Although the gentrification literature continues to expand and encompass more themes, aspects, and geographical contexts, gentrification studies are typically associated with middle-class single or dual households in a life stage prior to having children. Little attention has been paid to what happens to gentrifiers when they have children or, more generally, when they age (D.Smith, 2002). Only a few studies have included the role of families in this process (Bridge, 2003; Brun and Fagnani, 1994; Butler et al., 2008; Butler and Robson, 2003a; Karsten, 2003, 2007).

It is important, however, to realize that gentrification is a practice that is often connected to a life stage before having children. The everyday practices and strategies middle-class families use for the intergenerational reproduction of class differ in some respects for middle-class people who do not (yet) have children.
Bridge (2001, 2003, 2006) has helped us understand gentrification from a lifecycle perspective. He argues that when gentrifiers have children their housing practices may diverge by following different time-space trajectories. Various fractions within the middle classes apply various housing strategies in reproducing their class position (Bridge, 2001a, 2003).

The age of the children also influences these housing strategies (Silverman et al., 2005). Very young children can still be accommodated in a small apartment and they interact very little with public space. However, school choice and the birth of a second or third child may cause parents to reconsider where to live.

Butler and Robson (2003) have mapped London neighbourhoods that show various forms of middle-class settlement, including families. These authors connected residential location (the neighbourhood) with class position, indicated by the amount and orientation of cultural, social, and economic capital. They built on the work of Pierre Bourdieu (1984) by making use of his concepts of habitus, field, and capital. These authors connect place with lifestyle by constructing ‘residential choice’ as a practice that is informed by class position represented by the habitus (Butler & Robson 2003) rather than being a free choice. They identify four fields that play a role in determining what neighbourhoods fit with which middle-class groups: housing, employment, consumption, and education.

In addition, Karsten’s work on ‘family gentrifiers’ (2003) points out that an urban lifestyle for middle-class families has three related aspects: first, an urban location offering time-budget advantages, which facilitate combining childcare and a career, particularly for women (De Meester et al., 2007; Droogleever Fortuijn, 1993). Second, large amounts of social capital accumulated through social networks enable certain middle-class families to remain urban. Third, living in the city plays an important part in a family’s identity; they consider themselves real urbanites and many see the suburbs as a homogeneous, boring, and petit-bourgeois world where they simply would not fit in. (Karsten 2007).

We are induced to conceive of a place of residence as a site: the dwelling and its characteristics (field of housing); and its situation, the neighbourhood, which we understand as a field that is made accessible through various forms of capital, and at the same time offers a stage for the accumulation of capital. To access a neighbourhood, one needs either enough financial capital to buy a dwelling in a certain area or to know the right people who will rent one a dwelling. But taste could also be conceived as a form of cultural capital, which also determines the neighbourhoods that can be accessed (Bourdieu, 1984, 1999; Bridge, 2001b; Jager, 1986).

On the other hand, a neighbourhood is enabling in the sense that it offers time-space advantages, social networks, access to good schooling, and so forth. Buying a home in a particular neighbourhood should be understood as an investment: not only an economic investment (although this can very well be a motivation too), but also an investment of one form of capital in order to acquire another. A field is a stage where the exchange of capital takes place. To ascertain
which neighbourhoods middle-class families find attractive, we need to know not only what is required in terms of capital to access a certain dwelling in a certain neighbourhood, but also how it positions families in the fields of housing, education, consumption, and employment.

**Methods**

We analyse the case of Amsterdam in four steps. First we put it in perspective by comparing the historical trends in family households in Amsterdam with data from the other three major cities in the Netherlands (Utrecht, The Hague, and Rotterdam). Second, we show the spatial patterns and trends of family households in Amsterdam neighbourhoods in the period 1996-2007 on the basis of municipal statistics. Our third step is to reveal the patterns and trends of middle-class families in Amsterdam neighbourhoods. In the Netherlands, however, there are no statistics for level of education at the level of individual households. We have based our analysis of middle-class families on a dataset from a sample of the Living in Amsterdam Survey (WIA), conducted every two years since 1995 by the Statistical Office Amsterdam. This sample is representative of the city as a whole, and for 2007 also at the neighbourhood level. However, the numbers in former editions are too low to allow significant conclusions to be drawn for developments at the neighbourhood level. Nevertheless, for the city as a whole it is possible to use the results of the WIA-survey to analyse trends in spatial patterns.

The WIA data have been recalculated to provide useful data for our analysis. Since we have used this sample to draw conclusions for the population as a whole, we encountered problems inherently associated with ‘translation’ from sample to population. We provided confidence intervals to give an indication of the margin of error. Eventually, we defined middle-class families as households with a net monthly income higher than 1611 Euro (modal income 2006), with at least one adult that has completed education at Bachelor level or higher and at least one cohabiting child (below age 18).

Our definition of family is hence quite broad, since it includes all households with cohabiting children, including single-parent households as well as other family configurations. Our definition of middle class depends on two classic variables: income and level of education. We are aware that this choice limits our analysis, particularly as we assume a Bourdieuvian perspective, in which various forms of capital other than income and education define various middle-class fractions. We are, however, constrained by the data and cannot include factors such as occupational type and status.

---

1 Family households include single-parent families, married and unmarried couples with children (source CBS 2008).
Finally, we tentatively explain the patterns and processes by categorizing the main locations of middle-class families.

**Trends in family households in the Netherlands**

Looking at an overview of the number of family households, an upward trend can be seen since the end of the 1980s (Table 2.1). Data on households do not go back before 1987. However, data on the percentages of children in the four major cities in the Netherlands are available for the period 1972-2007 (Table 2.2). Here we see that, since the end of the 1980s, the percentage of children has been on the rise in all four cities, although recently it seems to be dropping again in Amsterdam and Rotterdam.

| Table 2.1. Percentage of households with children in four largest Dutch cities |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Amsterdam | 21.6 | 23.2 | 24.0 | 24.4 |
| The Hague | - | 20.7 | 21.1 | 22.1 |
| Rotterdam | - | 28.4 | 28.5 | 28.7 |
| Utrecht | - | 21.6 | 24.2 | 23.9 |

Source: CBS (2008)

| Table 2.2. Children (0-15) percentage of total population in four largest Dutch cities |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Amsterdam | 19.0 | 16.6 | 14.6 | 13.7 | 14.7 | 15.7 | 16.1 | 15.9 |
| The Hague | 19.3 | 17.2 | - | 14.7 | 15.5 | 16.4 | 17.4 | 17.5 |
| Rotterdam | 20.6 | 18.2 | 16.2 | 15.4 | 16.5 | 17.3 | 17.4 | 16.8 |
| Utrecht | 22.9 | 19.1 | 16.1 | 13.8 | 14.2 | 14.9 | 15.8 | 16.2 |

Source: CBS (2008)

One explanation for the general increase in the numbers of both children and family households is that the four cities have been engaged in large-scale housing construction in the periphery of their territories, or have extended their municipal borders so as to encompass suburban neighbourhoods that formerly belonged to other municipalities. De Aker and Uiburg in Amsterdam are large-scale housing development projects that have attracted many family households owing to their supply of large single-family dwellings. These areas are inhabited by many families with relatively high fertility rates and who are predominantly native Dutch. An increase in children could also be explained by higher birth rates amongst non-western immigrant populations, who over the last few decades have become concentrated in the larger cities in the Netherlands. The majority of children are now of non-native Dutch descent (O&S, 2010). However, non-western immigrants’ fertility rates are becoming more similar to the Dutch average (Garssen et al., 2005). Recently, the share has stabilized.
Since many immigrant households lack the means to buy a home, most non-western family households rely on social-rental accommodation, which is mainly clustered in the larger cities (Musterd and Deurloo, 1997). Nevertheless, suburbanization among non-western groups has recently started to become more significant. Initially, only immigrants of Surinam descent showed these trends (De Groot, 2004), but more recently immigrants of Turkish and Moroccan origins have also demonstrated similar patterns (Garssen et al., 2005).

With these explanations in mind we turn to patterns of family households in Amsterdam neighbourhoods.

Family households in Amsterdam neighbourhoods
In the municipality of Amsterdam only 24.4 percent of households are a family (against one third in the Netherlands). The distribution of families in the city, however, is quite uneven. Neighbourhoods have figures ranging from just 6 percent of the households in some central neighbourhoods (situated in the red-light district for example) to almost 50 percent in more peripheral neighbourhoods in the Southeast, Western, and Northern edges of the city.

Figure 2.1 shows the ten neighbourhoods with the highest percentages of households with children. Nine areas are situated in the periphery of the municipality; most of these are characterized by a relatively high share of larger, owner-occupied dwellings. Two neighbourhoods deviate in some respects. Kolenkit and Nieuwendam Noord are typical immigrant neighbourhoods and most of the housing consists of cheap social-rental apartments. The rest of the neighbourhoods in Figure 2.1 are dominated by owner-occupied housing.

In Amsterdam two types of area seem to be typically rich with children: low-income, cheap (social) rental housing areas that are mainly inhabited by non-western families with relatively many children; and owner-resident housing areas that are mainly inhabited by native-Dutch households.

---

3 Amsterdam municipality, 747,290 (2008) inhabitants, comprises the central city in the metropolitan area (2.1 million) and some of the suburban areas. Most of the suburbs, however, are municipalities in their own right.

4 Neighbourhoods are defined as buurtcombinaties. On average a buurtcombinatie in Amsterdam has 7784 inhabitants. Although these units are quite large, they are fairly homogeneous in terms of housing, ethnicity, and class.
Figure 2.1. Amsterdam neighbourhoods with highest percentage of families

Source: O&S (2009)

Trends in family households in Amsterdam neighbourhoods
Figure 2.2 shows that nearly all the neighbourhoods undergoing the strongest growth (in black) are located in a belt immediately around the city centre. The neighbourhoods that have the highest share in family households (from Figure 2.1) are shown in grey. Inner-city districts are showing stronger growth rates in the share of family households than peripheral neighbourhoods. Hence, it seems that in Amsterdam inner-city neighbourhoods are becoming more child rich.

As we can see in Table 2.3, most of the neighbourhoods that have witnessed strong growth in family households are characterized not only by a central location, but also by a relatively affluent and native-Dutch population. Apparently the growth in family households in most of these neighbourhoods cannot be explained more than marginally by an increase in immigrant groups. Nieuwendam Noord and Overtoomseveld (in the western part of the inner-city) are the exceptions.
Except for Overtoomseveld and Nieuwendam Noord, most of the fastest growing areas are either middle-class, or gentrification neighbourhoods (that are socially and physically upgrading). Furthermore, the growth in family households in most neighbourhoods cannot be ascribed to increasing shares of non-western immigrants. We are therefore tempted to conclude that the increase in family households in Amsterdam is associated with the (new) residential preferences of the middle classes. However, data at the neighbourhood level say little about the individual household level. We need to look at individual households to test the assumption that the increase in the share of family households is actually associated with middle-class families.
Table 2.3. Amsterdam neighbourhoods with the strongest increase (%) of households with children (1996-2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Family households 1996 (N)</th>
<th>Family households 2006 (N)</th>
<th>Percentage of which are Moroccan and Turkish families 1996</th>
<th>Percentage of which are Moroccan and Turkish families 2006</th>
<th>Relative average income 2004 (Amsterdam =100)</th>
<th>Relative income growth 1994-2004 (Amsterdam =100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centrale markt (ecowijk)</td>
<td>24 (123)</td>
<td>36.5 (405)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieuwemond Noord</td>
<td>33.3 (1801)</td>
<td>39.3 (2138)</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oostelijk Havengebied</td>
<td>2.4 (835)</td>
<td>31.8 (2437)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staatsliedenbuurt</td>
<td>12.3 (861)</td>
<td>17.4 (1321)</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollobuurt</td>
<td>24.1 (737)</td>
<td>36.2 (917)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middenmeer</td>
<td>26.3 (1249)</td>
<td>39.7 (666)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtoomsveld</td>
<td>28.9 (1082)</td>
<td>33.1 (1188)</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Zuid WTC</td>
<td>13.9 (90)</td>
<td>18.1 (114)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmersbuurt</td>
<td>15.1 (550)</td>
<td>19.1 (639)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willemspark</td>
<td>22.9 (517)</td>
<td>26.6 (661)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>22.9 (80720)</td>
<td>24.1 (87868)</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: O&S (2006), X = no data available

Table 2.4. Middle-class family households in Amsterdam 1995-2007 as percentage of total households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(79,978)</td>
<td>(85,203)</td>
<td>(88,405)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-class households</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(64,517)</td>
<td>(84,914)</td>
<td>(104,096)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-class families</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12,386)</td>
<td>(18,820)</td>
<td>(28,345)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Middle-Class Family households in Amsterdam neighbourhoods

Table 2.4 shows that middle-class families have more than doubled from 12,400 in 1995 (3.6 percent of all households) to 28,400 (7.7 percent) in 2007. At the same time the number of middle-class families (defined as more highly educated and higher income) has increased by some 40,000 (from 16.2 percent to 25.4 percent). The number and share of family households also increased in general. These figures imply that part of the growth in middle-class families may come from immigration especially to new-build areas, but that most of the increase comes from middle-class households who decided to stay within the city when they had children.

---

5 Data are based on the WIA sample. 1995 N= 6,076; 2001 N= 12,148; 2007:14,019; 95% confidence intervals are: 1995: 3.3-4.1% ; 2001: 4.8-5.6%; and 2007 7.1-8.1%
In Table 2.5 the top ten middle-class family neighbourhoods are summarized. On average 32 percent of the households in these areas are a family; 20 percent are a middle-class family. Together these neighbourhoods are home to 14,503 family households and approximately 9,300 middle-class families (33 percent of all middle-class families in the city). The proportion of middle-class families as part of all family households in these neighbourhoods is higher (0.62) than the Amsterdam average (0.32) (not shown in table).

Four of these neighbourhoods are situated in relatively peripheral parts of the city (IJburg, De Aker, Waterland, Sloten) (see Figure 2.4). Apollobuurt, Museumkwartier, Willemspark, Middenmeer, Scheldebuurt and Oostelijk Havengebied are situated within the motor ringway.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amsterdam neighbourhoods with highest percentage middle-class families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family households 2007 (O&amp;S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ijburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterland/Nieuwendammerdijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonbourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middenmeer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oostelijk Havengebied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Aker/Lutzemeer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willemspark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloten en Riekerpolder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheldebuurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museumkwartier/Duivelseiland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 10 neighbourhoods together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: O&S 2007; WIA 2007

FIGURE 2.4. Amsterdam neighbourhoods with highest percentage of middle-class families

Trends in middle-class family neighbourhoods
Our data are based on a sample with a size which does not allow for significant claims for the developments of the share of middle-class households in individual neighbourhoods. However, when aggregated, these neighbourhoods can be analysed for developments over the past twelve years. When we single out the central neighbourhoods and look at the development in these middle-class family

42
neighbourhoods, we see that they show a stronger growth than the peripheral
neighbourhoods. This finding supports the theory that middle-class families
are increasingly oriented towards inner-city living. Nevertheless, peripheral
neighbourhoods still have higher concentrations of middle-class families. The
average of the share of middle-class families for the ten middle-class family
neighbourhoods increased less rapidly than for the city as whole (Table 2.6). This
implies that other areas in the city show even stronger growth.

In Table 2.3 we also saw two areas (Helmersbuurt and Staatsliedenbuurt) that
are not traditional middle-class areas, but are gentrifying in terms of both physical
and social upgrading. They showed a strong increase in the share of families, and at
the same time a faster growth in income than the city as a whole in the period 1996-
2006. This type of neighbourhood, together with other centrally-situated areas, may
be responsible for accommodating increasing shares of middle-class families.

Table 2.7 shows that, in 2007, the share of middle-class families with only
young children (younger than five years) in the ten neighbourhoods with the
highest share of middle-class families became lower than in 1995. Furthermore,
in 2007 the share in central neighbourhoods was higher than in the peripheral
neighbourhoods. This finding indicates that families with children also tend to
stay in peripheral middle-class family neighbourhoods when their children get
older. In contrast, in the city as a whole, the share of middle-class families with
young children has increased, indicating that the growth in middle-class families
in the city is stronger among families with young children.

| TABLE 2.6. Middle-class family households in Amsterdam 1995-2007 as percentage of
total households |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central neighbourhoods</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral neighbourhoods</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for top 10 middle class family neighbourhoods</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| TABLE 2.7. Households with only young children (age <5) as % of all middle class
families in middle class family neighbourhoods |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central neighbourhoods</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral neighbourhoods</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for top 10 middle class family neighbourhoods</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tentative explanations
We have presented empirical evidence that new-build areas, typical immigrant neighbour- 
hoods, but particularly centrally-located middle-class and gentrification areas 
show a strong growth of family households. We have demonstrated that middle-
class families show a stronger growth than both families and middle-class groups 
in general. Our data suggest that, although many middle-class families also choose 
peripheral areas within the municipality, middle-class families increasingly prefer 
centrally-located middle-class areas. In this last section we offer tentative explana-
tions for the patterns and processes in middle-class family settlement in Amsterdam. 

We argue that, for families, the management of time has becomes much more acute, while the position in other fields is changing. In Bourdieuvian terms: time is more at stake for families; it is a rare and thus valuable form of capital. Choosing a residential location (that is, living in a certain neighbourhood) may be a strategy to optimize a household’s time budget. This choice requires investment in terms of other forms of capital (financial, cultural, social). We therefore suggest that, to understand why specific families reside in specific areas, it is necessary to comprehend both the time-space consequences of that place as well as how it might position people in class terms. Although we recognize that the meaning of neighbourhood as a community is fading and becoming replaced by networked forms of community (Blokland and Savage, 2008), we maintain that every neighbourhood still offers specific conditions that structure everyday life in a functional sense (time-space) and in a symbolic sense by providing those who participate in that field with meaning (Van Engelsdorp Gastelaars, 2006).

Following Bourdieu (1990), we see neighbourhoods as fields that are characterized by local rules and that can be accessed by making use of specific forms of capital. The practice of living in a particular neighbourhood is therefore enabled by commanding certain forms of capital (for instance, money to buy a house in a particular area or having a certain taste for some area), but also offers a stage where capital can be accumulated (by building up a sense for the city social networks as well as being an expression of good taste: symbolic capital).

In addition to the four fields (housing, employment, consumption, and education) distinguished by Butler and Robson (2003), we therefore suggest that place of residence (neighbourhood) represents a structure for the commanding of time. We recognize that the fields of housing, employment, consumption, and education are integrated though both time and space and that time-space is a part of gentrification research. In fact, important aspects of classic gentrification theory were based on accounts of the advantages of proximity to work and leisure (Clay, 1979; Gale, 1980; Glass, 1964) and also on the symbolic meaning of centrality (Zukin, 1987, 1995). We do not claim that integrating time into gentrification literature is entirely new. However, we propose that time should be treated as another type of capital that plays an important part in the everyday life of middle-class families.
A typology is presented that captures the trend towards centrally-located neighbourhoods and explores the implications of neighbourhood in terms of class to show how the neighbourhoods we identify may suit various types of middle-class families. The typology grasps the ‘accessibility’ aspect: what capital is required to access a neighbourhood; and the ‘benefit’ aspect: what capital the neighbourhood ‘provides’.

The first dimension captures the amount of capital required to access a neighbourhood. We appreciate that various forms of capital are important in gaining access to the housing market of a particular neighbourhood. Nonetheless, we suggest that economic capital plays the most important part in gaining access to housing in a neighbourhood, particularly for middle-class households. In this typology, this dimension is measured by the average house value of owner-occupied dwellings.

The second dimension of the typology captures what the neighbourhood provides. We focus on the time-space consequences of residential location within the city for practices in various fields. Our descriptions of the types of neighbourhood show how location has time consequences in the fields of consumption, education, and employment (Butler & Robson, 2003). A central location within the city is treated as a proxy for what is called a rich opportunity structure (De Meester et. al. 2007), that is, a dense network of amenities and facilities, ranging from schools and childcare facilities to restaurants, concert halls, and sports facilities. Central areas are defined as being situated within the first motor ringway (see Figure 2.4).

We are aware that this typology is a simplistic method of classifying neighbourhoods. Apart from their internal differentiation, neighbourhoods represent a complex set of variables that play a role in the social and spatial organization of everyday life. Housing price and location defined as centrality only.

### Table 2.8 Typology of Amsterdam middle-class family neighbourhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Accessibility</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Peripheral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relatively inaccessible (real estate value &gt; €300,000)</td>
<td>Apollobuurt (€572,000)</td>
<td>Zuid WTC (€406,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Museumkwartier (€506,000)</td>
<td>Waterland (€347,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willemspark (€496,00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively accessible (real estate value &lt; €300,000)</td>
<td>Oostelijk Havengebied (€283,000)</td>
<td>IJburg (€296,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middenmeer (€274,000)</td>
<td>Osorp de Akker (€256,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scheldebuurt (€271,000)</td>
<td>Sloten en Riekerpolder (€243,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helmersbuurt (€249,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staatsliedenbuurt (€173,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: O&S (2007)
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cover part of this complexity. We therefore mainly use this typology to structure some broader descriptions of the various neighbourhoods in terms of the position they take in the fields of housing, consumption, education, and employment and how the location impacts the management of time, also taking transport into account.

The neighbourhoods classified in this typology are the top ten neighbourhoods in terms of share of middle-class families, plus three neighbourhoods that showed a strong growth in families and average income.

Central and inaccessible neighbourhoods
Willemspark, Apollobuurt, Museumkwartier, and Zuid WTC are situated in the southern borough, which for many decades has had an upper-middle-class population. The areas are characterized by quite high densities: many large dwellings from the end of the 19th century with multiple bedrooms, often with small back gardens, in relatively quiet streets. Partly because of status and partly because of size and quality, the housing prices of these dwellings are among the highest in the city. These prices make it difficult for outsiders to gain access, so that these neighbourhoods remain homogeneous. Investment in these areas is secure, both financially (‘risk-averse’ investment (Gale, 1980) and symbolically (because the status of the neighbourhood is high and stable). Hence living in these areas provides a ‘safe’ status.

The homogeneity of the population fosters reciprocal relationships between residents, for example, by taking care of each others’ children. Like-mindedness amongst parents may also foster child-child relationships in these areas. Thanks to the number of children in these neighbourhoods, children can easily find peers to play with. For children, however, this area is not perfect. Parked cars, narrow pavements, and a lack of playground and green make these areas unsuitable for playing outdoors (Karsten, 2005; Matthews, 2003).

The neighbourhoods are within walking or cycling distance of the city centre, major train stations, opera house and concert hall, restaurants, daily grocery shops, and so forth. In addition, most of these neighbourhoods are also only a few minutes away from the motorway, and have relatively plenty of parking space. The international airport and other important business areas, especially for financial services and law firms, are within a short distance (15 minutes).

As Butler and Robson (2003) have shown in the London case, choosing a good school for one’s children is considered a decision of utmost importance. In Amsterdam, parents have free school choice, which makes it less urgent to ‘migrate along with good schooling’. Nevertheless, good schooling is one of the top priorities of middle-class parents. The primary schools considered to be the best are mainly situated in the central and expensive neighbourhoods. Often these schools are of a specific kind (Montessori; Free School; Dalton), making them prone to selection on the basis of taste, which is a mechanism for class distinction (Bourdieu, 1984).
Accessible central neighbourhoods

Middenmeer is situated four kilometres southeast of the city centre. The neighbourhood shares many of the advantages of the central expensive areas in terms of housing. A considerable share of the housing is purchasable on the free market and the supply consists of relatively spacious and generally good quality housing, often with private green space. Middenmeer resembles the central and expensive areas described above in building style and building period, but housing prices are lower. The share of families in the population is large and has increased considerably in recent years. Owing to the construction of new housing and the lower prices, access to this area has become easier for middle-class groups with slightly lower incomes.

The somewhat more peripheral location makes the area less diverse in terms of urban functions such as bars, clubs, and shops, which makes it less lively. The area is quite dormant: the focus is the residential function rather than shopping or other forms of consumption. Although Middenmeer has less of an urban feel and the city centre and its functions are further away, this area has most of the amenities required for everyday life, such as grocery shops, neighbourhood restaurants, and childcare facilities. The vicinity of sporting facilities is one of the major assets of this area, as well as the presence of a big central park and many primary schools. This area is quite suitable for children: streets have broad pavements and are not usually crowded; sporting facilities and playgrounds are available and also accessible for children on their own.

Oostelijk Havengebied is a new-development project in the former eastern docklands, situated three kilometres from the city centre. In the course of the last few decades this industrial district has been transformed into a varied and popular residential area. The area has achieved the status of a new district with character by using bold architecture and making subtle use of history. This carefully-planned identity has contributed to the status of the area and helped it stand out as a new-build area that has become acceptable in terms of ‘good taste’.

As with all Amsterdam new-build areas, a considerable proportion of its housing stock has been reserved for social housing, which produced heterogeneity in terms of income and ethnic background. Despite this mixture, the Oostelijk Havengebied is predominantly a middle-class area, with high shares of larger apartments and single-family dwellings. Although its increasing popularity has pushed prices beyond the Amsterdam average, the area was quite accessible in terms of price and rent when first on the market. Initially, the city planning department designated this area as a residential quarter particularly for dual-earner households without children. Nevertheless, Oostelijk Havengebied has become inhabited by large numbers of family households. Despite the problems that arose in terms of lack of childcare, schooling, and play facilities (Karsten, 2003), this area offers advantages for families with children, too. The way in which the
building blocks have been placed creates a public space that is relatively child-friendly (low traffic) and enables social control. Oostelijk Havengebied is centrally located at 10 minutes by bicycle from the Central Station. The area is also well connected to the circular ringway. Two tramlines and several bus services open up the area. Although few jobs are located within the neighbourhood, access to both railway and motorway make this a strategic location in commuting terms. All kinds of opportunities for going out are also within reach of this location. In addition, the area itself is also witnessing an increase in restaurants, bars, and other opportunities for cultural consumption such as the new jazz club and chamber music building. Daily groceries are concentrated in the shopping centre at five minutes by bicycle from most homes in the area.

Scheldebuurt is situated three kilometres south of the central city. The neighbourhood forms part of the larger Plan-South development project designed in the early 20th century by the famous architect Berlage. The housing stock consists mainly of larger private-rental apartments (4 rooms or more). Housing prices are lower than in other parts of the southern borough, but are still much above the city average. The neighbourhood is located between the city centre and the business districts in the south. Several tramlines and quick access to the motorway gives this area good accessibility.

The neighbourhood is mainly a residential area, which is crossed by two arteries where most commercial functions are concentrated. Daily groceries, but also many bars and restaurants are within walking distance.

Scheldebuurt has some good schools in the area itself, but is also located within the southern borough where most of the good schools are concentrated.

Built in the late 19th century, Staatsliedenbuurt and Helmersbuurt are two neighbourhoods that used to be relatively poor. They are two kilometres from the city centre. Although Helmersbuurt is characterized by stylish larger apartments and was never as low in status as Staatsliedenbuurt was, both neighbourhoods may be seen as gentrification areas. Typically, these areas offer similar time-space advantages for parents as the other central neighbourhoods, but are more accessible in terms of housing price. In financial terms they serve as second-best options for people opting for a central-urban lifestyle, but cannot afford a dwelling in a more expensive area. These areas, however, have their own distinctive character and differ in various respects from the expensive middle-class areas.

The Helmersbuurt is situated at walking distance from the Leidseplein, the heart of Amsterdam nightlife, and other districts for going out. Staasliedenbuurt is also situated very close to one of the centres for highbrow consumption: the Jordaan quarter, which is dotted with small trendy restaurants and bars. Furthermore, the new cultural hotspot Westergasfabriek is within a five minute walk. Daily groceries and childcare facilities are available in both neighbourhoods.
Both quarters are mainly residential in character; for employment, most inhabitants have to leave their neighbourhood. The location of both neighbourhoods is, however, quite strategic relative to large clusters of jobs. In addition, small creative businesses have lately started to cluster in both neighbourhoods (O&S 2007).

Finally, schools are somewhat more problematic, especially in Staatsliedenbuurt. Few ‘good’ schools are located in the area. Nevertheless, the free choice of schools in Amsterdam makes it possible for parents to choose schools in adjacent (middle-class) areas, such as the nearby Jordaan.

Peripheral accessible neighbourhoods
In many respects the accessible peripheral neighbourhoods, De Aker, Sloten, and Ilburg offer the classic advantages of suburban living. The neighbourhoods fit with the set of preferences Bell (1968) described as familism: widely-held ideas about what is good for a child (playing outdoors, living in a green, healthy, safe, and homogeneous environment, and so forth). However, what makes these areas different from ‘real’ suburbs is their relative proximity to the city centre compared with real suburbs and, perhaps more importantly, the claim that these neighbourhoods are still part of the city. The inhabitants of Ilburg consider themselves real urbanites, and they often express their aversion to what they see as ‘real’ suburban areas (Lupi et al., 2007). Symbolically, these areas constitute an important residential milieu between city and suburb.

In terms of accessibility, these areas are an important milieu for many family households, including middle-class families. A considerable share of the dwellings in these areas is owner-occupied, and because they are newly constructed, often with a fixed price, they are relatively affordable. Although these neighbourhoods are closer to the city and are also characterized by higher densities than real suburbs, the opportunity structure of these areas is quite suburban. For daily groceries and other day-to-day activities, these areas suffice. For more urban forms of consumption, the residents of these areas need to travel.

There are few jobs within these areas, but they are quite strategically located for those who depend on cars for their work. There is enough parking space; roads are rarely jammed and the motorway is easily accessed. Public transport is quite good, but is relatively time-consuming. Primary schools in the areas are nearby and generally considered good, although on Ilburg, some class-related and ethnic struggles are taking place, which may affect parents’ future residential choice.

Peripheral inaccessible neighbourhoods
The dykes Nieuwendammerdijk and Buiksloterdijk offer a truly rural residential milieu within the city, at a cycling distance of 15 minutes from the city centre. The combination of country life and urban living has made these areas extremely popular residential milieus that are inhabited by a very affluent population.
This milieu does not have much to do with urban living in terms of atmosphere and functionality. However, its location enables residents to access many of the advantages of inner-city living in terms of consumption. For daily groceries, childcare, and other amenities residents rely mainly on adjacent neighbourhoods. Since most jobs in the area are of a different type and status, middle-class families in the neighbourhood are not usually employed there. They need to commute for their work by bicycle to the city centre, or take the car to the readily-accessible motorway. Since the neighbourhood is embedded in the Amsterdam Noord borough, which in terms of population contrasts starkly with the upper-middle-class of the dykes, finding a good school may be problematic.

While the dykes are physically embedded in the urban fabric, the adjacent district of Waterland is a nature- and landscape reserve. Densities are very low and housing is concentrated in a few small old village cores. This residential milieu is unique in the sense that it enables the realization of the pastoral idyll of country life within reach of urban life. Waterland offers a milieu that supersedes the presumed petit-bourgeois image that sticks to suburban family living and avoids many of the disadvantages of urban living. Furthermore, building restrictions on the one hand and the high demand for this milieu on the other guarantee a stable and safe financial investment and a stable community with strong social cohesion.

Distances and poor public transport, however, make the inhabitants of these areas dependent on cars, which particularly constrains youngsters in their spatial mobility. For daily groceries and childcare most residents need to travel by car. The city is just 15 minutes drive, but by bicycle it takes much longer. Almost all residents need to commute quite long hours for work. Coming from the northern part of the metropolitan region, morning and evening traffic jams are also among the disadvantages. There are primary schools in only two of the six villages; secondary schools are located in Amsterdam or in neighbouring municipalities, all to be reached by bus or car.

Conclusion and discussion

We have addressed the question, what patterns and trends in middle-class family settlement can be identified in Amsterdam neighbourhoods in the period 1995-2007 and how can they plausibly be explained. Before answering this question we first summarize our findings for the first two sub questions: 1) what are the patterns of middle-class families in Amsterdam? 2) What are the trends in middle-class settlement?
Patterns
Despite the fact that many families suburbanized in the 1960s and 1970s, a considerable share of all Amsterdam households is still a family (24.4 percent). In 2007 the strongest concentrations of families within the municipality were in the peripheral neighbourhoods, which are characterized by relatively high shares of larger, often owner-occupied housing situated in quiet, green areas. Other strong concentrations are found in typical immigrant neighbourhoods, which are characterized by high shares of social-rental accommodation.

As far as we know, our paper has provided the first empirical data of the scale of middle-class families in Amsterdam. Based on the WIA survey, we have shown that approximately 28,300 households (7.7 percent) qualify as middle-class families. This share corresponds to approximately one third of all family households in the city. In contrast with families generally, middle-class families are mainly concentrated in inner-city districts, although many middle-class families also live in new-build areas on the city’s fringes. Only 36 percent of all middle-class families have children younger than five years old.

Trends
Since the mid 1980s the number and share of family households have increased in all four large cities in the Netherlands. The Amsterdam neighbourhoods in which the share of families increased most strongly in the period 1996-2006 are mainly situated in inner-city districts. We found that growth in the number and share of families is mainly taking place in central traditional middle-class neighbourhoods (Middenmeer) and gentrification areas (Staatsliedenbuurt), but also in new-build areas (Oostelijk Havengebied, De Aker) and immigrant neighbourhoods with high shares of social-rental dwellings (Overtoomseveld).

We have provided evidence that, in the period 1995-2007, middle-class families strongly increased in numbers in both relative and absolute terms. We have shown that the share of middle-class families increased from 3.6 percent in 1995 to 7.7 percent in 2007. We have provided evidence that the central parts of the city are increasingly becoming inhabited by middle-class groups, including middle-class families. Our data suggest that the largest numbers of middle-class families tend to cluster in the central areas that were already mainly inhabited by middle-class families such as Middenmeer and Museumkwartier. Nevertheless, relative change is most rapid in central gentrification areas such as Staatsliedenbuurt and Helmersbuurt.

In the city as a whole, the share of families with young children is increasing, but in the typical middle-class family neighbourhoods that share is getting smaller, particularly in the peripheral areas. This finding suggests that these areas are becoming less accessible for young families, and that more families with older children are residing there.
Tentative Explanations
We presented a typology based on our analysis on the neighbourhood level in Amsterdam that connects the requirements to access a neighbourhood with what it provides. We suggested four types of neighbourhood that represent different sectors of middle-class habitus: (in)accessible central, and (in)accessible peripheral areas.

Some middle-class families with very high incomes are congregating in a few stable middle-class central areas that offer not only good housing, a sound financial investment, and access to good schooling, but also time-budget advantages. These areas have a lower share of young children, which might indicate that families are there to stay. The continuing pressure on the market makes these areas almost exclusively accessible to households with (two) high incomes.

Families who also seek the advantages of a central location, but cannot afford to live in these increasingly expensive areas, either stay in their current neighbourhood or move into second-best central areas. Fractions of the middle class with less economic capital (but who also seek other types of distinction) may be expected to populate those spill-over areas, which are often at the gentrification frontier. The success of peripheral new-build areas within reasonable distance of the city centre, and with the advantages of suburban single-family homes, suggests that some middle-class families seek residential locations that constitute a residential environment between city and suburb. These areas are relatively accessible, but offer less clear time-advantages.

The inaccessible peripheral neighbourhoods offer a residential environment that has the advantages of the suburbs. The relatively short distance to the city centre and other business districts makes these areas more tightly knit within the urban system than real suburbs are. These neighbourhoods have, however, become much more expensive and are therefore not very accessible to most families. The fact that the share of young children has decreased in these peripheral areas tells us that these areas have become inhabited by middle-class families in earlier stages and that those families have probably decided to stay and become true middle-class urban-oriented family households.

We have linked the reorientation of middle-class families to the city with two interrelated processes: a reorientation of middle-class groups to the city; and the role of place in balancing work, family, leisure, and social obligations in the everyday lives of middle-class families. In Amsterdam changes in employment and a rise in higher education has created a larger group of middle-class people who live in the city for a considerable part of their lives. We have argued that these people have accumulated experiences and could be claimed to have built up an urban habitus. They have established social networks, may have various work experiences, and may derive parts of their identity from living in the city. They have accumulated a feel for the city, both metaphorically and practically. Consequently
there are more people with an urban lifestyle when they come to the stage of having children. When members of the middle class have children most of them still suburbanize, but our data suggest that centrally-located areas are becoming increasingly popular among middle-class families, while peripheral (particularly new-build areas) are also growing in favour. These findings support the idea that the gentrification of the city also spreads into subsequent stages of the life course.

Our data suggest that, in line with the findings of Butler and Robson (2003), we can identify various middle-class fractions, with a different habitus, who prefer different residential environments, depending on the amount and forms of capital they command, as well as how their residential location offers positions in the fields of employment, housing, consumption, and education. We have suggested that, in addition to these fields, the neighbourhood should also be analysed for what advantages it might give in terms of time-budget and qualities of space. Bell’s (1968) distinction between familist and careerist has become blurred. Compared with earlier research (Karsten, 2003), we now suggest that there are various types of ‘family gentrifiers’ with different habituses who are attracted to various areas. As our data on the age of children suggest, the share of young children among middle-class families in the city is increasing. This increase may indeed indicate that middle-class households are settling down in the city, if only in the first stage of parenthood.

The residential practices of middle-class families in Amsterdam suggest that different residential environments are related to various middle-class habituses. In our future research we will further explore the relationship between place and habitus for middle-class families and how urban environments are part of larger time-space trajectories.
2b. Box 1: Family Households in Amsterdam

The previous chapter has given an overview of the patterns and trends of middle class families in Amsterdam based on data from the period 1995-2007. This box provides a brief update of the latest patterns and trends for the period up till 2011.

In the period 2008-2011 the share of family households in Amsterdam has slightly increased. Figure 2b.1 shows the share of family households in the neighbourhoods municipality of Amsterdam in 2011. As appears from the map, the concentration of families tend to show a relatively concentric pattern, where the lowest shares inhabit the historical centre, and the suburban fringes have the highest shares. Yet, some relatively centrally located neighbourhoods deviate from this general pattern. Willemspark, Apollobuurt, Centrale Markt, Oostelijk Havengebied and Transvaal have higher shares of families than their adjacent neighbourhoods.

Figure 2b.2 shows a very different spatial pattern. Although on average the share of family households has increased in the whole city throughout the period 1996-2011, the neighbourhoods with the strongest increase in family households are Centrale Markt, Slotermeer, Willemspark, Middenmeer, and Nieuwendam Noord. From this figure it appears that typically two types of neighbourhoods have the strongest growth in families: relatively central affluent neighbourhoods such as Willemspark and Middenmeer; and neighbourhoods with high shares of non-western immigrants, mainly in Nieuw West, such as Slotermeer.

Figure 2b.1: % family households in Amsterdam in 2011

Source: O&S, 2011
The results from this extra analysis show that also in the period after the publication of Chapter 2 the main patterns and trends are still visible. The increase of family households in Amsterdam is generally related to the gentrification of the central boroughs. Yet, the increasing shares of family households in neighbourhoods in the borough of Nieuw West, which was less evident in Chapter 2, may point to the fact that various processes are taking place simultaneously. The scope of this mini-analysis, however, does not allow for any definite conclusions.
Introduction

In the last few decades most Western countries have witnessed a marked increase in the participation of women in the labour market. In the United States female participation exploded from 36 percent in 1960 to 70 percent in 2008 (OECD, 2008). For Europe figures are comparable, although there are some differences between countries. However, in spite of these changes, in most families the division of labour is still highly gendered. Women tend to take care of most of the household tasks and children, while most men do full-time paid work.

As women have entered the work forces of most Western countries, many of them now have to combine a job with the largest share of domestic labour; a phenomenon which has become known as the second shift (Hochschild and Machung, 1989). Women seeking to reconcile work and life are put in a time squeeze (Clarkberg and Moen, 2001). In families with young children women have to balance ‘life’ and ‘work’ particularly carefully (McDowell, 2004). One of the ways in which women do so is by reducing the number of paid hours, especially after the birth of children (Warren, 2004). Part-time work, mostly for women, has become common in many segments of the economy. In the EU, 37.5 percent of women and 6.6 percent of men work in part-time jobs, for working mothers these figures are even higher (Corral and Isusi, 2007).

In many households the part-time job, which is usually taken by the female spouse, is often an auxiliary income for the household rather than at a level with the (male) main income (Plantenga, 2002). The size of the part-time job often ‘expands’ and ‘contracts’ according to economic situation and the life phase of the household. As a consequence part-time workers generally earn less; are more readily dismissed in an economic downturn (Ginn et al., 1996); build up less social rights (pension, social security) (Ginn et al., 2001); and tend to be tied to particular ‘female’ lines of work such as health, administrative jobs and (lower) education, so called “care-work” (England et al., 2002). Part-time work is hence related to a continued gendering of labour.
Much of research on the participation of women, however, is characterised by two flaws: The first is that participation of women is too much seen as an independent factor and too little as the outcome of ongoing negotiations between partners on the level of the household. The division of paid and unpaid work between partners is dynamic and is the outcome of a complex set of decisions related to, national policies, household and individual characteristics; labour market conditions and housing market contexts; and informed by gender ideologies (cultures of care, cultures of providing)(Van der Lippe et al., 2006; Van Wel and Knijn, 2006).

The second problem is that much research on labour market participation is based done at a national level or at best between regions. As Odland and Ellis (1998, p. 333) have noted, this ‘conceals important local and regional differences in women’s labor force activities’. Stated more generally, data on a large scale make it hard to identify the relationship between space and the participation in the labour market and a division of labour within households. Mainly qualitative studies have filled this gap by looking into local contexts and scrutinising the meaning of time and space for the participation in and division of labour (Jarvis, 1999, 2005; Kwan, 1999). These studies, however, have not analysed the geographical dimension for participation in and the division of labour systematically, which makes it difficult to generalize their findings.

We argue that the spatial dimension is important for the division of paid work for two main reasons:

1) Individuals and households are sorted spatially into different regions, cities, and neighbourhoods with various labour market conditions (England, 1993; Hanson and Pratt, 1992, 1995; Odland and Ellis, 1998; Pratt and Hanson, 1988; Wyly, 1999), according to (among other things) their demographic, ethnic, and socioeconomic characteristics, which simultaneously affect practices in the labour market of women and men.

2) Space plays an important role in the temporal managing of everyday life, particularly for households in a ‘time squeeze’, which means that any study of participation in paid work and the division of labour should also include the spatial dimension (De Meester et al., 2007; De Meester and Van Ham, 2009; Jarvis, 2005; Karsten, 2003; Kwan, 1999; Schwanen, 2007; Turner and Niemeier, 1997; Van Ham and Mulder, 2005).

Hence, the spatial context may influence both the participation in the labour market (of men and women) and the division of labour (domestic and paid) within a household. In this paper we report our investigation of the relationship between spatial context and the division of paid work by looking at family households and their place of residence. The question we address is: How does the division of paid work correlate spatially within an urban context and how can we tentatively explain these patterns?
In order to answer these questions, we turn to the case of the city of Amsterdam in the Netherlands. As the Netherlands leads Europe in part-time work both for women (72 percent) and for men (21 percent) (Corral and Isusi, 2007), the Dutch case offers an opportunity to explore the diversity of ways in which partners divide their paid work. We could expect a variety of number of hours worked by the man and the woman, as well as all possible variations of a division of labour. The city of Amsterdam was selected as a case because it offers the widest variety of household types as well as a wide variety of residential environments. We have concentrated on families consisting of two adults with dependent children, because it appears from the literature that the time squeeze is particularly acute in households with dependent children.

In order to show in what ways the spatial dimension is important, we first give a short literature overview. Secondly, we present data from the Netherlands that show the relationship between degree of urbanization and the division of labour. Thirdly, we zoom in at a local level by mapping the spatial distribution of family households with different arrangements for the division of paid work in the city of Amsterdam. The results are used as a starting point for tentative explanations. Finally, we set a research agenda for the type of research to be carried out in order to disentangle the complex relationship between space and participation in and the division of paid work.

Literature Overview

The relationship between the residential environment and labour-market participation has predominantly been analysed from two different conceptual standpoints: labour-market participation matters for the residential environment and the residential environment matters for labour-market participation. Obviously, most research acknowledges that the relationship usually works both ways. Nevertheless, in searching for explanations for this relationship, scholars are informed by the direction in which they assume the effect to work.

The first type of research considers residential location to be a function of the demands associated with the labour-market participation of both spouses. Research (Vijgen and Engelsdorp Gastelaars, 1991, 1992) has indicated that dual-earner households in the Netherlands (both with and without children) are relatively urban in their residential orientation, while traditional breadwinner households opt more often for a suburban location. Vijgen and Van Engelsdorp Gastelaars explain this contrast by claiming that urban environments offer better opportunities for outsourcing household tasks of all kinds, and offer a better management of tight time budgets through, for instance, multi-purpose trips. These authors are inspired by the work of Bell (1968) and Gans (1968) who suggested that residential choice was related to lifestyle, which was defined as a set of preferences and attitudes.
This line of research has been continued by Droogleever Fortuijn (1993), who studied dual-earner families in various residential contexts. She builds her analysis on a typology of two dimensions: one that indicates the relative importance of a career (total amount of hours worked) that she summarizes as careerist vs. familist orientation (1968); and another that indicates the degree of equality in the division of paid and unpaid work (symmetrical vs. asymmetrical). In her study, she concluded that households with a careerist lifestyle and an equal division of labour were city-oriented, while couples with a familist lifestyle and an asymmetrical division of labour were suburban in their orientation. The other two types assume an intermediate position.

To account for these differences, Droogleever Fortuijn builds on Hägerstrand’s time-space theories (1970). Her study introduced the time-space prism of these working families; a prism illustrates the meaning of location for organizing daily activities in a time-space setting. This part of the research explains the situational aspects of the residential environment: that is, the extent to which it offers opportunities for organizing everyday life. The meaning of residential environment (situation) is particularly important for households with a tight time-budget. As parents struggle to combine two (demanding) jobs and bringing up children, they rely heavily on the opportunities the city offers. Doogleever Fortuijn concludes that, if budgets are less tight, the site characteristics of the dwelling, such as size, number of rooms, and a garden become more important relative to situation characteristics.

Her qualitative research has been continued quantitatively, among others by Bootsma (1995). Controlling for a range of background variables such as age, educational level, and income, he found a relationship between work orientation (whether women want a career) and residential choice. His conclusions confirm the findings from Vijgen and Van Engelsdorp Gastelaars and Droogleever Fortuijn that the more women (tend to) work, the more urban is the residential orientation of the household. His research, however, did not differentiate between dual-income households with and without children. Nevertheless, he identified a negative effect for having a child on female participation.

A second standpoint regards the residential environment as instrumental in explaining labour-market participation. De Meester and colleagues (2007) scrutinized the relationship between residential environment and hours spent on paid work by men and women. In their analysis, they assumed that an urban environment would positively influence female participation. Continuing on the track of time-space-budget research, they tested the effect of various variables on participation in paid work, such as job access and degree of urbanity, as they controlled for personal characteristics such as level of education, income, and age. Their conclusions for couples with children are that living in an urban environment positively influences female participation in the labour market; while for men there is a negative correlation. These authors concluded that urban environments offer
what they call a rich opportunity structure, that is, a context that offers many different amenities such as shopping opportunities and child-care facilities. Van Ham and De Meester (2009) confirmed the effect of an urban environment in their work on residential environment and working arrangements: men work part-time more often in urban environments; and dual-earner households in which both partners work full-time are overrepresented in urban areas.

Van Ham and De Meester’s study supports the findings of several earlier American studies that described the spatial entrapment of suburban women and their confinement to particular segments of the economy (Hanson and Pratt, 1992). Although England (1993) disputed the idea of ‘pink collar ghettos’, Wyly (1999) found evidence that labour-market segregation is strongly related to place and highly gendered. Labour markets are local to a large degree and tend to differ across spatial contexts. As men and women tend to slot into different sectors of the economy, the absence or poor accessibility of ‘female’ jobs could be presumed to be related to lower female participation. Correspondingly, a differentiated and accessible job market increases the likelihood of female participation in paid work (De Meester and Van Ham, 2009; Van Ham, 2002).

The literature suggests that the residential environment matters for the participation in paid work of men and women in various, sometimes ambiguous ways. In much of the research described above evidence has been sought of an independent effect of environment on participation or of labour-market participation on residential environment. As a result, the study of the relationship between residential context and labour-market participation has come to share many of the theoretical and methodological problems and limitations inherent in what are known as neighbourhood effect studies (see Galster (2008) for an overview of the problems and solutions of neighbourhood-effect studies). One of the major problems in identifying an independent effect of place is the selection effect (Manski, 1995): individuals disperse through migration into different places (countries, regions, cities, neighbourhoods), so the actual effect of the spatial context is difficult to separate out (Sampson and Sharkey, 2008).

In this study we have considered the relationship between space and participation in paid work as mutually informing. We hold that the relationship between place and paid work is an extreme complex of individual and household characteristics; gender ideologies; labour-market characteristics; and housing-market characteristics, explicitly including also the spatial configurations of both the labour and housing markets. Furthermore, we emphasize that the relationship between spatial context and participation in paid work should always be researched by looking at the household and not the individual alone. Decisions concerning work and place of residence are taken in a process of negotiation between both spouses and in accordance with the conditions of the household. Although many variations exist, feminist scholar rightfully emphasize that in the power position of men and women within the household is often unequal. Outcomes of negotiations
on the household level in many instances tend to reflect dominant ideologies about a division of labour between the sexes (England, 2005; Gregson, 2000).

Neighbourhoods are specific residential environments that are accessed by various forms of capital (mainly economic) and provide the residents with certain material goods, such as housing; and also access to amenities and jobs; but neighbourhoods also provide symbolic capital through, for example, the status of a certain neighbourhood (Boterman et al., 2010). In terms of time-space, neighbourhoods are both constraining and enabling. How they are is contingent on how members of the household deal with their patterns in time-space (Kwan, 1999; Schwanen, 2007). These patterns in time-space also depend on decisions concerning paid work. We argue that the relationship between men’s and women’s participation in paid work is the outcome of ongoing negotiation in which the configurations of the local housing market – including also the time-space consequences of that locality – are taken into account. What type of housing a family can afford also depends on both the outcome of the negotiations and the structural context of the housing market. What a family feels it can afford is not just related to objective conditions such as income but is also a matter of intra-familiar debate and depends on personal preferences. These, however, are likely to inform the position on the labour and housing market as well. Hence, the complexity of this relationship is such that we choose to look at the spatial correlations first.

Data and Methods

In this study we have made use of a large dataset that comprises population statistics for all Dutch citizens: the Dutch Social Statistical Database 2005 and 2006 (SSB). This contains data for every taxpaying citizen who is individually registered and identified with a unique personal (and encrypted) code. Although these population data are rich and useful, using them requires patience and several time-consuming modifications such as aggregating personal data to the level of the household. We have drawn on this dataset to identify the spatial distribution of various models for the paid work of family households in the city of Amsterdam.

The data presented in this study are a selection made for households in the municipality of Amsterdam that only includes people who live together with a heterosexual partner, have dependent children younger than 18 years, and in which at least one of the partners has paid work. We categorized the various ways in which partners divide their paid work on the basis of the number of hours of paid work of both partners. It was therefore not possible to include households in which one of the partners was self-employed, as the dataset does not contain data on their hours worked.

These categories are suited to the Dutch context in which the majority prefer an arrangement involving women working part-time and men full-time (Corral and
Isusi, 2007), as practiced by a majority of women and a substantial large minority of men. We distinguish between various models of division of labour in which men and women work part-time, because in accordance with official emancipation policies part-time work is not considered an impediment to a serious career (SCP, 2006), particularly in the public sector, research and education, and healthcare. It is also assumed that both the division of unpaid work between the spouses and the outsourcing of housework is also a function of the arrangements for paid work (Hiller, 1984; Hiller and Philliber, 1982).

In order to provide a link with studies undertaken on the national level, (notably De Meester et al., 2007) and to put the Amsterdam case into perspective, we start by presenting the distribution of those household arrangements for paid work according to degree of urbanity for the Netherlands as a whole. These data are based on the Dutch Labour Force Survey (EBB, 2006), which is a large representative national sample that also includes other information, such as level of education, which is not available in the SSB. Where national and local data from Amsterdam are compared, the fact that the data are derived from two different sources should be taken into account. The differences are, however, clear enough to draw conclusions.

We defined the household types as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Hours worked by male</th>
<th>Hours worked by female</th>
<th>Hours difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male breadwinner</td>
<td>&gt;36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Male&gt;36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td>&gt;36</td>
<td>1-31</td>
<td>Male&gt;4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Full-time</td>
<td>&gt;36</td>
<td>&gt;36</td>
<td>Not defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmetrical part-time</td>
<td>1-35</td>
<td>1-35</td>
<td>Male or Female&lt;4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Dominant</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>&gt;4</td>
<td>Female&gt;4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Male breadwinner model**
Men work full-time; women do not participate in paid work. Women are assumed to do the largest share of domestic work and childcare. Outsourcing is little used. As the household depends on only one income, the choice range for dwellings is limited, particularly on the expensive Amsterdam housing market. Finding a suitable family home is therefore restricted to a few areas, and disproportionately to the social sector. The traditional division of labour is expected to be associated with familist ideals (see Bell, 1968).

**1 1/2 model**
Men work full-time; women usually work two or three days a week (1-31 hours). Women provide an auxiliary income and are assumed to take care of most household tasks and childcare. Outsourcing is little used, and childcare only for two days a week.
As women have only a modest job of about 24 hours a week, household income depends mostly on the male spouse. This household model is expected to be found in those areas that present a compromise between career and family, but with an inclination towards familism.

**Dual-full-time model**
Both partners work full-time. Women are still assumed to spend more hours on domestic work and childcare than men do. However, outsourcing is a common strategy to loosen time-constraints, as it is financially more feasible. Childcare is also assumed to be largely outsourced. The location is expected to be strategically chosen, in an environment that is characterized by a rich-opportunity structure. This type of household can afford spacious and expensive dwellings. Careers are prioritized over traditional familism, although sufficient economic means make compromise less necessary.

**Symmetrical part-time model**
Both partners work part-time. The difference in the time they spend on paid work is less than four hours. Outsourcing is less common than for two full-time jobs. The division of unpaid work is assumed to be more symmetrical than in dual-full-time households. This arrangement is hypothesised because of the gender-role-breaking step for men to work part-time.

This household type is expected to opt for neighbourhoods similar to those for the dual-full-time model. However, the purchasing power of these households is expected to be somewhat lower than dual-full-time couples, which limits their choice range.

**Female dominant model**
Women work more hours (>4) than men do. Some overlap exists with the dual-full-time category as women may work more than four hours more than their male counterpart, but his job may still fall in the full-time category. This arrangement is assumed to lead to a division of unpaid work in which men do at least as much as their partner does. The degree of outsourcing is dependent on the total hours worked. As the women may also work part-time, the parents are expected to take care of children. As this model is the most gender-breaking, the location is expected to be a typically non-conformist neighbourhood.

We now show the distribution of these household models in various neighbourhoods in the Netherlands, categorized according to degree of urbanity. This is defined on the basis of the density of addresses per square kilometre (CBS). We then map the spatial patterns of various household models for the city of Amsterdam. We expected traditional household models to be less well represented in urban areas, while more symmetrical households as well as female-dominant households would be overrepresented in urban areas.
Residential Environment and Household Arrangements for Division of Paid Work

Household Arrangements for Paid work

In this paragraph we show the distribution of household types according to various residential environments. This overview serves as the starting point for our next step: looking more closely into the diversity of neighbourhoods that offer various households the environment they prefer.

Table 3.2. Family household models in the Netherlands, according to degree of urbanity (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dual Full-time</th>
<th>Male breadwinner</th>
<th>Symmetrical part-time</th>
<th>Female Dominant</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>total N=100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly urban</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly urban</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-urban</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EBB 2006.

From Table 3.2 it appears that the shares of dual full-time and dual part-time, as well as households in which women work more than men increase with degree of urbanity. The one-and-a-half model follows an opposite pattern: the higher the degree of urbanity, the lower the share of this household type. These results are in line with our expectations. The traditional male-breadwinner model, however, presents somewhat more puzzling results. The frequency of this model also increases with degree of urbanity, which does not fit with our expectations. The rest category ‘other household types’ includes various ways in which the division of labour is divided. These models include households where the male spouse works full-time and the woman works between 32 and 35 hours, as well as households with various divisions of part-time work. The share of other household types clearly increases with degree of urbanity.

As this Table of Dutch neighbourhoods shows, the degree of urbanity correlates with the division of labour. The variation of household types is broadest in very urban contexts, where symmetrical and gender-breaking categories are overrepresented. Although these results are in line with those from other studies (De Meester et al., 2007), the diversity of residential environments within these areas is in our opinion too great to allow conclusions to be drawn. For example, neighbourhoods in Amsterdam, which are all categorized as “very strongly urban”, may differ enormously in terms of the local housing market, the opportunity structure of local amenities, and even in terms of local job market access. A closer look into the spatial patterns within a highly urban context is needed. In the remainder of this paper we show the spatial patterns of the household models that represent different arrangements for paid work in the city of Amsterdam and to tentatively explain these patterns.
Patterns of Paid work in Amsterdam

Table 3.3. Family household models in the Netherlands and Amsterdam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dual Full-time</th>
<th>Male breadwinner</th>
<th>Symmetrical part-time</th>
<th>Female Dominant</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Netherlands</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Compared with the Dutch average, symmetrical part-time work, symmetrical full-time work, and household models in which the female partner works more hours than the man are overrepresented in Amsterdam. In contrast, the dominant Dutch one-and-a-half model is much less well represented. Hence, Amsterdam deviates from the Dutch average in terms of both gender-breaking household models as well as the one-and-a-half model. However, the male-breadwinner model in which the division of labour between the genders is organized traditionally is higher than the Dutch average. We expected that within Amsterdam these models would not be evenly distributed. We now consider some maps that show the spatial patterns of the various models for paid work within the city of Amsterdam:
Figure 3.1. Various Models for Paid Labour in Amsterdam neighbourhoods

Source: SSB, 2005.

Figure 3.1 shows the various spatial concentrations of the five household types in Amsterdam neighbourhoods. The dark colour indicates the neighbourhoods with high concentrations (> 1 standard deviation) of that particular household type compared with the city’s average. The light colour indicates below average concentrations.
Figure 3.2 combines the various models in one map. From this it can be seen that in most neighbourhoods just one (and sometime two) particular household models are concentrated. This finding suggests that the spatial configurations of neighbourhoods correlate with the way in which labour is divided between spouses. We maintain that the relationship between residential context and the division of labour is complex and mutually informing. In order to understand why a correlation exists between specific spatial contexts and the division of labour we need to look at the characteristics of both the neighbourhoods and the various households. In our view the individual characteristics of the household members and the various aspects of the residential environment both matter.

First, in order to address the question in what types of neighbourhood are these various households concentrated, Table 3.4 summarizes the average values for the neighbourhoods that have above-average concentrations of the five different household types (the dark-coloured neighbourhoods in the maps in Figure 3.1).
Table 3.4: General statistics for neighbourhoods according to household model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Model</th>
<th>non-western</th>
<th>moroccan</th>
<th>turkish</th>
<th>surinamese</th>
<th>children (&lt;14)</th>
<th>families</th>
<th>house value (WOZ)</th>
<th>large dwellings (&gt;4 rooms)</th>
<th>social rent income (*1000 €)</th>
<th>pop. Density</th>
<th>cars per hh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male breadwinner</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8812</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One and a half earner families</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3411</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual fulltime families</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12331</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female dominant families</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12965</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmetrical parttime families</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12313</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4580</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Male breadwinner model
Breadwinner families are particularly concentrated in neighbourhoods in the Western part of the city, the Indische buurt, and the northern borough. Most of these areas are characterized by relatively-cheap housing, often in the social sector, and accommodating a high share of non-western and particularly Turkish and Moroccan communities. For these neighbourhoods the average income is lower than the city’s. Relatively many families live in these neighbourhoods. The population density is quite high and the number of cars per household is relatively high.

One-and-a-half model
Almost the negative of the former image is presented by the dominant Dutch one-and-a-half model. The neighbourhoods that have an above-average score for this model are located on the fringes of the city. These areas are the most typical family areas in terms of housing and household composition: the share of family households and children is clearly above average. Also a large share of the housing stock consists of larger dwellings and the number of cars per household is almost double the city average. The average income in these neighbourhoods is above the Amsterdam mean. Neighbourhoods with high concentrations of social-rented dwellings, in which relatively many Moroccans and Turks are accommodated, have a below-average score on this household model.
Dual-full-time model
Dual-full-time working families are typically over-represented in the canal-belt, the upper-middle–class, and expensive neighbourhoods in the southern borough. Even though the population density is still high, the most expensive and relatively spacious housing is found in these areas. A double income is required for the acquisition of dwellings in these neighbourhoods. This factor is reflected in the average income in these neighbourhoods of 153 percent of the Amsterdam average.

Furthermore, for this household type neighbourhoods in Amsterdam South East also stand out. In the Bijlmer area, which is a blend of one-family homes and large estates, dual full–time families are highly overrepresented. The Bijlmer area is characterized by relatively-large concentrations of people of Surinamese descent.

Symmetrical part-time model
Symmetrical part-time households are concentrated in areas located in the inner-part of the city, particularly in the 19th century belt around the historic city centre, and are characterized by high population densities. Another area that shows above-average figures for symmetrical part-time is Watergraafsmeer. This borough is characterized by older, one-family housing, often in the private sector. It is a stable (upper) middle-class area, although more affordable than the canal belt or the southern borough.

Female dominant model
Finally, the family households in which women work more hours than men overlap slightly with the neighbourhoods for symmetrical part-time and dual-full -time households (in the Bijlmer), but also tend to be overrepresented in areas where none of the other models has an edge over the city’s average. Generally, they can be found in the central parts of the city and the South East borough. Female-dominant households live in areas that are characterized by low shares of family households and low shares of children, and that have relatively few larger dwellings.

The neighbourhood statistics give an indication of what type of neighbourhood is associated with the various household types. However, the statistics do not necessarily say anything about the individuals in those households. For this purpose, some of the most important individual characteristics Table 5, 6, and 7 show descriptive statistics for individuals within the various household types in Amsterdam. Obviously, a whole range of personal characteristics could have been included. We were, however, limited by access to data so we only included ethnicity, income, and number of dependent children.
As becomes clear from the tables, breadwinner households are strongly overrepresented amongst non-western groups, particularly Moroccans and Turks, and are underrepresented amongst native-Dutch groups. Most of the male-breadwinner households fall into the lowest income category, while only a small share falls into the highest categories. Breadwinner families have three or more children relatively often.

One-and-a-half-earner families are clearly underrepresented among the various non-western groups and overrepresented among the native-Dutch. Income levels are understandably higher than for male-breadwinner families. Only 5.8 percent of these families have an income in the lowest scale; while the rest have quite a high income. Typically, these families have one or two children.

### Table 3.5. Ethnicity female per households types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>native Dutch</th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>Moroccan/ Turkish</th>
<th>Surinamese</th>
<th>other non-Western</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dual Full-time</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male breadwinner</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmetrical part-time</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Dominant</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 3.6. Income distribution per households type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>below modal income (€ 30,000)</th>
<th>30,000-60,000</th>
<th>60,000-90,000</th>
<th>&gt; € 90,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dual Full-time</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male breadwinner</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmetrical part-time</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Dominant</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 3.7. Number of children per household type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 child</th>
<th>2 children</th>
<th>3 children</th>
<th>4 or more children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dual Full-time</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male breadwinner</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmetrical part-time</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Dominant</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Surinamese in particular, but also migrants from western countries, are overrepresented among dual-full-time families. They have relatively often only one child. Moroccans and Turks are underrepresented. Unsurprisingly, dual-full-time earners have the highest incomes. The largest share of this type falls into the highest income group, while only three percent of them earn less than the modal income. Clearly the difference in income between dual-full-time and male-breadwinner families is far too great to be explained by the hours worked. The level of education and line of work also need to be taken into consideration. Symmetrical-part-time households are mainly a native-Dutch phenomenon and are underrepresented among non-western groups. These households often have only one child and are least likely to have a large family. Income levels are lower than for dual full-time families, but are still relatively high.

Households in which women work more hours than men have relatively common in non-western groups. Most of these households have one or two children, but 14 percent of them have three or more children. The Surinamese are particularly overrepresented in this type. Female-dominant households fall mainly into the lowest income group, which may imply a female-breadwinner family with a man not working at home. The female-dominant households that fall into the higher-income groups may be the product of a household strategy that prioritizes the female career.

**Figure 3.3. Income from labour per household type and ethnicity**

Source: SSB, 2006
Figure 3.3 shows the interaction effects of ethnicity and income for the various household types. For the sake of simplicity all non-western groups were aggregated, while western and native-Dutch groups were also merged together. As becomes clear from the table, the relationship between type of household and level of income remains intact when corrected for ethnicity. Non-western groups earn much less than western and native Dutch groups do. This difference can probably be explained in part by level of education, but this is not included in the SSB data. Given the fact that non-western groups are also overrepresented in traditional household types, which also have relatively-low incomes, non-western groups have a relatively-weak position on the Amsterdam housing market. The interaction effect of ethnicity, income, and type of arrangement for the division of paid work indicate that existing differences in income level are exacerbated by the way in which families divide their paid work.

Conclusions and Discussion

In this paper we addressed the questions: How does the division of paid work correlate spatially within an urban context and how can we tentatively explain these patterns? Our findings for the Netherlands confirmed that the degree of urbanity correlates with the division of paid work (De Meester et al., 2007). Household models that have a symmetrical division of labour or in which women work more hours than men are found more frequently in urban than in less urban contexts. Conversely, the share of one-and-a-half model households – which has become the dominant model in the Netherlands – decreases with degree of urbanity. Male-breadwinner models are overrepresented in urban areas. These patterns are even more clear-cut for Amsterdam.

We looked into the diversity of residential environments within a ‘very strongly urban context’ to identify the spatial relationship between neighbourhood and the division of paid work. We mapped the prevalence of the various household models within Amsterdam. It seems that, although most neighbourhoods accommodate a diversity of household types, different neighbourhoods tend to be particularly attractive for one particular type. This association may indicate that some residential environments within the city of Amsterdam are more attractive than others for different family households. Areas are therefore not ‘suitable’ for families in general, but differentiation between family households may also play a role. This conclusion is in line with previous research (Droogleever Fortuijn, 1993; Karsten, 2007) that showed that different families sort themselves out into various residential environments, not just because of the structural conditions that produce segregation such as income, but also as a result of the complex interwoven relationships of preferences, the structural conditions of housing and the job markets (De Meester & Van Ham, 2009), and objective means in the form of economic capital, which are all negotiated within the household.
In Amsterdam we find three main patterns:

1) Families mainly in non-western groups, predominantly Moroccans and Turks, who work with a traditional division of labour. These families are generally large, have little economic and social capital, might sometimes suffer discrimination on the housing market, and are therefore often particularly limited in their residential choice. As the result of their choices with respect to both the division of labour and their relatively weak socioeconomic position they gravitate geographically into the large clusters of social housing in the western part of the city and the urban renewal areas of the 1980s in the northern and eastern parts (Musterd and Ostendorf, 2003). These areas are also the only parts of the city where the social sector offers spacious dwellings that can accommodate these often large families. To some extent their residential choices, although limited, may also be related to the relatively-easy access to low-skilled jobs in the western docklands or at the international airport, which are both situated at the western side of the city.

2) Families who follow the most common Dutch trend of the man working full-time and the woman working part-time seem to be particularly oriented in the most suburban parts of the city. Most of those families are native Dutch and seem to have quite traditional familialist ideals (Bell, 1968). Most of the homes are owner occupied, have a garden, and offer easy parking space. Their incomes are such that they can afford to buy homes within the city of Amsterdam, which are much more expensive than the same type of housing in truly suburban municipalities in the metropolitan region. Apparently these families are in some way more strongly connected to Amsterdam because of their work, social networks or otherwise. They may be in search of ‘compromise milieus’ (Lupi, 2008) that constitute a suburban environment within the city (Brun and Fagnani, 1994).

3) A third category consists of symmetrical, sometimes gender-breaking households. Many of these families belong to the upper-middle-class groups that are increasingly populating the city (Boterman et al., 2010). It seems that the families in which both partners work full-time in particular tend to inhabit the traditional upper-middle-class areas in the city; while families with symmetrical part-time jobs, in which the parents have good qualifications but less economic capital than the dual full-timers, reside relatively often in neighbourhoods that are socially and physically upgrading. These households may have been described elsewhere as family gentrifiers (Karsten, 2003). They may exemplify the households who seek the time-space advantages of a particular rich opportunity structure (Jarvis 2005, De Meester 2007) that they find in the more centrally-located parts of the city.
We argued that the distribution of households over different neighbourhoods, the effect of these neighbourhoods on households, and the interrelationship of these effects constitute a Gordian knot that is difficult to untie. We have not run any multivariate analyses that could show that this distribution is related to residential environment rather than just a fortuitous composition of population in terms of class, age, and ethnicity. Nonetheless, mapping the various household models for neighbourhoods in Amsterdam has suggested that there might be a causal relationship between residential environment and arrangements for paid work within Amsterdam. Our current data cannot support this claim fully as yet, but we feel that it could be hypothesised that families tend to be sorted out geographically according to division of paid work.

In future research it would be necessary to address the limitations that have only been touched on in this paper. The agenda for future research should include at least three different strains: longitudinal research to analyse the trends in what types of family are settling in what areas. This strategy would resolve some of the problems associated with selection effects. Multivariate analyses could be carried out in order to identify some independent effects and disentangle some of the overlapping and intertwined relationships. It should, however, be noted that multivariate models should not lose sight of the fact that nearly all relationships in this matter are mutually informing. Finally, qualitative research should be carried out to investigate further the complexity of those relationships and provide a better understanding of the way in which parents manage to balance work and family in various residential environments and how their residential choices are related to this balance.
3b. Box 2: Division of Labour of Middle-Class Families

In the preceding chapter the spatial concentrations of various arrangements of division of labour within two-parent family households were based on register data on Amsterdam. There it was shown that division of paid work are geographically sorted out. In cities in general the share of non-traditional divisions of labour are more common, but also within the city of Amsterdam divisions of labour correlate spatially. In this box some extra analyses are presented that show the divisions of labour of the urban middle-class households of the sample made for this dissertation and how these arrangements changed when these couples became parents. Figure 3b.1 shows the division of labour of couples in 2008, before they became parents: a majority of the couples works both full-time; a much smaller group has a one and a half arrangement; and only a very small group has divided their labour in a traditional male-breadwinner manner.

During the second wave, the division of labour had been altered significantly. Most dual full-time couples has chosen a different way in which they divide their paid work, resulting particularly in a growth in the number of symmetrical part-time workers. The patterns are quite different from those in Amsterdam in general. This is most probably related to the selection of the respondents, who are all higher educated and earn above-modal incomes. In Figure 3b.2 it is specified how women and men individually changed their working hours when they became parents.

**Figure 3b.1. Division of labour of cohabiting couples 2008-2010, (n=198)**

Source: source: own data.
From Figure 3b.2 becomes clear that although a substantial group of men (45%) reduced the number of working hours women are more affected by the transition to parenthood than men. Of the new mothers 40% works more than one full working day less and another 25% reduced the number of hours with one day or less. For only a small group, both men and women, the transition to parenthood was associated with an increase in the number of working hours.

Figure 3b.3 shows how the division of child-care is organized. As becomes clear from that figure, a large majority of women tend to take at least one day off to be with the children. About 40

5 of all fathers have one day with the children, but very few have more than one day. Although grandparental care in the Netherlands is rather common (De Meester, 2010), the respondents rely only limitedly on their family for care. Most parents in this study use formal, paid day-care. It is most common to have children in formal daycare for three days a week. To rely completely on formal daycare is quite exceptional: only 2% has their children five days at a kinderdagverblijf.

**Figure 3b.2. Change in hours worked 2008-2010, (n=198)**

![Bar chart showing change in hours worked](image)

Source: source: own data.
Figure 3b.3. Child care weekdays, \( (n=198) \)

Source: own data.
4. Deconstructing coincidence

How middle-class households use various forms of capital to find a home
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Introduction

In a recent interview with a local newspaper Jeroen Slot of the statistical office of the city of Amsterdam explained that affluent households have a better chance of finding a home than low-income households. This may be self-evident in a ‘free market’. However, Slot claims it also applies for the social housing sector where income is only a handicap. He concluded, “the research, however, does not provide us with any hard proof of what causes the difference in opportunities” (Het Damen, November 2008).

In studies on how middle-class households find a home in Amsterdam and Copenhagen, I encountered many examples of people who were successful in the housing market, but expressed that they felt very lucky to have found their home. Even though those people were all higher educated and relatively affluent, when asked to explain how they managed to get their home they would forward a series of coincidences. Sometimes they seemed to ignore their own role completely. Despite the idea that middle-classes operate the world by choice (Skeggs, 2004) they narrated as if they had been only subject to chance rather than making housing choices. Apparently they didn’t have an explanation either why they were successful in the housing market.

From a scientific point of view this experienced 'coincidence' may be well explicable. Although financial resources may be most clearly related to residential choice, other forms of capital also work enabling in the housing market. Van Kempen and Özükren (1998) for instance identified in addition to financial resources social, cognitive, and political resources. These forms of resources may be less directly associated with access to housing but they are equally related to class position.

This paper couples a broader perspective on resources with the various ways in which middle-class households navigate the housing market. Following Bourdieu (1984), this paper conceives class position as made up of various forms of capital (economic, cultural, social and symbolic) which are produced in the interplay of habitus and field. Access to housing is assumed to be influenced by various forms
of capital (Bourdieu, 2005), which are deployed in a range of strategies and tactics (De Certeau, 1984) in different fields of the housing market.

This paper will address the question: ‘How do middle-class households use various forms of capital to find a home in different housing fields?’

In this paper I will present three cases in which middle-class households apply various strategies and tactics informed by their forms of capital in three different housing market contexts (fields).

The first case is on the Amsterdam social housing system. The second case is on the Copenhagen ‘andelsboligforeninger’ (privately organized co-ops). The last case is on the Amsterdam housing market for larger family homes.

The paper will draw upon fieldwork conducted in 2004 among young middle-class households in Copenhagen and fieldwork in 2008 among middle-class households couples that are about to have their first child in Amsterdam.

Theory

Access to housing is often understood in terms of the interplay of supply and demand in a market setting. Dwellings are considered a commodity and renting or buying is considered a form of housing consumption. Demand is determined by the interplay of demographic factors, notably life course (Rossi, 1955), and social class position (Rex and Moore, 1967). Housing supply is usually associated with market conditions, institutional context (Priemus, 1986) and the historically grown built environment (Robson, 1975).

A prominent strain of housing studies have used (dis)equilibrium models of housing that describe the process of “bringing housing demands into adjustment with the housing available to them” (Clark and Ledwith, 2006). Housing disequilibrium models have included an ever more fine-tuned range of factors (demographic, financial) that predict housing demand and residential mobility in which they account for housing stress (Huff and Clark, 1978) caused by for example events in the life course (Clark and Dieleman, 1996; Mulder, 2006). Increasingly housing economists are also sensitive to the constraints in the housing market, both at the level of the households and at the supply level (O’Sullivan and Gibb, 2003).

Although most disequilibrium models include a wide range of variables that cover many aspects of housing, most have focused on the causes and outcomes of residential mobility and less on the mechanisms that provide access to housing. This is partly caused by the fact that they generally tend to consider housing from a market perspective. The allocation of housing through interplay of supply and demand in a market context may in most western contexts be the
primary mechanism, but who has access to what housing is determined by other mechanisms as well. If we want to understand who has access to what types of housing it does not suffice to include only accounts of how the housing market functions. Furthermore, the mechanisms of housing allocation in a market context cannot solely be explained by accounts of housing demand and supply either.

In the first place all housing market contexts are regulated to some degree by institutional frameworks; and all contexts know some form of de-commodified housing (Harloe, 1995). Therefore, it is necessary to understand how regulation of the market influences mechanisms of housing allocation, and how institutional mechanisms produce housing outcomes (Murie, 1986). Moreover, mechanisms for allocation in the social rent sector for instance cannot be explained by models based on market principles.

Secondly, mechanisms by which people access housing are more complex than most models suggest. There is a large body of studies that have looked into search behaviour for housing and how this affects outcomes in the housing market (Smith et al., 1979). Various studies have identified that search behaviour is racialised (Farley, 1996; Krysan, 2008), classed and gendered, which leads to unequal opportunities. Also it has been argued that real estate agents and other intermediaries influence who can access what type of housing (Bridge, 2001b; Williams, 1976), which also creates disparities between various social groups.

As literature on search behaviour shows, gender, race, and particularly class strongly influence access to housing. Economic models account for much of this through variables that measure income, ethnicity race, education, and so forth. Nonetheless, as the work of Rex & Moore (1967) has pointed out the conflict over access to housing is central to the production of the city as a social unit and to the reproduction of class. In a neo-Weberian analysis they coined the term ‘housing class’, which refers to relationship between socio-economic position and type of tenure, i.e. owner occupancy versus rent. Their work argued that housing is not something that is wittingly chosen as a market of supply and demand, but that more durable and structural relations exist between social position and (access to) housing. The central position of housing in debates on class formation and reproduction has been maintained by scholars such as Harvey & Chatterjee (1974) and Savage et al. (1992). The central questions in this debate were: how does the housing system (re)produce class; and how does the housing system produce spatial configurations of class.

In most studies of the relationship between housing and class, the main focus lies on economic dimensions of class (i.e. income, access to mortgage loans). Some scholars, however, have tried to analyse other dimensions as well. Van Kempen & Özküren (1998) have summarized some of the resources that could explain patterns of segregation in Western cities. They mention financial resources, cognitive resources (i.e. knowledge of the market), political resources, social resources (networks) and present housing condition as forms of resources which determine who has access to what type of housing.
Other studies have confirmed the importance of social networks for the housing market position particularly of minority groups and illegals (Hulchanski, 1997). Siksjö & Borgegard (1991) concluded that social networks, but also having resided a long time in the market-area granted access to private rental apartments in central Stockholm. This links up with the work of Clapham (2005) who has shown that housing decisions tend to follow up on one another, thereby creating housing pathways. These individual or household pathways are shaped by institutional opportunities and constraints and individual decisions which are informed by demographic, employment, identity and other conditions (Clapham, 2005).

The perspective that this paper assumes on the housing market largely follows the logic of Bourdieu's work (1984, 1990, 2005) who adopts an 'economistic' perspective on social affairs in which various forms of capital (economic, social, cultural and symbolic) play a role in obtaining material and symbolic goods. Bourdieu's thinking goes beyond conventional conceptions of economic and human capital by considering all embodied experiences (habitus) as a potential source of capital (power) in a specific field. Applying these ideas to housing, this paper considers all means that may give access to housing as forms of capital. Capital is considered relational, that is, it only becomes 'valuable' when it becomes articulated in relation to the practices of other agents in a specific context, which is called a field. Access to housing is therefore influenced by the amount and types of capital at one's disposal, which is determined by habitus and the specific field in which it is used. Yet it is not the product of a static class position, but the result of a dynamic interplay of dispositions and the behaviour in a field. Subjects are not to be seen as actors that are wittingly and rationally choosing housing, but their behaviour should be understood as 'interested' and strategical, but (un)consciously produced through the habitus which has been formed historically within objective structures (Calhoun, 1993). This means that social class matters for access to housing; middle-class households have more capital at their disposal than lower classes and will hence be relatively more successful in obtaining a home. Middle classes do not only have relatively more economic capital, but may also have better access to information, and have a broader and more 'useful' social network. Yet, how housing success is produced and experienced may differ between various middle-class habituses and housing fields.

Proposing a Bourdieuvian perspective on the housing market that brings together interested behaviour from the part of subjects and constraints from the part of 'structures' or 'institutions', is not a new endeavour. Bourdieu himself did a study of the French housing market that focuses on the interconnectedness of institutions, market actors such as developers, and housing consumers (Bourdieu, 2005). Although a very insightful work about the working of the field of housing as a whole, Bourdieu says surprisingly little about the mechanisms by which individual households access their homes.
Scholars who have adopted a Bourdieuvian view on housing approach the issue of housing from the perspective of households for which consumption of housing has symbolic and practical meaning (Allen, 2008; Bridge, 2001b, 2006; Butler and Robson, 2002a; Robson and Butler, 2001; Savage, 2010; Watt, 2005, 2009). In studies that tend to focus on the various forms of capital middle-class (urban) households dispose of, these scholars stress the importance of social class for explaining who lives where and how habitus and field are spatially integrated. Watt (2005) for instance explains the presence of middle-class groups in council housing by showing that living in cheap housing enables middle-class groups to pursue other goals in life, such as particular work careers.

Another example of how other forms of capital play a role in access to housing is offered by Bridge (2001, 2006), who shows how particular forms of housing taste work as mechanisms to create distinction and how real estate agents need to interpret these forms of capital in order to broker a deal between different social classes.

Building further upon this strain of literature, this paper proposes to look at the housing market as a kaleidoscope of fields in which class position plays an important part, but where the tactics and strategic practices of subjects eventually produce the outcomes. Bourdieu describes strategies as “the ongoing result of the interaction between the dispositions of the habitus and the realities and constraints and possibilities which are the reality of any given social field” (Jenkins, 2002). Bourdieu’s concept of habitus has often been mistaken for the idea that agency and social change are impossible in Bourdieu’s worldview (Jenkins, 2002). Conversely, the term ‘strategy’ in Bourdieu’s work is sometimes confused with rational action. I think that we can come around these controversies by focusing on the use of his approach in specific situations. The degree to which practice is strategical in a rational action or conscious sense is specific in time and space. De Certeau (1984) who was inspired by the work of Bourdieu has proposed a distinction between tactical and strategic behaviour in which a hierarchy is proposed for the degree to which subjects exercise control over their lives. The difference between tactics and strategies lies in the timescale and the degree of reflexivity, which are both associated with power. Tactics are the ad hoc seizing of opportunities; tactics therefore are what de Certeau calls “the art of the weak”. Strategies, however, are intentional practice when the subject can be isolated from the environment. It assumes a place from where the subject can plan its future practices. (De Certeau, 1984).

Following De Certeau I consider getting hold of a dwelling as a process that is sometimes strategical, in the sense of reflexive decision-making, and sometimes tactical in the sense that one has to intuitively react on constraints imposed by the market and institutional conditions. Whether practices are strategical or tactical differs between the dynamic between fields and habitus. What specific forms of capital are useful depends on the field in which one is engaged. We can thus think of a housing system of consisting of housing fields (submarkets and non-market.
allocation mechanisms) that are all operated by specific forms of capital, which are deployed in strategical and tactical practice in time and space. According to the level of reflexivity of the subjects and the timescale of these practices the outcomes are then experienced by people as more or less related to coincidence.

Methods

In order to address the question ‘How do middle-class households use various forms of capital to find a home in different housing fields?’, I investigated the housing practices of middle-class households in three different housing market fields: the social housing system in Amsterdam, the Netherlands; the collective ownership system (Danish: andelsboligsystem) in Copenhagen, Denmark; and the owner-occupied housing market for family homes in Amsterdam. These three fields are specific housing market contexts that are guided by relatively autonomous rules and thus are operated by different forms of capital. The Amsterdam social housing system is officially operated by waiting time and urgency status; economic capital plays only a minor part. The andelsboligsystem in Copenhagen officially works by a mix of economic capital and waiting time. The Amsterdam market is a ‘free market’ in which economic capital is paramount, albeit the market is regulated in multiple ways. These ‘evident’ forms of capital are summarized in Table 4.1.

I want to show how these fields which are situated in highly regulated housing regimes are navigated in different ways by members of the middle-class by making use of not only the evident forms of capital but also what I shall refer to as ‘additional forms’ of capital. These additional forms of capital are hence specific for the fields in which they are used and are derived from the specific social position (habitus) of the agents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Evident forms of capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social housing in Amsterdam</td>
<td>Waiting time; Urgency status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andelsbolig Copenhagen</td>
<td>Economic capital; waiting time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied family housing Amsterdam</td>
<td>Economic capital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This paper draws on data from fieldwork in 2004 in Copenhagen and in 2008 in Amsterdam from qualitative studies on housing market practices of middle-class households. The Copenhagen study was primarily concerned with gentrification and the role of other forms of capital than economic, notably cultural capital in the form of taste. The Amsterdam data are part of a longitudinal study of housing market practices of (upper)-middle-class family households in an urban context. All the members of the households that I interviewed at the time of the research lived in inner-city neighbourhoods. All of the interviewed had completed a higher
level of education and a higher than average household income. Their age ranged between 25 and 40 years.

I conducted and analysed 20 semi-structured Copenhagen interviews and 55 semi-structured interviews with 29 couples\textsuperscript{6} from Amsterdam for the way in which my respondents described how they searched and eventually found their dwelling throughout their housing histories, paying special attention to the discourse on coincidence. I used Atlas TI to code my interviews. From the interviews I selected examples that show how various forms of capital play a role for the strategies and tactics within three housing fields. These examples were selected because they articulated best the general image that came forth from the interviews. The Copenhagen fieldwork provides data for the andelsbolig field; the other two housing fields draw on the Amsterdam fieldwork.

For the social rent case I drew upon stories from nine respondents from the 29 interviewed that lived or earlier in their housing history had lived in social housing. These stories may not be representative for how the social rent system generally works. Nevertheless, most of my (middle-class) respondents had in one way or the other made use of alternative tactics or strategies within that system. The stories thus are illustrative for how middle classes navigate the field of social housing.

Of the 20 Copenhagen respondents, 11 lived in an andel-apartment, and some of the others had also experiences with the andelsbolig-system. They told me about the class politics of the general assembly as well as the nepotistic characteristics of the system. The selected examples below are hence by no means unique.

At the time of the interview, 18 of the 29 Amsterdam respondents lived in a dwelling that they had bought. The three examples for this case were selected because they are typical for most of the other respondents that bought their home.

The next sections will present the examples of practices in the three fields.

Gaming and Cheating the System: Social Housing in Amsterdam

In the course of the 1970s housing became an integrated realm of the post-war Dutch welfare state: housing became defined as a right and was considerably decommodified (Faludi and Van der Valk, 1994; Hoekstra, 2003; Priemus and Dieleman, 2002). Most of the housing produced between 1950 and 1990 in Amsterdam is allocated through housing associations (Van der Veer and Schuiling, 2005). These housing associations are non-profit organizations and officially should provide housing for low-income groups. Despite changes in political views on the role of these organizations and selling of significant numbers of dwellings to the free market leading to a reduction of the social rent stock, these organizations still own and allocate approximately 50% of all Amsterdam dwellings (Van der Veer and Schuiling, 2005). Allocation of these dwellings occurs through a waiting list based on seniority (residents of Amsterdam can join when

\textsuperscript{6} I interviewed 26 couples twice, once in 2008 and the second time in 2010, and three couples only once, in 2008.
they turn 18), which can be bypassed due to urgency (i.e. divorce, becoming handicapped) and is only open to households below a certain income level. Once one occupies such a dwelling, however, changing income position does not affect one’s status as resident anymore. As a result many households with relatively high incomes occupy dwellings that actually are ‘too inexpensive’ for them, a phenomenon which is called scheefwonen (‘skewed living’).

It is not my intention to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of this system, but rather to show how the specific rules of this housing field actually enable some, and consequently harm others. The following stories will illustrate how some of my respondents navigate the field of social housing in Amsterdam:

Eva is a woman of 29 years old. She works as a fashion designer at a large international fashion agency in Amsterdam. She lives in a three-room apartment in up-and-coming Westerpark. Waiting time for a social-rent apartment in Westerpark has increased steeply the last years. Since most housing in the social rent sector is small and has only one bedroom, larger apartments such as Eva’s are rare and difficult to obtain.

Coming from another part of the country Eva only had little waiting time. One of her friends, however, moved to Haarlem to live in a house with her little daughter and husband. Normally one is required to cancel the rent and the dwelling is open for re-habitation by another tenant. Mirthe, the official tenant of the apartment, however, retained the apartment and sublet it (illegally) to Eva.

Jenny is a woman of 31 years old. She lives in an apartment in the eastern part of Amsterdam. As a youngster she has moved from student room to student room, but after years of moving about she tried to find a home where she could stay longer. Her waiting time was insufficient to find a place in an area to her taste. Therefore, she decided to accept an apartment that she knew was bound to be renovated or even demolished in the nearby future. When the housing association finally started renovations and she had to move out, she was granted an urgency status, which enabled her to top waiting lists for apartments she liked.

Tania and Mart both had a small apartment in the Indische Buurt, an area characterized by large volumes of social rent, but situated at the Amsterdam gentrification frontier. Although they had to pay double rent and practically lived together in Tania’s apartment, they maintained the other apartment as storage room and office space.

When the housing associations made an adjustment in the allocation rules providing the opportunity to combine waiting time of tenants that intended to live together, Tania and Mart immediately took action: “Although we already lived together, we applied for this ‘living together trial’ and in the meantime we sublet our one
other apartment while applying for other apartments on the web. And then there was this new rule that you can combine your waiting time...."

They were able to combine their waiting time and apply for a large new-built apartment in the same neighbourhood, with a rent that was some 300 euro’s less than what they paid before.

The three stories reveal how four different types of practices produce similar outcomes. Eva took advantage of someone she knows who cheats on the system. Although her behaviour is clandestine and can be fined, the municipality and housing associations estimate that this type of practice is quite common. Jenny was aware of the advantages of renting a to-be-renovated apartment, which provided her with a declaration of urgency. While Mart and Tania were keen on the changes in the rules of the system and made a head start with their newly granted capital.

In one case a change in ‘the rules of the game’ provided Tania and Mart with more official capital, which they recognised and made use of right away. In the other three cases the would-be-tenants lacked the official form of capital (waiting time) to acquire an apartment. Instead these tenants made use of knowledge about how the system works (a kind of cultural capital) and used their social network (a form of social capital) and combined this in some cases with the willingness to break the law to achieve their goals. Since pricing mechanisms do not operate within the social rent market in Amsterdam, economic capital plays only a minor part in determining who gets what apartment. Hence, which apartments are eventually rented by whom, depends on other forms of capital one commands. The respondents were gaming the system or cheating on the system in order to have access to housing. Thus, what may become clear from the examples is that knowing the right people and how the system works can be an advantage. Furthermore, a particular attitude towards the official rules, which we could call ‘criminal capital’, also works enabling in the system of social rent.

These forms of capital are, just like economic capital, not evenly distributed among those who search for a social rent apartment. The fact that economic capital (income) doesn’t carry a long way in this housing field, having a high income is not the causal factor for explaining this phenomenon. It seems plausible to assume that high-income groups command other forms of capital as well. They may have larger and more ‘useful’ social networks, have a better chance of knowing people that can help them finding a home, and may have a better

---

7 The fine for subletting illegally is max. € 18,000, for subrenting € 340 http://www.wzs.amsterdam.nl/ prejaanzak_woenfraude/Handhavingsbesluiten/Bestuurlijke_boete
8 According to the Amsterdam federation of housing associations 20,000 dwellings (10%) are illegally sublet. They fear, however, that this is a conservative estimate. http://afwc.nl/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=edit&id=28&Itemid=31
9 The housing associations changed the rules for allocation. They call it literally ‘new rules of the game’.
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understanding and knowledge about the market and the rules that govern it (Van Kempen and Özükren, 1998). Although criminal behaviour is not very often associated with middle-classes (Hirschi, 2002) these types of crime are more common among middle classes (Shover, 2010). Although it should be stressed that it is not practiced by the majority, illegal subletting and other forms of illegal activities do play a considerable role, also amongst higher classes. Perhaps, the rigidity of the social housing system and the relative locked housing market in Amsterdam have created an attitude towards the official rules that considers this type of offence as normal or acceptable. It is, however, clear that also the willingness to break rules is not evenly distributed and hence produces disparities in opportunities in this housing field.

The practices of Eva, Jenny, and Tania and Mart are in some respect strategic and tactical in other. Clearly, Eva made some decisions that advanced her own interests, but she didn’t think of this as such. For her she was lucky enough that one of her friends was so kind to letting her rent the apartment. Because of the difficulty of ‘getting into the system’ as an outsider she felt “powerless” and as if she didn’t have any other choice. Of course also other options were available to her, but she seized this opportunity very ad hoc.

Jenny’s practices could be qualified as more strategical. She deliberately planned ahead to optimize her housing opportunities. Even though she felt as if she depended on the social housing system, she was able to make an investment in terms of waiting time and temporarily living in an apartment that was due to be demolished. She used her knowledge of the system and accepted the uncertain status of her housing situation in order to capitalise the urgency status. Tania and Mart present also a largely tactical case: they experienced a lack of opportunities and also that they had to accept any suitable dwelling (because of a lack of financial resources mainly). When they saw an opportunity, however, presented by the changed rules of their housing field, they seized it swiftly.

The next part of this article will address a different field, with other rules, and other strategies and tactics. However, it gives another example of how other forms or perhaps other dimensions of capital other than economic capital play a role in a particular segment of a housing market.

‘Money Under the Table’: Nepotism in the Copenhagen Andelsbolig Housing Market

Vesterbro is a neighbourhood in Copenhagen, which has undergone a major transformation in the past decade (Larsen and Hansen, 2008). Due to a large-scale urban renewal project, initiated by the Copenhagen municipality, the ownership of a significant part of the housing stock in Vesterbro has shifted from publicly owned social housing to privately, but collectively owned, housing in so-called andelsboligforeninger (private co-ops). From a seedy red-light district the area has become the trendiest quarter of the Danish capital. The gentrification process that took place in this neighbourhood was fuelled by major public investment, but
was already underway. The process is characterized by gentrification phenomena such as the displacement of poor and often ethnic minority households, by higher educated and more affluent ones (Lund Hansen 2003). Simultaneously, housing prices have exploded, apartment blocks and public space have been renovated (both by public and private funds), and trendy fashion shops and hip bars popped up on the street of Istedgade and around Halmtorvet.

The increased pressure on the Vesterbro housing market due to a greater demand for living in the neighbourhood has not only pushed prices in the private sector, but also in the semi-private market of andelsboligforeninger. Since understanding the Danish system of collective ownership is crucial for the remainder of this paragraph, I will present a short introduction to local housing regulations: The system of collective ownership in Denmark works as follows: in order to acquire an apartment one becomes a member of an association that collectively owns a whole building block (which consists of several apartments) by buying a share. This share gives the right to dwell in one of the apartments in exchange for a monthly rent (officially called a fee), which is usually lower than rent on the ‘free’ rental market. In order to become a member, one either has to enlist on a waiting list or buy a share directly from an occupant that wants to move out. This depends on government legislation and on the particular rules of the association, which are decided in the annual assembly in which all members take part (Erhvers&Boligstyrelsen, 2006). The price of these shares differs between associations, but is usually between 20,000 and 100,000 euro, with an average of 49,000 (Erhvers&Boligstyrelsen, 2006). This means that the costs for such an apartment are higher than for common rent, but much lower than the price of a comparable apartment on the free market. When one vacates the apartment, either one sells back the share to the association for the same price (corrected for inflation), which is common among most associations; or one sells the apartment to anyone at will, for a price determined by the association. In theory, government legislation and regulations of these andelsboligforeninger should guarantee that these shares do not become elements of speculation. A waiting list would ensure that access to these apartments is open to anyone, both insiders and outsiders.

In practice, the way in which the system is selective is also determined by other factors. The following stories will illustrate this point:

Søren is a 30 year old male who came to Copenhagen to study. Initially he lived in several rooms across the Danish capital, but after he completed his studies he wanted a place for himself. Not being from Copenhagen he could only inscribe to several waiting lists a couple of years ago. Consequently, he depended on the private sector and the andelsboligforeninger that allowed direct purchase from seller to buyer. He found an andels-apartment in Vesterbro, for 65,000 euro. When we discussed the atmosphere in his block and in Vesterbro more generally, he pointed out that:
“Actually, well, my block is increasingly becoming... more people of the same kind are moving in... When an apartment becomes vacant it is taken by, you know, people like you and me”

This has changed the composition of the general assembly of the association that decides on all matters concerning the association. The most concrete effect has been that the assembly decided to make the value of the shares more in line with real market values. This has produced a threshold for those that would like to buy a share in the association.

Dorthe is a woman of 33 years old, who works as a designer of accessories. She lived for many years in an apartment in an andelsboligforening that maintained a waiting list. Once she decided to move to another apartment, she was constrained in her options by the fact that her association did not make the value of the shares more in line with market prices. Relatively, her share had become less valuable on the Copenhagen housing market.

One day she heard from a friend who lived in an andelsboligforening in Vesterbro that a dwelling in the block became vacant. As this apartment was relatively cheap she was very determined to get it. She approached the seller and offered him the official price for the share plus a bonus for him of 6600 euro, which she called *pengene under bordet* (money under the table).

“I don’t think it’s good, what I did, you know. But things are difficult. It’s hard to find a home in Copenhagen and this is a way to do it and many people do it.”

What may become clear from these examples is that access to the Copenhagen andelsbolig-system is worked by various forms of capital. Although both the price of andelsboligforeninger, and ‘money under the table’ are two dimensions of economic capital, it is not simply a matter of having financial means.

Dorthe feels trapped in a conservative andelsboligforening that constrains her seriously in finding another apartment. Similar to the Amsterdam case, she feels that the system doesn’t leave her much choice than to cheat on it. Even though her cheating is illegal, her willingness to bypass the official rules is in this case a particular asset. It seems that also in the Copenhagen context the rigidity of the housing market works as a catalyst for clandestine behaviour. Probably she didn’t think through the consequences of her illegal behaviour and acted without delay.

The access to andelsboligforeninger is also related to the dynamic within these housing associations and the relationship between buyer/tenant and the

---

10 According to research by the Danish housing council (Erhverv og Boligstyrelsen, 2006) money under the table is a relatively minor phenomenon. Acquiring a dwelling via family or acquaintances, however, is very common: about two thirds of andel housing is so allocated. The seller can be fined or even face criminal prosecution, the buyer can be fined. [http://www.kuben.dk/composite-618.htm](http://www.kuben.dk/composite-618.htm)
seller/association. The decision-making process within the general assembly is very much influenced by the relationships between the residents and how they change in the course of time. Gentrification processes, such as in Vesterbro, are characterized by processes of displacement of lower classes with higher classes (Larsen and Hansen, 2008; Lund Hansen, 2003). Politics in the general assembly of andelsboligforeninger can be understood as one of the battle grounds for the conflict between different habitus. For example, this conflict becomes apparent in the different attitudes to housing between old lower class residents of Vesterbro and the gentrifiers. As many old residents have lived most of their life in Vesterbro, they are very much attached to the area. Since they intend to stay, they don’t really see their apartments as an investment. Contrarily, gentrifiers usually see their apartment as a temporary home, suiting their current life-stage and may thus be more inclined to make a profit on their investment. This results in clashes within meetings of the general assembly on for instance issues such as making the shares more in line with market prices, which is taking place in many associations (Mortensen and Seabrooke, 2008). But also outside of the official arena for the settling of conflicts, and often in a more implicit way different habituses are opposed to each other. This can for instance become apparent in the interpretation of ‘house rules’ concerning for instance garbage disposal, barbecuing in the courtyard, life rhythm and so forth. Disputes about trivial everyday life practices may seem marginal but can turn out to be a lever for change within housing co-ops when some groups tend to select their likes. To what extent an andelsboligforening experiences rapid replacement of old residents with new higher classes is dependent on the rules of that particular association. However, as these rules are decided upon by the residents themselves the changing relations within the association are both the cause and the result of this process.

Owner occupied family housing in Amsterdam
This third case describes how middle-class families find a home on the ‘free’ market in Amsterdam. As described in the first case the free market for buying a home is relatively small: only 30% of all dwellings are private buying market; 50 is social rent; and 20% is private rent (O&S, 2010). Due to a great and increasing demand and lack of supply, particularly large family dwellings are expensive and difficult to find. Nonetheless, middle-class families are on the rise in Amsterdam (Boterman et al., 2010) as they seem to be relatively successful in finding suitable dwellings. This case describes some of their strategies and tactics that they deploy in order to navigate this difficult market.

Richard and Halley bought their apartment in the borough Westerpark in 2001 for 250,000 euro. The four-room apartment is situated in a quiet, traffic-free neighbourhood, close to the new cultural district and public gardens Westerpark. For their work both Halley and Richard use a car, which made
them purchase two additional garages in an adjacent street. When they were looking for their current dwelling, they had a budget that was quite typical for people of their age and class. It was the heyday of the Amsterdam housing market, where quick decisions and over-bidding asking prices were endemic. Halley describes their search as a struggle and full of disappointments. Richard described the purchase of their apartments as a deliberate choice. He emphasized the strategic nature of the decision:

“This area was a bit out of everybody’s sight. You always had to explain where it was. Nowadays everybody knows Westerpark, and particularly the park... it is really interesting to have witnessed this process [Westerpark becoming more popular, Author].

But actually, we already saw it coming. I lived close by, in the Spaarndammerbuurt, and I was invited by the local tennis club that resides in the park to have a look at the plans they had for the park and the cultural hotspot. Well, these plans looked like it would really become beautiful and nice. That’s the reason why we started looking for an apartment here, and we really chose it consciously.

(Richard)

This story illustrates in the first place that buying a dwelling for Richard is clearly motivated by investment considerations. The choice for a particular neighbourhood is stirred by the expectations that a certain area will change for the better and hence provides a profitable or at least a relatively safe investment. This has for example been central in discussions on gentrification in the work of Gale (1980) who discerned four consecutive stages of gentrification based on the degree of risk in housing market practices of the gentrifiers. In the presented case ‘choice’ should be regarded in various ways: in the first place what Richard experienced as the range of options was contingent on their own possibilities and taste. They considered particular neighbourhoods and had specific priorities, such as parking space for their cars. Some areas or dwellings were simply not taken into account in their search for a home. Whether consciously ignored or unconsciously overlooked, their own taste demarcated a particular segment of the market, in which they were interested. Taste should not be understood as a mere preference; it is learned behaviour, embodied in the habitus. Much of the pre-selection before making a ‘conscious choice’ is related to historical experiences. The fact that Richard recognised the developments in Westerpark and interpreted them as positive for the neighbourhood is not as self-evident as it may seem. If and when such a development is recognised depends on the habitus of the observer.

Secondly, it is important to note that the range of options is always limited by temporal and local conditions of the housing market. In the period in which they tried to find a home, the Amsterdam housing market was overheated, which made the market relatively impulsive. They may have made a conscious choice, but
it was clearly constrained and limited by the conditions of the housing market of that time. These conditions urged for hasty and swift action. The impulsiveness of the market at that time is also illustrated by the next quote from a description of the acquisition of a house by Dora and David, another couple that expect their first child:

And then we acted quickly; we arranged a broker at once: a no cure, no pay guy. Eventually everything turned out fine. We spent 1500 euro on him, so no percentage. Apparently, the seller liked us from the start: as we acted very swiftly; made a bid and some other people made a bid as well, but all without a broker. I had already heard that in Amsterdam they all lend each other a hand. So the broker made a positive recommendation for our bid and things were settled in three days.

(Dora and David)

Most of my respondents acted very swiftly once they found something they liked. In many cases this lead to high overbidding and to serious financial responsibilities. Often the respondents that made use of real estate agents associated their success in the housing market with the work of the broker, as is also illustrated by this quote:

Yes, we really checked a lot of homes ... and eventually that broker. We had a broker who also, well...Uhm, who knew in advance that this home would be put onto the market. So a day after it came on the market, we took a look around in the house and I think that these people just thought we were okay. Eventually we got the house some 5000 euro below the asking price, you know...So in fact this negotiation was a bit playing around to put it that way. And that they also granted us this home...

(Tessie and Gareth)

This is another aspect that can help explain success in the Amsterdam housing market. Real estate agents are closely working together within the city, which makes their position quite important. Nevertheless, many buyers try to broker a deal without the services of a real estate agent. The dexterity of potential home buyers in negotiation processes is not evenly distributed. Even so, the willingness to hire an agent to help brokering the deal is not evenly distributed among all potential buyers either. This is not just a question of money or greed; it is also a question of social learning. Some people want to take the credit themselves, others mistrust real estate agents, and others again want to spare the money. Although this could be framed as one’s own responsibility, it is in fact socially constructed behaviour that is related to the habitus of the social group of which one makes part. What is thus argued is that some habitus works to increase and others work to decrease the odds for finding and obtaining a desired dwelling, for example working thorough the relationship between the buyer and the real estate agent.
Conclusions and Discussion

This paper has argued that in order to understand how access to housing is connected to class it is important to include all forms and dimensions of capital that make up social position. Obviously economic capital plays a crucial role in market contexts, but this cannot explain why middle-class households are also relatively successful in other housing fields where money is not paramount. The three cases in this paper have cast light on the alternative forms of capital that play a role for middle-class households finding a home in three different housing contexts. In my interviews I encountered many examples of behaviour in the housing markets that was not in line with rules that officially guide the way in which these systems work. Some of this behaviour could be qualified as strategic, as it deliberately sought to improve opportunities over time. Other behaviour is less conscious and less intentional, that is tactical, as it creatively interpreted rules and bent it in certain—for my respondents- advantageous directions.

This paper showed various strategies and tactics of middle-class households in the social rental sector in Amsterdam. In order to bypass the official rules of that field, some subjects deploy other forms of capital, such as willingness to cheat on the system. Others used their knowledge of how the system works to their own good. This knowledge should be understood in multiple ways. In the first place there is direct knowledge of what the official rules are, whether they might become altered in the nearby future and how they can be made to apply or not. Secondly, knowledge of the market also consists of knowing how allocation of dwellings is organised in practice. Thirdly, knowledge of the market can also imply a certain feel for what neighbourhoods are inaccessibly popular and which neighbourhoods are still within reach (in terms of waiting time). Anticipating the development of a particular neighbourhood depends on a particular judgement that not everyone has.

The same logic applies also to the buying market for family housing. Anticipating the development of a particular neighbourhood (and thereby catalysing it) is a strategical practice. Some groups will be able to recognize developments in areas earlier than others and this may gain them an edge over others. This is a practice associated with groups that lack the financial means to just buy themselves in, but have specific cultural forms of capital that enable them to recognise trends, shape them and catalyse them. This process is particularly inherent in earlier stages of gentrification in which pioneers enter low-status areas and start turning them into more legitimised spaces for the middle-classes (Clay, 1979; Gale, 1980; Ley, 2003). My data suggest that gentrifiers may acquire a feel for the city as well as accumulate economic capital through their successful investment in housing, which gives them an edge when they become parents and make a next step in their housing career.
As the Copenhagen case showed, also institutions such as privately organised co-ops can function as a ‘social sorting machine’. In particular the andelsboligforeninger where the board or the general assembly selects new residents and has a majority of middle-class members, and tends to prefer new members that have a similar social profile, that is, means people with a similar habitus. Also when individual members are allowed to sell their share directly to any buyer in an increasingly popular neighbourhood those buyers that have more financial resources, but equally important good social skills and the ability to negotiate cunningly are more likely to enter such a co-op. Once a certain tipping point is reached, gentrification processes become consolidated or even intensified.

These diverse examples show that in order to understand specific dynamics in segments of the housing market it is important not only to investigate the official rules and the evident forms of capital such as money or waiting time that play a role, but also to look at what people actually do in order to find a home. Table 4.2 summarises the in this paper identified forms of capital that play a role in the three housing fields.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Evident forms of capital</th>
<th>Additional forms of capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social housing in Amsterdam</td>
<td>Waiting time; Urgency status</td>
<td>Knowledge of the system; ‘Criminal capital’; Social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andelsbolig Copenhagen</td>
<td>Economic capital; Waiting time</td>
<td>Social capital; ‘criminal capital’; Taste (cultural capital)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied family housing Amsterdam</td>
<td>Economic capital</td>
<td>Knowledge of the housing market; Taste (cultural capital); Attitude towards brokers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The paper suggests that people with various habituses have different strategies and tactics for finding a home, depending on the housing field. In highly regulated housing fields it seems that social capital and particular forms of cultural capital are sometimes more important than economic capital. But also in market contexts, although also regulated, other forms of capital than merely financial play an important role. This paper started with the fact that these various housing practices are experienced differently. People that lack financial capital or act in housing fields where money plays a minor role may have a sense that they can exercise less control over their own housing conditions. Finding a satisfactory dwelling may then be perceived as a lucky shot. My data suggest that this is particularly the case with people that seize ad hoc opportunities and hence navigate the housing market mainly tactically. Yet, even though these people experience a sense of powerlessness, they may possess other forms of capital which enable them to find a suitable home. Hence, this paper suggests that the experience of coincidence depends on the types of capital at one’s disposal.
This would imply that specific middle-class habituses are associated with specific strategies and tactics culminating in various housing pathways (Clapham, 2005). These time-space trajectories as Bridge (2003) calls them are thus associated with specific housing practices and with specific housing fields. Middle-class groups with a more economic habitus may follow housing pathways that are more focussed on the free market sector. Other middle-class households with a less strong focus on the accumulation of economic capital may follow their housing pathway in the social sector thereby making use of their social and cultural forms of capital. This links up with Watt’s (2005) observations about ‘marginal’ middle classes in council housing in London and the work of Butler and Robson (2003). As they, and others (i.e Savage, 2010; Watt, 2009) already observed it is important to link these housing habituses also to other fields such as employment, education and consumption. The role of housing as an investment and a stage for the accumulation of particular forms of capital should always be linked with the broader time-space trajectories through physical and social space. Future research should analyse more structurally and longitudinally how social, cultural and economic capital are interlocked and how these forms of capital become accumulated and are associated with specific housing fields and pathways in both time and space.
Box 3: Housing of Middle-Class Families

In the preceding chapter the various strategies and tactics of middle class households were discussed. The focus in that chapter was mainly on the differences between middle classes in terms of their housing pathways. This Box shows the housing positions of the families in the sample of this dissertation and how they changed in the transition to parenthood.

Figure 4b.1 shows the tenure position of middle class families in 2008 and 2010. As appears from the Figure most middle-class families are homeowners in 2008; about 20% lives in social rental dwellings and another 20% lives in private rent. Even though still about 30% continues renting their home, it is clear that the transition to parenthood is associated with a move into homeownership. In the Amsterdam context of only 25% owner-occupied dwellings, the households in this study are relatively often homeowners. This is probably related to their (potential) income as well as a strong homeownership ideology among middle classes.

Figure 4b.1. Tenure 2008-2010, (n=230)

Source: Source: own data.

In 2008 most households in the sample lived in apartments without private outdoor space, only 6% lived in a (terraced) house. In 2010, however, those households that moved out of the central city were in majority living in houses with a garden. Those households that moved within the central city, now occupy slightly more houses and apartments with access to private outdoor space. Notwithstanding, nearly all households that moved managed to improve their
housing conditions in terms of space. Figure 4b.3 shows that households that moved out of central Amsterdam live in the largest homes, while those that live in central Amsterdam generally inhabit smaller dwellings. Nevertheless, also centrally living families still 40% lives in housing larger than 100 square meters.

**Figure 4b.2. Dwelling type in 2008-2010**

Source: own data.

**Figure 4b.3. Dwelling size and residential location, 2008-2010**

Source: own data.
Dealing with Diversity

Middle-class family households and the issue of ‘black’ and ‘white’ schools in Amsterdam

This is a revised version of a submitted manuscript:

Introduction

Although social relations between middle classes and lower classes in diverse areas are often no more than ‘tectonic’ (Robson and Butler, 2001), diversity is an important theme for many members of the middle-class. Many gentrifiers celebrate multiculturalism and use the ethnic or racial make-up of a neighbourhood to contrast themselves with traditional middle classes in the suburbs (Bridge, 2006; Ley, 2003). However, when gentrifiers become parents, the diversity of the neighbourhood may be perceived as a threat. To paraphrase Bridge (2006:1965), the desire to display symbolic capital may conflict with the need to reproduce cultural capital through the educational system.

The issue of education is indeed a delicate one for middle-class parents in various urban contexts (Ball, 2003b; Bunar, 2010; Hollingworth and Williams, 2010; Maloutsas, 2007; Noreisch, 2007; Rangvid, 2007; Vincent et al., 2008). Several studies have shown that middle-class parents in diverse urban contexts fear exposing their children to lower standards of education, the ‘wrong’ types of socialisation, and even victimisation (Byrne, 2006, 2009; Reay, 2001). For the UK context, it has been argued that the way in which urban middle-class parents handle these issues depends on their resources (capital) (Ball, 2003a) and their identities (Reay et al., 2011). These studies have argued that various middle-class fractions or habitus have different strategies for reproducing social class.

It is often emphasised that residential practices and school choice are tightly interwoven in a ‘geography of education’ (Butler and Hamnett, 2007; Butler and Robson, 2003a, b). The current understanding of the ways in which the fields of housing and education are interconnected is disproportionately based on findings from the UK and, specifically, London. The UK context of school catchment areas, the stark division of private and public education and the dynamics of the housing market, however, are likely to produce rather specific outcomes. Although studies from other contexts have revealed important parallels with the practices of the middle class in the UK, they have also revealed differences in terms of urban middle-class strategies in the field of education. These differences should be
associated with the specific configurations of the local housing market, national and local education policies and discourses and meanings of social class, ethnicity and race.

In Amsterdam, the Netherlands, national and local housing and educational policies have created a schooling landscape stands out in the following three major respects:

1) private and public education are both funded by the state; therefore, the role of economic capital in education is very small but that of life style (religion, cultural capital) is much more important.
2) parents have free school choice; therefore, the intertwinement of school and neighbourhood is much smaller than in other contexts.
3) most neighbourhoods in Amsterdam are diverse, both socially and ethnically; therefore, the interactions between residential choice and school choice are quite different from those in the UK and other contexts.

These specificities of the Amsterdam context create a schooling landscape that allows for parental school choice strategies that differ from those in the UK and other contexts. The goals of the current paper are as follows: 1) to show how the meaning of diversity for Amsterdam middle-classes changes when they become parents; 2) to identify how configurations of ethnicity, social class and housing and schooling policies in the context of Amsterdam influence middle-class parents’ strategies regarding school choice; and 3) to show how school choice strategies are linked to the interaction of habitus and the specific rules of the Amsterdam field of education.

The main questions are, more specifically:

How does the meaning of diversity change for urban middle-class households when they orientate for primary schooling for their children?

What are the socio-spatial strategies for school choice of white middle-class parents in the context of Amsterdam, and how are these strategies informed by their habitus?

Utilising concepts derived from the work of Bourdieu and inspired by a range of mainly UK-based research on diversity, school choice, habitus and white middle class identities, the present study demonstrates the Amsterdam middle class’ struggle with diversity. I will show how white middle-class households develop various socio-spatial strategies for schooling in the ethnically and socially diverse context of Amsterdam and how specific Amsterdam outcomes confirm and challenge the broader literature on the reproduction of white middle class privilege.
Dealing with Diversity

Theory

Diversity as distinction
It has been argued that new middle classes tend to set themselves apart from the suburban old middle class by living in inner-city areas (May, 1996). Living in the city has become part of a life style and a distinction strategy of particular middle-class habituses (Bridge, 2006; Butler and Robson, 2003a, b; Ley, 1994, 1996). An important aspect of their distinctive repertoire lies in the embracement of cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism, which is also reflected in the political views expressed by many gentrifiers (Butler, 1997; Ley, 1994; Rose, 2004). Furthermore, much of the distinctive potential of inner-city living lies in residing in ethnically and socially diverse areas, which symbolises tolerance and open-mindedness (Blokland and van Eijk, 2010).

Middle-class inhabitants of (formerly) working-class neighbourhoods often emphasise the positive aspects of living in a diverse neighbourhood. Whether they describe the variety of exotic shops or the colourful streetscape, many gentrifiers consider diversity as a neighbourhood asset. Various scholars have rightfully pointed to the hidden power relationships that are played out here (Allen, 2008). Nevertheless, it carries too far to simply dismiss the positive feelings many gentrifiers have toward diversity and to portray it as a cover up for displacement. Although interaction between different social classes is limited, there is real meaning in the middle-class’ desire to live in areas that are socially diverse.

Diversity and education
However, when gentrifiers have children, the diversity of the neighbourhood may no longer be primarily viewed positively but may also be perceived as a threat. Particularly for middle-classes, the educational system is crucial in maintaining and legitimising class differences (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977; Green, 1990; Reay, 2001). Therefore, access to high-quality schooling is one of the foremost priorities of most middle-class parents (Butler and Hamnett, 2007; Butler and Robson, 2003a, b). Beginning with the selection of child care facilities, and continuing into the field of primary and secondary education, middle-class parents carefully plan the schooling of their children (Ball, 2003b; Hollingworth and Williams, 2010; Vincent et al., 2008). Middle-class parents are particularly concerned with the following three main issues: the quality of the school; the atmosphere at the school; the ‘wrong’ types of socialisation; and even victimisation at the school and in the neighbourhood (Byrne, 2006, 2009; Reay, 2001; Vincent et al., 2004; Vincent et al., 2008).

As Byrne (2006) indicated, these fears are often framed and studied from a class perspective and surprisingly rarely from the perspective of race or ethnicity. However, in multicultural urban contexts, class is often mediated by race (Byrne, 2006, 2009; Reay et al., 2011). Another study confirmed that middle-classes
“associated ethnic difference with material disadvantage and implicitly whiteness, with social and economic privilege” (Hollingworth and Williams, 2010: 55).

Many of the middle-class fears are, hence, related to the socio-economic and ethnic/racial diversity of the school population. Thus, although gentrifiers have a particular urban life style that emphasises ‘political correctness’ and ‘good taste’, their distinctive practices become challenged by the newly acquired responsibilities of parenthood.

Particularly in jurisdictions where access to schools is geographically defined through catchment areas, school choice and neighbourhood choice are closely interrelated. School segregation at the metropolitan level is generally higher than residential segregation, but in most Western cities, these types of segregation are spatially strongly correlated (Burgess et al., 2005). Therefore, the dilemmas of middle-class parents become most apparent in areas that are diverse in terms of class and ethnicity/race. Given that many gentrification areas are rather diverse in terms of class and often also ethnicity/race (Freeman, 2009), the local school population is also quite diverse. Many of these areas have a school infrastructure that was once suited to the needs of working classes (Butler and Robson, 2003b). In many former working-class areas, middle classes may have trouble finding schools to their taste.

Middle-class strategies for education

It has been suggested that various fractions or habituses within the middle classes may employ different strategies for managing these challenges (Ball, 2003a). Several scholars have linked this to the identities, values and resources that middle-class parents command. An emerging literature that examines school contexts beyond the UK demonstrates that the national and local context of both education and housing also influence the strategies of middle-class parents. Although many similarities have been identified across various Western contexts, middle classes in different national and local contexts develop strategies in line with the specificities of their schooling and housing context. Furthermore, the degree, perceptions and definitions of diversity also differ.

A strategy that is often described for the US context is the suburbanisation of white middle-class families. This strategy is strongly associated with the central role of race in US segregation patterns (Frey, 1979). Nonetheless, white flight is also a phenomenon in European contexts, notably the UK. In European contexts, ‘white flight’ is often understood as the relationships between (white) natives and immigrant groups of various descents (see for Scandinavian examples Bunar, 2010; Rangvid, 2007). Suburbanisation, however, is not an option for those who desire to ‘bask in the warm glow of multiculturalism’ (Reay et al., 2011: 2).

Another strategy, which is related to white flight, is retreating into relatively majority white middle-class areas within the city. This strategy fits with broader trends of middle classes ‘padding the bunker’ (Atkinson, 2006), whereby middle
classes attempt to maintain control of their environment and retreat from public urban space. For some middle-class parents, moving into a particular school catchment areas is a way to safeguard the reproduction of privilege (Noreisch, 2007). This strategy is often a matter of deploying large quantities of economic capital (Butler and Robson, 2003b; Leech and Campos, 2003).

Strategies that do not involve moving into a desired catchment area include travelling greater distances from home to school. Butler and others have demonstrated that as a response to a mismatch between school and residential location, middle-class parents in London have adopted a metropolitan-wide strategy for (secondary) education (Butler and Hamnett, 2007; Butler and Robson, 2003b). This strategy can be considered as an example of elective belonging (Savage, 2010), whereby middle classes select certain aspects of inner-city living and dispose of others. However, this strategy is only viable in contexts with a large private schooling sector, such as in the UK. Furthermore, it applies mainly to secondary education as primary education is much more geographically confined.

A final strategy that is described in various international contexts is the middle-class ‘colonisation’ of local schools in diverse neighbourhoods. In the UK, this often implies the ‘gentrification’ of public working class schools with the aim of creating safety in numbers (Vowden, forthcoming). This active shaping of the social and academic conditions of schooling is a relatively risky strategy that does not guarantee the reproduction of privilege. As Reay and colleagues (2011) have shown, first-generation middle classes would have avoided this type of risk-taking. These socially engaged and uncertain strategies are likely to be associated with households endowed with high cultural and social capital, which can be used for compensation. Moreover, these strategies provide parents with specific forms of symbolic capital that fit their liberal and tolerant identities and habituses.

The Amsterdam context
The Amsterdam context stands out in the following three respects:

1) Measured by ethnic diversity, Amsterdam is one of the most diverse cities in the Western world. Approximately half of the population has a non-Dutch background. Furthermore, income and ethnic segregation levels are relatively low (Musterd, 2005). Local and national housing policies have been and continue to be strongly committed to social mix. Partially due to a large social rent sector, most neighbourhoods in Amsterdam are diverse, both socially and ethnically.

---

11 The most common Dutch statistical definition of ethnicity is ‘allochtoon’. Dutch statistics define people of whom at least one parent was born abroad as ‘allochtoon’. Commonly, a distinction is made between Western and non-Western ‘allochtoon’.
2) Since 1917, private education and public education have been nearly fully funded by the state. The city of Amsterdam has 111 private primary schools (O&S, 2011b) that offer a wide range of different types of education, based on various didactical or confessional principles (i.e., Montessori, Catholic, Protestant, Islamic), and 98 public schools. The fee differentiation between schools is quite limited; therefore, the role of economic capital in school choice is very small.

3) In the Netherlands, parents' freedom of school choice is granted by the constitution. Although caveats apply, parents can select any school in the municipality for their children. Consequently, the intertwinement of school and neighbourhood is much weaker than in most other contexts, notably in the UK. Although some popular schools in Amsterdam have adopted enrolment procedures based on postal code, UK-style school catchment areas do not exist.

These three aspects of the Amsterdam schooling context, in which choice plays an important role, have produced a school landscape that is characterised by high levels of school segregation (Karsten et al., 2006; Karsten et al., 2003). Interestingly, school segregation is largely debated in racial terms rather than academic qualities and social deprivation. Schools with high shares of non-Western minorities are referred to as ‘black’ schools; schools with high shares of native Dutch students are referred to as ‘white’ schools (Vedder, 2006). These racial labels, however, do not refer only to the ethnic composition of the school population. In common discourse, ‘bad schools’, ‘black schools’ and ‘deprived schools’ are used interchangeably. Amsterdam parents may use the ethnic composition of schools as a marker of academic quality.

Dutch studies on school choice show that most middle-class parents are quite aware of the ethnic composition of potential schools (Jongejan and Tijs, 2010). For higher educated parents, ethnic composition is mainly a reason not to go to particular schools (Karsten et al., 2003). It has even been suggested that although higher educated parents express a stronger commitment to sending their children to an ethnically diverse school, they eventually do not practice what they preach (Jongejan and Tijs, 2010). Enabled by the free school choice, middle-class parents are more mobile in finding ‘the right’ school.

If Amsterdam middle-class parents seek to reproduce their middle-class privilege, it is likely that they develop strategies that are in line with the opportunities and constraints of the local schooling landscape. It has indeed been argued that middle-class parents search for a ‘match’ between home and school, which implies both an ethnic match and a match of values, rules, and didactical approach: cultural capital. Based on evidence from Amsterdam and other contexts,

---

2) Private education (Dutch: bijzonder onderwijs) in the Netherlands is a denominator for a wide range of religious (Catholic and Protestant) and education methods such as Montessori, Dalton and Anthroposophy. By far, the largest share of private education is religious.
it could be hypothesised that because economic means cannot help middle-class parents select the school that they prefer, cultural capital and social capital play a greater role in school choice.

Furthermore, because school and neighbourhood are less strongly interrelated than in contexts with school catchment areas, the need for residential relocation for the sake of school choice is reduced. In Amsterdam, freedom of school choice may, therefore, reduce ‘white flight’ or ‘padding the bunker’ because it allows white middle classes to circumvent the perceived disadvantages of neighbourhood diversity.

Data and Methods

This study aims to investigate the changing meaning of diversity for middle-class couples when they become parents and search for primary education for their child and how they handle this diversity in the Amsterdam context. The most suitable method for studying changes in both attitude and practice is detailed in-depth interviews over a long period of time. This paper draws on 53 semi-structured in-depth interviews with 28 middle-class couples that resided within the inner ring road of Amsterdam. The participants were selected from a larger sample of 460 middle-class families, who completed two questionnaires (in 2008 and in 2010), which provided information about their income, education, work and consumption. In 2008, 28 interviews were completed with couples that were in the last stage of their first pregnancy and that lived in the inner-city of Amsterdam. At the end of 2010, 25 interviews with the same couples (three dropped out) were carried out. The interviews were held with both the male and the female partner (except one), took place at the respondents' home and lasted between one hour and two hours. The interviews were analysed with Atlas TI, whereby all fragments of the interviews were coded for the issue of ethnic, racial and class diversity and the issue of school choice.

In the first interview, respondents were extensively asked about their relationship with the city and the neighbourhood, what they expected of their future parenthood and how parenthood would affect their relationship with the city and their neighbourhood.

During the follow-up interview, all respondents had one child of approximately two years of age and 14 cases also had a newborn or were in the final stages of a second pregnancy. Most parents were actively engaged with finding a primary school for their oldest child. The second interviews were focussed on what had changed in the lives of these middle-class couples and how the changes had affected their relationship with their residential environment. In all follow-up interviews, respondents were asked about the process of finding and choosing a school, although most parents began discussing it prior to questioning. This was compared with the first interview, in which parents were also explicitly asked about schooling.
Amsterdam Diversity

Although most of the respondents are not originally from Amsterdam, most of them considered themselves urbanites. Most respondents agreed that Amsterdam does not have the metropolitan qualities of larger urban centres. In fact, many of them described Amsterdam as a 'big village' because of its modest size and snug atmosphere. Nonetheless, many emphasised—somewhat contradictorily—the cosmopolitan feel of Amsterdam. They attributed this characteristic particularly to the abundance of cultural amenities and the diversity of the population:

Amsterdam is small, but it has that urban feel, that cosmopolitan feel, that all cultures come together. (Gerreth)

I always have a bit of a New York feeling of, you know, when you come here and you have the feeling of the city, then you are an Amsterdammer. Because an Amsterdammer is white and black and everything mixed. (Egbert)

As Egbert expressed, there is a certain pride among some of the respondents that Amsterdam is such a diverse city. However, this diversity has various realities. At the level of the city, diversity is often associated with cosmopolitanism; however, at the neighbourhood level, diversity is not always appreciated:

Satellite-dish neighbourhoods: I don't think that's very pleasant. It looks so shabby. I don't feel comfortable with that. Here [Westerpark] it's very mixed, but there it's actually not so mixed anymore. I think it's pretty shabby there. (Dave)

Dave referred to a former dwelling in De Baarsjes, where he lived before he moved to his current home in Westerpark. Although De Baarsjes is also in both ethnic and class definitions quite diverse, Dave felt that 'it is not mixed anymore' and that 'it's pretty shabby'. For him, diversity was a positive notion, referring to the cosmopolitan buzz. Dave pointed to the following important issue: the appreciation of diversity also depends on the degree and type of mixing. Satellite-dishes, in the Dutch context, represent the presence of Turkish and Moroccan immigrants. For many respondents, these immigrant groups represented a more negative type of diversity associated with crime and conflicting norms and values. Interestingly, diversity in the city as a whole was considered positively, whereas negative aspects of diversity were nearly always expressed in relation to children’s services such as day-care and primary schools.

Thinking about future schooling

At the time of the first interview, the first child was recently born. Day-care was the respondents’ foremost and immediate concern. Yet, many respondents were already thinking about primary education as well. Of the 28 couples, nine explicitly
stated that they did not think about schools at all. However, the other couples were to some degree already engaged with the selection of schooling for their first-born. In two households, the parents had registered for a particular school in the neighbourhood; in six cases, parents had clear ideas about the type of school they preferred. Another theme that surfaced was the long waiting lists for particular schools and, hence, the necessity to orientate and enrol early. Most of the respondents (15), however, expressed that they preferred a school near their home and checked local schools first.

I would like it if our child had friends at school who also just live in the neighbourhood; the idea that you live in the neighbourhood with children that attend the same school.

(Helene)

At the end of the day, you want to send your child to a good school, and I think it’s important that it’s a local school. We are lucky to live in a neighbourhood with two very white and posh schools, which also score very high. If we had lived in De Pijp, our choice would have much more difficult.

(Bea)

Bea felt lucky to live in a neighbourhood with good schools, albeit they were a bit posh for her taste. She expressed that they would have faced other dilemmas had they lived in another more diverse neighbourhood (De Pijp).

I think it’s funny that we chose this house, because it could have been somewhere else: In De Pijp if there had been a nice home there. Things would have been different then. Then, we would have faced more dilemmas. (Bea)

Bea’s quotes articulate the relationship between ‘the neighbourhood’ and schooling. The choice for a local school depends on the neighbourhood. For parents such as Bea, the relationship with the neighbourhood is favourable, but the dilemmas associated with living in diverse neighbourhoods such as De Pijp are literally and figuratively just around the corner. Other parents considered the diversity of their neighbourhood and school population a problem:

Marc: It is still quite mixed here and I do notice that! If I see what kinds of parents go there...And I don’t even look at the children but more at the parents. Then, I think: well, that’s not really my cup of tea.

Willem: So what type of parents attend this school?
Marc: Well, there are a lot of people smoking outside, you know. It’s not that I’m anti-smoking per se, but they’re just...these women that chit-chat with a cigarette in their mouth (imitates low-class accents).
Marc lived in the mixed neighbourhood of De Pijp. The school he referred to is next door to his home. Without directly referring to it, Marc’s concerns with the school population were related to issues of class. The women who smoked and stood outside after school were not Marc’s ‘cup of tea’. Later in the interview, when discussing pre-schools, he described his cup of tea:

That was a very special pre-school, according to some Italian pedagogical scheme. Once every week an artist comes by. He will work with the children. I think that’s really interesting. And they make music every week: someone comes and plays the violin and these kind of things. I think I’m mainly going to pay attention to these kinds of things. But then you’ll end up automatically with white schools. (Marc)

The type of education that emphasises the high-brow cultural development of children is restricted to particular schools. Often, these schools are special schools13 with a particular teaching method such as Montessori. As Marc remarked, there is a correlation between the learning methods and the school’s population. Implicitly, some of his remarks about the type of education also refer to the ethnic composition of the school. However, other parents were much more outspoken about this issue:

There are a couple of really black schools around here. Well, we wouldn’t want that. Uh, just a bit mixed: fine, but it’s just really important that children speak Dutch well, that in the class there are no children with language deficiencies or whatever else. (Thea)

It concerns me what school he’ll go to. I mean nothing to the detriment of the other kids, but yes I rather have him in a classroom with 25 children that are all the same than that he’ll be the only white kid. And that he’ll come home with all kinds of strange rituals. (Fiona)

Thea and Fiona both made strong statements concerning the ethnic or racial composition of the school. Interestingly, class ‘race’ and ethnicity were combined. ‘Black schools’ have children with language deficiencies and may lead the only white child to ‘bring home strange rituals’. Yet, during the first interview, only seven participants made explicit remarks about the ethnic or ‘racial’ composition of the school. Even fewer made indirect remarks about class issues:

It shouldn’t be a dangerous neighbourhood but a neighbourhood where just decent people live. Uhm, yeah, I think that’s just very important, and schools! Good schools! (Dan)

Dan used the term ‘decent people’ to describe the type of neighbourhood population he preferred in his vicinity. Later, he specified ‘decent’ as ‘higher educated’. Nonetheless, such utterances were rare. Despite a looming concern
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for ethnic and class issues, often expressed through reference to the academic quality of the school, most parents did not directly refer to these issues in the first interview. In the second interview, however, class and ethnicity were much more explicitly discussed.

Choosing a primary school
After two years, the issue of primary education had become a much more relevant topic for most of the parents. Some had received an invitation from the municipality to orientate for schools in the neighbourhood. Others had discussed it with their friends who were in the same position. Most of the respondents had also taken action, which ranged from biking along the neighbourhood’s schools to checking the schools’ scores on the Internet. At the time of the first interview, nine respondents had not yet thought about schools. In the second interview, this was only the case for two couples, which was because they planned to emigrate.

In the second interview, respondents were mainly orientating for schools in their neighbourhood. Naturally, in most cases, having a school nearby was considered most practical, but some schools also maintained some type of selection on postal code. In the first interview, only seven respondents referred directly to the ethnic composition of school; however, in the second interview, 23 of the 25 couples referred to the ethnic or ‘racial’ aspects of school choice. Most did so by making reference to the ideal ‘racial’ composition:

If you’re the only white kid I don’t think I would like that. But it also depends on the other impressions one has of such a school. What kind of teachers and such things. Ideally I would have a small, mixed school. Actually a school where it’s 50-50. Or uhm, 40-60. But 10-90 or 20-80, that’s...well...I don’t think so. (Natalie & Robert)

Most couples made a similar argument. They desired a mixed school for their children but preferred a composition in which ‘black’ kids did not outnumber the ‘white’ kids. Most parents were quite aware of the heterogeneity of the Amsterdam population and preferred a school population that mirrors that diversity:

I wouldn’t like a posh white school where there are only these Ralph Lauren kids, you know, I want her to go to a school that is a fair representation of society, so that she also learns what other cultures are. (Jade)

Yet, some parents believed that this ideal mixed school did not exist. At the neighbourhood level, schools can be rather segregated. However, when this was not the case, some felt that they had to choose between ‘black’ or ‘white’. When faced with this dilemma, they often chose white:
Anna: Apparently that doesn’t exist, because everybody really wants it. It’s nice that your child meets some Moroccans, some Turks. To let them know there’s something else, you know. But the standard of education shouldn’t be compromised of course. But apparently that’s almost impossible to find.

Sean: We ourselves also go for quality. Or well quality, we chose by these scores.

Sean and Anna preferred a mixed school, but they also ‘go for quality’, which implies that they would not compromise the quality of the school for an ideal ethnic composition. Most of the respondents stressed their adherence to multiculturalism. Nevertheless, the ethnic composition of schools manifested itself as the foremost concern of the respondents. The notion that the quality of the school is negatively correlated with the ethnic composition was partially confirmed by the publically accessible school performance scores. Interestingly, the most important fears concerned the effect that a ‘black’ school would have on the language development of the respondents’ children:

But yet you wonder like, hey, Anne will be at that school and she speaks, I think, much better Dutch than the rest. How will that affect her language development? (Esther)

Other parents were anxious that their children would be outsiders at a school with a non-white majority:

That he will be excluded, as a white kid, or that it...There is really a lot of Antilleans here, and a lot of Moroccans and they are really isolated communities, so that he won’t join in, because he’s the exception. I think that’s very important for children. That, yeah I think that’s every parent’s worst fear that his child is left out, excluded. (Hally)

This fear that their children would be outsiders at a school with a large majority of children from a non-Western background was common among the respondents. It was also common for the participants to voice their concerns about the ethnic or racial composition of the school in cultural terms. Particularly, the development of language seemed to be a legitimate way of voicing these concerns. As suggested by these quotes, the respondents combined issues of ethnicity and race with issues of class and culture. Most of the concerns were related to class, but expressed in racial/ethnic terms. In this way, ‘black schools’ became bad schools and white schools were good schools. In spite of the quite general concerns about the school populations, parents handled this in various ways. The next empirical section will show the various socio-spatial strategies that middle-class parents adopted in the search for primary education for their children.

Dealing with diversity
Evidently, reasons to move are only partially related to school choice. Yet,
geographical location has consequences for the options available. Even in the free-choice school landscape of Amsterdam, geography and education are related. Access to the schools that are perceived as good is to some extent determined by the postal code, that is, the neighbourhood. One-third of the respondents considered schools when they moved at the time of the first interview. At the time of the second interview, more than half of the respondents considered schools to be important for their residential choices. Nearly all respondents were concerned with the ethnic composition of schools in the city and neighbourhood schools in particular. In spite of this rising awareness, only few moved, and some considered moving to a particular area because of good schools. The strategies of managing school choice varied by residential location and parents' preferences for school characteristics. I identified the following five strategies:

1) Moving to another municipality with a less diverse population and good schools.
2) Moving to or staying in a neighbourhood within Amsterdam with a less diverse population in both the neighbourhood and school.
3) Staying in (or moving to) a relatively diverse area but sending children to a 'white' school within or outside the residential area.
4) Staying in a relatively diverse area but, together with other more highly educated 'white' parents from the neighbourhood, 'mixing' a 'black' school.
5) Staying in a relatively diverse area and sending children to a local school with a diverse or predominantly 'black' population.

**Strategy 1:**
Only two of the respondents moved outside of Amsterdam into a relatively homogeneous suburb. For Minou and Henk, the issue of diversity did not surface as the key for understanding their residential practices, although it did play a role. However, for Fiona and Mike, diversity and the issue of schools were among the main reasons to leave the city of Amsterdam:

> Well, eventually it comes down to schools. To put it a bit sharply: I just want my children to know what Christmas is and not what the Eid-ul-Fitr is; or that they come home with things like: ‘why do we not slaughter a lamb?’ So I do think that it’s important that they know how to get along with all kinds of people but it shouldn’t tip the other way and that’s what I think is the case in Amsterdam. (Fiona)

Fiona considered the diversity of Amsterdam as a threat to her cultural norms. During the first interview, she and Mike expressed their concerns about negative socialisation at their pre-school. At the time of the second interview, they had moved to a homogeneous suburb (6% non-white) where the problems that they associated with ethnic diversity were less severe or did not exist at all:
I lived in very diverse areas and those norms and values are just very different from those that I would like to pass on to my children. And I don’t feel like explaining to my children all the time that that’s their culture and not ours. I think that these issues are played out much less here. Actually I’m quite sure of that. (Fiona)

Strategy 2:
Eleven couples were in this category. Nearly all of them lived in a homogeneous area because they moved there before their first child was born. Some moved to these areas after the birth of their first child. For those couples that already lived in these areas, schooling was presented as a secondary issue, almost a coincidental bonus of living there. During the first interview, Bea and Nigel explained that they almost resented the fact that the two schools that they considered were overly white and posh. In the second interview, they repeated their arguments but also indicated that other schools with a more mixed population were situated in another neighbourhood:

Firstly, I look at neighbourhood schools, but I think it’s a pity they’re so white. There is also another Dalton school which is much more mixed, but that’s in De Pijp but that feels quite far: it’s another neighbourhood. (Bea)

Apparently, choosing a mixed school in another neighbourhood because the local schools are overly white or upper-class was a bridge too far. Another couple, Sally and Mart, also lived in a relatively homogeneous middle-class neighbourhood. They did not mention the ethnic composition of schools:

Well, there are two good schools that are just close by. And then I think it’s important that they attend a local school. So that they come home with friends that they also see at school and with whom they play together in the street. (Sally)

For them, the local schools were ‘naturally’ fine. There was no need to discuss any of the issues associated with diversity, simply because they felt that issue was not pressing for them. In this type of situation, parents seemed to be concerned with other less pressing issues such as traffic safety and having friends at school and in the neighbourhood. These themes may have also played a role for other couples; however, in the interviews, these themes were eclipsed by the issue of ethnic diversity.

Strategy 3:
The third strategy was practiced by six families. Two of these couples chose a ‘white’ school in their neighbourhood and four intended to send their child to such a school outside their residential area. These families gave much stronger voice to their concerns about the ethnic composition of schools than the families in the relatively homogeneous areas. Mandy and Marc, for instance, resided near
a school that they described as a ‘terrible school’. They inscribed their child at two well performing and predominantly white schools outside their residential area but within walking distance (less than 500 metres) from their home. Another couple, Helene and Garry, chose the same strategy. They considered some schools in the direct vicinity overly black and poor; therefore, they decided to send their child to the ‘whitest school’ in the area. Other parents had to cover much larger distances to find the right school. Hally and Richard, for instance, lived in a very ethnically diverse area that was surrounded by predominantly native Dutch but generally working class areas. They considered only one school in the entire borough of Amsterdam North as suitable for their child:

Well, good schools are sporadic here in Amsterdam North. But, as I said, we have some schools just around the corner but that's really black, black. So I had a look, but it makes me feel uncomfortable. I would prefer a grey school, black and white mixed, but if I have the choice between black and white, then I'll go for white. So close to our day-care is a white school and there we will enrol him. (Hally)

Strategy 4:
A fourth strategy was the ‘mixing’ of ‘black’ schools. This strategy almost always occurred on the initiative of more highly educated native Dutch (‘white’) parents who agreed to send their children simultaneously to the same neighbourhood school. At the time of the interviews, this strategy for creating a more middle-class and ‘white’ environment for children only existed in the minds of the respondents. Whether they will proceed is uncertain, but some respondents seemed quite serious about it and did not consider any alternative actions. Two couples that resided in one of the most diverse neighbourhoods of Amsterdam discussed the option as follows:

Actually what I plan to do is to contact the local authorities and ask who in the neighbourhood white [laughs]... what other white parents...this sounds quite bad, but what I want is that you just decide together with other parents to inscribe for a local school because here they're really black schools. I just think that's not representative for how the neighbourhood's changing. There are really coming more families. (Esther & Ralph)

Well, one can also take other action, but that's very laborious. That you say: well we are all stuck here in this neighbourhood and these schools are not good. So we're gonna try together to make them good. The question is: do you want to expose your child to this kind of idealism? (Tania & Mart)

Strategy 5:
Almost all parents expressed that they preferred a mixed school, in terms of ethnicity and class. However, only few seemed to opt for such a school. The
choice for a mixed or a ‘black’ school depended on factors beyond the school population, such as the type of education, scale, and proximity. In fact, if parents chose a school with a population that was not their first choice, proximity was an important factor in this decision. Nevertheless, it is important not to confuse idealism and pragmatism. The fact that some parents chose a diverse school in their vicinity does not indicate that ideology did not play a key role. After all, most parents that lived in diverse areas chose a ‘white’ school within or outside their residential area. For some respondents, choosing a local black school was closely linked to political ideals. Esther and Ralph, who also considered the possibility of mixing a school, were politically opposed to the idea that higher educated parents should find the perfect school:

I would find it terrible if you will have a situation of white flight to all these schools outside the neighbourhood. Because then all those white parents will take their children elsewhere. Actually we really want her to go to school here. Because she will go out of the front door and be almost literally already at school. (Esther)

No, we didn’t choose the best school in Amsterdam. (Ralph)

In addition, other parents had serious problems with their own ideas about school choice. Some connected their own behaviour to the reproduction of school segregation at the city level. In some cases, parents deliberately chose a less ‘white’ and ‘elite’ school. Yet, for most parents that lived in very ethnically diverse areas, this was not an option.

Class fractions and Strategies
As evident from the descriptions of the strategies, the households displayed a combination of motives for school choice. These motives were based on their identities, values and resources, but they were also related to their housing positions and other practical considerations. This taxonomic overview of strategies suggests that strategies are related to specific habituses within the middle class. The present small set of interviews allows only for a tentative coupling of strategies and habitus or class fractions. This paragraph will provide an analysis of the forms of capital (cultural, economic) of the studied households and how they relate to the strategies.

Economic capital is defined by self-reported annual household income, whereby an income between 90,000 and 200,000 euro is defined as high economic capital, and an income below 90,000 euro is defined as low economic capital. Cultural capital is defined by binary scores on several questionnaire items, with a maximum total score of 14 points. Households scoring 6–14 points on the scale were classified as having high cultural capital (50%); those scoring below 0–5
points were defined as having low cultural capital (50%) (see Table 5.1).

Table 5.2 shows how capital orientation is correlated with four strategies (type 4 and 5 are merged because the same respondents considered both strategies). As shown in the table, suburbanisation was practiced by two households with different orientations of capital. Strategy 2 was evidently dominant among high income, high cultural capital households, although these households also commuted for their schooling. Mixing strategies were mainly practiced by lower-income, but higher cultural capital households.

### Table 5.1. Definition cultural capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items included</th>
<th>Possible score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University degree female spouse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree male spouse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree mother of female spouse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree father of female spouse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, arts and social science female spouse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, arts and social science male spouse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and creative job female spouse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and creative job male spouse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently visit classical concerts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently visit museums</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently visit galleries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently visit theatre plays</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription to high standard newspaper (NRC, Volkskrant)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports liberal political parties (D66, Groenlinks)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0-14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.2. Capital Orientation and School-Choice Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suburbanise Strategy 1</th>
<th>White middle-class school Strategy 2</th>
<th>Commute for schooling Strategy 3</th>
<th>School Mixing Strategy 4 and 5</th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low cc low ec</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low cc high ec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high cc low ec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high cc high ec</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author
Amsterdam School-Choice Strategies in a European Context

In Amsterdam, school choice is a practice that lays bare the Janus face (Reay et al., 2011) of middle-class habitus. Most of the parents in the current study enjoyed the diversity of the city but also voiced an aversion to the homogeneity that they associated with suburbs. Simultaneously, they viewed this diversity as a threat to the intergenerational transfer of their class position through good education. Although most of the parents could not be described as frantic about schooling, not a single family was unconcerned with the quality of education. All families expressed that they wanted an environment that would enable their child to thrive academically and socially. Although they genuinely seemed to prefer social mixing, their practice often contributed to the process that they politically opposed. Some were quite aware of this but felt that they could not ‘expose their own child to some social experiment’.

It is interesting that the discourse that urban middle-class parents used to describe their half-heartedness about diversity is almost identical to that in different contexts such as the UK. Comments on feeling ‘lucky’ to live in good neighbourhoods with good schools (compare Reay et al., 2011: 55) or wordings such as: I wouldn’t like a posh white school could literally have been taken from interviews in London (Byrne, 2006) or Stockholm (Bunar, 2010). Apparently, class fractions within middle classes across various urban contexts have similar or homologous positions in this field. The various strategies identified for the Amsterdam context also show many parallels with the strategies described in various studies. To some degree, white flight, hunkering down, commuting for schooling and engaging diversity through mixing or colonising are all practices that the present study has demonstrated in the Amsterdam context. These homologies, which are also found in comparative research between other contexts, suggest that urban middle classes across the Western world, to some extent, constitute a global class (fraction) (Atkinson and Bridge, 2005).

Nevertheless, the Amsterdam context also produces specific outcomes. The minor role of economic capital and the diverse context of nearly all Amsterdam neighbourhoods makes all strategies depend less on economic capital and more on other forms of capital (social, cultural). Parents cannot buy access to good schools and thus must exercise caution in the selection of both neighbourhood and school. Freedom of school choice fosters more hidden and subtle ways in which parents create distinction and seek to reproduce their white middle class privilege inter-generationally. Although the current study did not compare middle-class parents with lower-class parents, it can be hypothesised that knowledge of the enrolment procedures, access and understanding of formal school information and informal knowledge from the ‘grapevine’ (Ball and Vincent, 1998) are unequally distributed, favouring middle-class parents with the right capital.

Furthermore, the distribution of various forms of capital also plays a role between middle class fractions. Despite the small sample, the present study has
demonstrated that strategies differ between households with various types of capital. The mixing of schools was associated with high cultural but low economic capital. Households endowed with high cultural and high economic capital were clearly orientated towards the relatively homogeneous, but still urban, neighbourhoods of the city. Commuting to school was particularly an option for parents that wished to remain urban but did not trust local schools to provide the right education. Although not substantiated in the present paper, commuting for schools is often facilitated by special private education such as Montessori (Karsten et al., 2006).

Conclusion

It is evident that nearly all middle-class couples that became parents in the course of the current study struggled with the issue of diversity in relation to their residential area and school choice. It is also clear that as the issue of schooling became more concrete, other aspects such as type of education and practical issues such as proximity seemed to be eclipsed by issues of school quality, which were often associated with and marked by the class and ethnic or racial composition of the school population. Notwithstanding the concerns with the diversity of the school population, nearly all parents preferred a mixed school for their children. Many parents expressed that they wanted their children to be aware of the ethnic diversity of Amsterdam. Furthermore, the majority of the respondents resented the parents that opted for a white elite school and ‘retreated’ from Amsterdam reality.

Parents’ clear commitment to multiculturalism and social engagement clearly mirrors experiences from other urban schooling contexts. However, the position of the households differed in both geographical and social terms. The strategies they developed to manage the issue of school choice were informed by their neighbourhood context and their identities and resources. It is argued that both positions are related to their habitus. Strategies of school choice are not only a matter of deploying economic resources; they are also the result of various time-space trajectories associated with different class fractions. The various strategies identified in the present study are similar to those described in other schooling contexts. It is remarkable that in spite of the clear differences in terms of housing market and school policies, the strategies of the middle class are quite similar. Therefore, a further and more structural approach to comparing various national and local contexts is needed. I argue that any such comparative research should include at least the following three dimensions: 1) a scale of the role of economic capital and corresponding cultural capital; 2) a scale that measures the degree of integration of school and neighbourhood; and 3) an analysis of the types and degrees of diversity that play a role in segregation and integration processes caused by middle-class school choice.
In the past decades, many Western cities have witnessed a remarkable transition from working-class dominated spaces of industrial production to middle-class dominated spaces of services and consumption. This transition is associated with a reorientation of both capital and people to the inner cities of most Western urban centres. Processes of gentrification go hand-in-hand with professionalisation and the internationalisation of the labour force (Hamnett, 1994b), the explosion of finance and international business, and changing patterns of consumption and class formation (Butler et al., 2008; Butler and Robson, 2003a; Ley, 1996; Smith, 1996a; Zukin, 1987).

Several scholars argue that gentrification constitutes part of the distinctive practices of ‘new’ middle classes that have alternative strategies of social reproduction than ‘traditional’ middle classes, as reflected in their consumption and residential choices. Living in the inner city is part of a particular life style and the fulfilment of the self-image of a specific fraction of the middle class (Bridge, 2006; Butler and Robson, 2003a, b; Ley, 1994, 1996). Gentrifiers are argued to typically have an urban habitus with a strong focus on the reproduction of cultural capital (Butler, 1997; Butler and Robson, 2003a). The urban geography of Western metropolises and the formation and reproduction of specific middle-class groups are hence intrinsically connected.

This specific urban orientation of some middle classes, however, is challenged by events in the life course. In demographic literature, the birth of a child is generally strongly associated with residential mobility, often from a city to a suburb (Rossi, 1955). This migration is explained by a greater need for space in and around the home and a desire to become a homeowner (Mulder, 2006) but is also related to changes in labour market position, the presence of kin networks and other social relations elsewhere, residential biographies (Feijten et al., 2008) and ideas about good parenting.

When urban middle classes have children, they may experience a collision or tension between their new roles and identities as parents and their experiences and identities as urbanites. Some studies have revealed that some middle-class family households choose the city as a way of life (Karsten, 2007). Although such families must compromise on public and private space, they tend to emphasise
the positive aspects of urban life for themselves (identity, work, and various forms of consumption) and for their children. Furthermore, having been urbanites for a long period, they have established extensive social networks in the city, which makes them prone to staying (Brun and Fagnani, 1994; Karsten, 2007). These studies have provided important insights into the experiences and relations of middle-class families with the city. However, by focusing on urban families alone, it remains largely unclear what factors differentiate these families from middle-class families that suburbanise.

In one of the few studies that specifically attempts to understand this differentiation of middle-class residential practices, Bridge (2006) suggested that different time-space trajectories over the life course are associated with various strategies for the reproduction of class that involve different types of capital (social, cultural, symbolic, and economic). Inspired by Bridge’s Bourdieuvian perspective on gentrification and the life course, this study investigates the residential mobility of urban middle-classes becoming parents for the first time. Particularly, this study addresses the following question:

How can the residential mobility of urban middle-class households be explained by the orientation of their capital when they become parents for the first time?

This study investigates the differences in residential mobility between urban middle-class households having their first child. This paper draws on survey data from a longitudinal study of middle-class couples that have lived in the inner-city parts of Amsterdam and are expecting their first child. These couples were followed for a period of two years to determine whether or not they moved out of Amsterdam and what factors influenced their residential choices.

Amsterdam is characterised by a large social housing sector, mainly in the periphery, and by a relatively wealthy region that houses the majority of family households in the metropolitan area. Despite the regulated housing market, the processes of gentrification affect most parts of the central boroughs. Previous studies have established that the number of middle-class families is increasing in Amsterdam and that this increase is related to gentrification processes (Boterman et al., 2010).

This study offers a perspective based on Bourdieu’s concepts of habitus, capital, and field to explain what types of middle-class households stay in the city and which families leave when they become parents. By bringing together studies on gentrification and demographic literature on the life course and residential mobility, this study aims to conceptualise the transition to parenthood as a field in which the habituses of urban middle classes become articulated differently. The residential mobility of urban middle-class households is thus understood as the outcome of the confrontation of habitus and the various aspects of the field of parenthood.
Literature review and conceptualizations

Gentrification as distinction
Although gentrification is also clearly associated with demographic trends such as the postponement of marriage and child bearing (Bondi, 1999; Buzar et al., 2005), there is a common understanding that gentrification should be primarily be linked to changes in social class structure (Bridge, 1995; Butler, 1997; Butler and Hamnett, 2009; Lees et al., 2008; Savage et al., 1992). Whether the agents of gentrification, i.e., the urban middle classes, are actually ‘new’, as several scholars claim (Ley, 1996), is a subject of debate, but it is evident that changes in the structure of the economy, i.e., deindustrialisation and the transition to a service-based economy and the professionalisation of the work force, have contributed to the emergence of a new urban geography of class (Butler et al., 2008; Hamnett, 1994b).

Following the work of Bourdieu (1984, 1990) several scholars have described the urban orientation of gentrifiers as a distinctive set of practices through which they attempt to set themselves apart from the traditional middle classes in the suburbs (Bridge, 2001b; Butler and Robson, 2001, 2003b; May, 1996; Watt, 2005). These studies argue that urban middle classes have a particular urban lifestyle with specific patterns of consumption, types of employment, housing preferences and liberal political attitudes. Gentrification is, in this respect, conceptualised as a field in which specific middle-class groups seek to acquire symbolic capital (Ley, 2003) by deploying various forms of capital such as embodied taste and financial resources. The prior work connects these practices with structural class dispositions and strategies of social reproduction through the habitus (Bridge, 1995). In fact, it is argued that new middle classes have developed a metropolitan habitus, which makes them intrinsically urban (Butler, 1997; Butler and Robson, 2003a). Butler and Robson (2001, 2003a, b) explored the idea of an urban or metropolitan habitus even further by arguing that specific orientations of capital (what they call ‘mini-habituses’ 2003a: 67) are related to the various positions in the fields of housing, employment, education and consumption. These mini habituses (forms of capital) eventually produce different residential orientations.

However, many gentrifiers only temporarily have an urban orientation. When gentrifiers have children, various aspects of their habitus may become articulated differently.

Residential Mobility and the Field of Parenthood
There is a wide range of demographic studies demonstrating that events in the life course are associated with residential mobility (Fischer and Malmberg, 2001; Rossi, 1955). Although it has been argued that there is no common life course, rather, there are multiple life courses and hence various mobility patterns (Warnes, 1992) there is a common understanding that the birth of a child changes the demand for housing, which often leads to residential mobility.
It has been argued that newly formed families in general tend to shift their priorities from locational aspects of their place of residence (situation) to the characteristics of the dwelling (size and tenure) and of the neighbourhood (social composition) (situ) (Broek, 1966; Green, 1997). Rossi (1955), for example, established that families primarily prioritise more space in and outside of their home. Other studies have argued that families aspire to become homeowners as they seek greater financial security and a greater sense of control over both the home and its surroundings (Clark et al., 1984; Mulder, 2006).

Other studies have emphasised that aspects of the residential environment are also important for family households (Baldassare, 1992), regarding both the physical and social aspects of the area. Various scholars have argued that families seek social homogeneity, that is, the presence of other families who are preferably of the same class and ethnicity or race (Ray et al., 1997). Such homogeneity also fosters the formation of social support networks and the perception of social safety (Karsten, 2007). To a large extent, place of residence (neighbourhood or town) structures the social milieus in which children grow up. Together with the circuits of education, the social environment in which people are brought up constitutes the framework for the accumulation of social experiences.

Decisions concerning residential relocation, however, are not only informed by aspects of housing and the neighbourhood. Housing careers are closely aligned with developments in other ‘careers’ such as labour-market and educational careers (Mulder and Hooimeijer, 1999). Decisions about residential relocation involve trade-offs between the site and situation characteristics of the dwelling and neighbourhood. For families, location as it structures time-space paths (Hägerstrand, 1970) matters in various ways; place of residence, for example, has direct consequences for the amounts of time spent on paid work and commuting (Van Ham, 2002), spare time and time spent together with the family (Hochschild and Machung, 1989) and thus indirectly affects the division of paid labour between partners (De Meester and Van Ham, 2009). The location of a home is also important regarding the distances to family and friends and the role these networks play in the organisation of child care. Additionally, location also determines access to other amenities that are important to both parents and children such as stores for daily groceries, sport clubs, playgrounds and formal child-care facilities (De Meester et al., 2007; Van Ham and Mulder, 2005). Spatial contexts that offer such a rich opportunity structure facilitate a more efficient use of time-space budgets.

Although almost all households experience a changing demand for housing when they become parents, family households respond differently to this transition to parenthood. To some extent this is linked to the resources available to households for the realisation of their housing aspirations. However, how the demand for housing changes also differs among family households. This variation is strongly connected to the position these households assume in the various social worlds in which they take part, not only in a practical sense but also emotionally.
and symbolically. Where people want to live is also very strongly informed by ideas about what constitutes good parenting (Jarvis, 2005). Bringing these aspects together, this study proposes to examine the transition to parenthood as a field. The field of parenthood is a social arena wherein trade-offs are required among social networks, labour-market position, housing demands and various forms of consumption. Furthermore, the field of parenthood is the arena wherein the concept of good parenting is negotiated. It is argued that the impacts of entering the field of parenthood differ for households with different habituses.

**Urban Middle Classes in the Field of Parenthood**

When urban middle classes have children, the entire set of historically embodied experiences, their habitus, becomes articulated in a new social world: parenthood. For many, this implies residential relocation out of the city, but some middle-class families stay in the city, and this phenomenon appears to be growing in several urban contexts, including Amsterdam (Boterman et al., 2010; Brun and Fagnani, 1994; Butler and Robson, 2003a; Karsten, 2007).

Karsten (2007) reported that urban middle-class families have three main reasons to live in the city: they are economically tied to the city through dual careers, they have invested in local social networks (see also Van Diepen and Musterd, 2009), and living in the city is part of their identity, which is based on a rejection of the presumed homogeneity and dullness of the suburbs and a corresponding celebration of urban diversity and tolerance. These findings are supported by studies that demonstrate that some family households remain urban because of their ‘strong attachment to urban values’ (Brun and Fagnani, 1994) and other studies showing that inner-city areas offer a particular opportunity structure that appeals to dual-income families with particular work and consumption patterns who require high flexibility in the organisation of their everyday lives, particularly in managing their work-life balances (Boterman et al., 2010; De Meester et al., 2007; Jarvis, 1999, 2005; Karsten, 2003).

According to Butler and Robson (2003a), the variation in residential practices among middle-class families can be explained by how their various forms of capital (economic, cultural, and social) are used in the fields of work, housing, consumption and education, arguing that residential environments have specific characteristics that create a particular profile that is more or less attractive for specific social groups (habituses). Although their work did not specifically investigate middle-class family households, they have suggested that priorities of family households tend to shift from the field of consumption and employment to the fields of housing and, especially, education. They argue that the social reproduction of middle classes through education (for example, by retreating into circuits of private education or the process of colonising public schools) is crucial for understanding which of the middle classes move out of the inner city and which families stay (Bridge, 2006; Butler and Hamnett, 2007; Byrne, 2009).
Although these findings may be relevant for explaining differences in residential practices between middle classes, none of the previous studies have compared middle-class families in urban and non-urban contexts and examined how they are positioned in the various fields. Moreover, prior research has not offered a longitudinal perspective that allows for the analysis of changes in the residential practices of households during key life-course events. It remains largely unclear which urban middle-class households stay and which leave and how the various fields are compared and evaluated.

Based on previous studies on the role of various forms of capital (e.g., Bridge, 1995, 2001, 2006; Butler & Robson 2003a), it is hypothesised that middle-class families that have made large investments in social and cultural (symbolic) capital through practices in the fields of employment, culture and housing consumption tend to stay in the inner city. In other words, those households that have extensive social networks (family and friends) in the city and for which the symbolic meaning of an urban lifestyle is very important are expected to compromise on their housing position and be less inclined to leave the city.

Correspondingly, households that tend to emphasise the accumulation of economic capital more than cultural capital are expected to leave the central city and settle in more suburban locations. Not only can these households be expected to prioritise the field of housing, their positions in the fields of employment and consumption are also less likely to bind them to the city.

Middle-class households that possess relatively little economic and cultural capital can be expected to assume an intermediate position. Finally, those households that tend have high shares of both economic and cultural capital are likely to stay in the city because they have invested in the city in a symbolic sense but also have the financial means to make relatively few compromises in terms of housing.

Data and Methods

This study builds on a set of two waves of longitudinal data that were collected in the period 2008–2010 from urban middle-class couples that were expecting their first child. The sample is highly representative, as it consists of randomly selected pregnant women from 12 midwife clinics that were situated within the inner-ring road in Amsterdam. The total number of respondents represents approximately half of all middle-class women that were pregnant with their first child in

---

14 Midwife clinics are the principal system in the Netherlands for overseeing pregnancies. Nearly all pregnant women attend a midwife from the early stages of pregnancy. As practices have a particular catchment area, it is possible to make a selection of the majority of the women that lived inside the inner-ring road. The questionnaires were distributed via 12 of the 14 midwife clinics in central Amsterdam.

15 Middle class is defined as: at least one of parents is higher educated (HBO or University) and the gross annual household income is between 30,000 and 200,000.
Amsterdam during the research period\textsuperscript{16}. The data set consists of two questionnaires filled out by the mothers, one from the summer of 2008 (n=291) and a second from the autumn of 2010 (n=234). The first questionnaire was distributed at the midwife clinics, and some questionnaires were completed through snowballing. Almost all respondents were approached personally by the researcher or one of his assistants for the first questionnaire, and less than 5% refused to participate. The second questionnaire was filled out by the same set of respondents via an electronic internet-based survey. For the second round, 234 respondents were approached via a working email address, of which 234 eventually complied (92%)\textsuperscript{17}. No bias was identified for the non-response.

The longitudinal data acquired from the questionnaires were supplemented with data at the neighbourhood level and data at the borough level (from Netherlands Statistics and the Statistical Office of Amsterdam). The data set that was thus obtained had a nested structure. To account for the statistical problems of overestimating significance at the neighbourhood and borough level, a multilevel analysis was used in the MLWin program.

The dependent variable in the analysis is residential mobility in the field of parenthood. Although residential mobility theoretically encompasses more than only moving behaviour, this study defined the dependent variable as \textit{moving out of the inner city of Amsterdam}. There are two reasons for this: first, the inner-ring road of Amsterdam is the central area of the metropolitan region; it represents a factual boundary between pre-war and post-war urban development and between relatively high- and low-density housing. Second, this boundary is also an imagined boundary on the mental maps of people living both inside and outside of Amsterdam. Many perceive Amsterdam outside the ring as not actually being a part of the city. Often, when people look for a home and post inquiries, they specifically state within the ring road.

To accommodate for moving behaviour after the study period (2008–2010), a second model was run with a dependent variable that measures intention to move out of the city of Amsterdam in the next two years (2010–2012). Hence, this only includes households that did not move out of Amsterdam during the first period (n=176). Although some discrepancies between the respondents’ intentions and their actual behaviours may be expected\textsuperscript{18}, this variable measures residential mobility during a second key phase in which parents make crucial decisions regarding their first-born’s primary education.

\textsuperscript{16} In Amsterdam, 5,459 first children were born in 2008. Approximately 30–40% of these children were born in middle-class families in central parts of Amsterdam. My sample, which was collected during three months in 2008, hence contains a considerable share of the mothers that were pregnant with these children. CBS, 2008, http://statline.cbs.nl/statweb/lvLAss-en.

\textsuperscript{17} Total response was 80.4%.

\textsuperscript{18} From 2008–2010, approximately 70% of all households that intended to move in 2008 had moved by 2010. Although housing-market conditions had changed, the economic possibilities of the majority of the respondents enabled them to be relatively residentially mobile.
The central relationship that is tested in the model is that between the orientation of economic and cultural capital and moving behaviour. In this model, three household types with various orientations of capital are tested with respect to a reference category (see Figure 1). The cultural and economic capital scores of all respondents are higher than those of average Amsterdam citizens. It should be stressed that the shares of capital are relative and that they represent different social positions within the (upper) middle class.

Cultural capital is defined by binary scores on several questionnaire items (see Table 6.1), with a maximum total score of 14 points. The study group was divided into two equal parts. Households scoring 6–14 points on the scale were classified as having high cultural capital (50%); those scoring below 0–5 points were defined as having low cultural capital (50%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.1. Definition cultural capital</th>
<th>Possible score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University degree female spouse</td>
<td>1   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree male spouse</td>
<td>1   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree mother of female spouse</td>
<td>1   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree father of female spouse</td>
<td>1   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, arts and social science female spouse</td>
<td>1   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, arts and social science male spouse</td>
<td>1   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge or creative job female spouse</td>
<td>1   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge or creative job male spouse</td>
<td>1   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently visit classical concerts</td>
<td>1   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently visit museums</td>
<td>1   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently visit galleries</td>
<td>1   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently visit theatre plays</td>
<td>1   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription to high standard newspaper (NRC, Volkskrant)</td>
<td>1   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports liberal political parties (D66, Groenlinks)</td>
<td>1   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic capital is defined by self-reported annual household income, whereby an income between 90,000 and 200,000 euro is defined as high economic capital, and an income below 90,000 euro is defined as low economic capital. This division was again chosen to divide the group into two equal subgroups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 6.1. Types of orientation of capital</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic capital high</td>
<td>Economic capital high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural capital low =1</td>
<td>Cultural capital high =2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31%)</td>
<td>(24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic capital low</td>
<td>Economic capital low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural capital low =3</td>
<td>Cultural capital high =4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19%)</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The category ‘high economic low cultural’ is chosen as a reference category because it is hypothesised that this household type will be most likely to move out of the central city. It is further expected that Type 4 will be most likely to stay and that the other two occupy intermediate positions. Although the orientation of capital is expected to correlate with other variables such as tenure and social and economic connectedness to Amsterdam, possibly reducing its effect, the model controls for a range of variables that are expected to influence the propensity to leave.

Five blocks of independent variables are introduced into the model. The first block consists of household characteristics, the second block of individual variables measures embeddedness in the city, the third block adds aspects of the dwelling, the fourth incorporates characteristics of the neighbourhood, and the fifth takes in variables at the borough level. The majority of the independent variables included in the second model measure the same things but for 2010 rather than 2008. Variables that did not change or changed linearly were included unaltered (age, age difference, etc.); see Table 6.2.

The dichotomous character of the two dependent variables and the nested structure of the data were accounted for in a binary logistic three-level model. The following formula describes the model (Figure 6.2):

\[
y_{ijk} \sim \text{Binomial}(n_{ijk}, \pi_{ijk})
\]

\[
\logit(\pi_{ijk}) = \beta_{o0}x_{0} + \beta_{o0}^j v_{0k} + \nu_{0k}
\]

\[
\left[ v_{0k} \right] \sim N(0, \Omega_v) : \Omega_v = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_v^2 \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\left[ u_{0k} \right] \sim N(0, \Omega_u) : \Omega_u = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_u^2 \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\text{var}(y_{ijk}/\pi_{ijk}) = \pi_{ijk}(1 - \pi_{ijk})/n_{ijk}
\]

wherein \( y \) is the dependent variable (moving/not moving), \( i \) represents level 1 variables, \( j \) represents the variables at level 2 (the neighbourhood), and \( k \) represents the variables at the borough level (level 3). \( \beta_{o0} \) consist of a fixed part \( (\beta_{o0}) \) and two random parts, \( u_{0k} \) at the level of the neighbourhood and \( v_{0k} \) at the level of the borough.
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Table 6.2. Variables included in the models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Valid n</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable 1:</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>X 233</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved out of central Amsterdam 2008-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable 2:</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>X 176</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intends to move within two years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Block 1: Household characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Valid n</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age mother 2008</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>3.7 233</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age difference between mother and partner</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>4.4 233</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(expecting) more than one child</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>X 233</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Block 2: Embeddedness in the city**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Valid n</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urbanites</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>X 230</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family in Amsterdam</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>X 225</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best friends in Amsterdam</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>X 225</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in central Amsterdam mother</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>X 233</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in central Amsterdam partner</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>X 233</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Block 3: Housing characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Valid n</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner in 2008</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>X 231</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner in 2010</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>X 174</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground floor + private outdoor space in 2008</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>X 231</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground floor + private outdoor space in 2010</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>X 174</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square meters in 2008</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>30.8 231</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square meters in 2010</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>34.8 172</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Block 4: Neighbourhood characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Valid n</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share middle-class family households 2008</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 55</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share middle-class family households 2010</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 51</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share owner-occupied dwellings 2008</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15 56</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share owner-occupied dwellings 2010</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12 51</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Block 5: Borough characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Valid n</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% 'black' schools</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28 10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several of the included control variables are quite straightforward; others may require some explanation:

**(Expecting) more than one child**
This is a dichotomous variable; families with one child are compared with families that are pregnant with the second child or already have a second child.

**Urbanites**
Urbanites are defined as individuals that grew up in Amsterdam or in another major city in the Netherlands or abroad.
Share middle-class family households
This is the share of households with an above-average income with at least one higher-educated adult living together with at least one dependent child (<18).

Percentage ‘black’ schools
Although in the Netherlands, no clear relation exists between ethnic composition and school quality, both Dutch and international literature demonstrates that parents use the ethnic or racial compositions of schools as indicators of the quality of a school, both in terms of performances measures in scores and especially in terms of the social ‘atmosphere’ of the school. ‘Black’ schools, as they are referred to in the Amsterdam context, are defined as schools where more than 75% of the pupils have non-Western backgrounds.

Results
Table 6.3 presents the descriptive statistics for all the variables included in the model. It appears that almost half of the households moved in the period 2008–2010, which is high compared with the Dutch average (See for instance: De Groot et al., 2011). The high-cultural- and high-economic-capital types moved the least (37%), and the low-economic and low-cultural-capital types moved the most (47%) during the study period. The locations where the groups moved to, however, are more differentiated. Among the high-cultural types only 15–16% moved out of central Amsterdam; among the high-economic, low-cultural group 38% moved out.

For all four types, residential mobility is associated with a transition from renting to homeownership, from upper-level apartments to ground-level dwellings with gardens, and from smaller to larger homes. However, the housing conditions differ among the various household types: high-economic-capital types live in larger apartments and own their homes much more often and also more often live in a ground-level home with a garden. To disentangle several of the interrelated aspects of residential mobility, the next section will present and discuss the results of the logistic regression analyses.
Table 6.3. Descriptive statistics per capital orientation type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital orientation</th>
<th>cc-/ec-</th>
<th>cc-/ec+</th>
<th>cc+/ec-</th>
<th>cc+/ec+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>moved 2008-2010</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: of which moved within central Amsterdam</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: of which moved to suburbs within the municipality</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: of which moved to suburbs in region</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moved out of central amsterdam 2008-2010</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intends to move out of central amsterdam 2010-2012</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Block 1: Household characteristics**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age partner</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two children or pregnant of second</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Block 2: Embeddedness in the city**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urbanites</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>works in Amsterdam</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>works in Amsterdam partner</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family in Amsterdam</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>best friends in Amsterdam</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Block 3: Housing characteristics**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m² 2008</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m² 2010</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homeowner 2008</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homeowner 2010</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground floor + private outdoor space in 2008</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground floor + private outdoor space in 2010</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Block 4: Neighbourhood characteristics**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% middle class kids in neighbourhood</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% owner occupied in neighbourhood 2008</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Block 5: Borough characteristics**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% ‘black’ schools in the borough</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 6.4: Estimates from two longitudinal models that describe change to move out of the city (model 1) and intend to move out (model 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>empty model 1</th>
<th>model 1</th>
<th>empty model 2</th>
<th>model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.145***</td>
<td>5.080***</td>
<td>-1.364***</td>
<td>8.706***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low cc low ec (ref=cc low; ec high)</td>
<td>-0.908**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.093**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high cc low ec (ref=cc low; ec high)</td>
<td>-1.752***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.023**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high cc high ec (ref=cc low; ec high)</td>
<td>-1.485***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.215**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two children</td>
<td>0.954***</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>-0.138**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age difference</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work in central Amsterdam</td>
<td>-1.318***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work in central Amsterdam partner</td>
<td>-0.990**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work in central Amsterdam * work in central Amsterdam partner</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family in Amsterdam</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.302**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>best friends in Amsterdam</td>
<td>-1.308***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.684</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urbanites</td>
<td>-0.385</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homeowner 2008/2010</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>square meters 2008/2010</td>
<td>-0.024***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.039 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ground level + garden 2008/2010</td>
<td>-0.704</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% owner-occupied in neighbourhood</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% middle class families in neighbourhood</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 'black' schools in borough</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Random Part**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borough level (L3)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood level (L2)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual level (L1)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N L3= 10  
N L2= 54  
N L1= 213  

** significant at the 0.05 level  
*** significant at the 0.01 level
Model 1
Of all middle-class households, one-quarter moved out of the central part of Amsterdam within the first two years after the birth of their first child. The data in Table 6.4 reveal that when controlling for a range of factors, the four types of middle-class households with various capital orientations display significantly different residential practices when they become parents. Compared with households with high economic and relatively low cultural capital, other orientations have smaller chances of moving out. The first type (low cultural and low economic capital) has no significant other practice; the second (low economic and high cultural) has a smaller chance of moving out. The households that have high shares of both capital types also have a smaller chance of moving out of central Amsterdam.

Among the control variables, several also have significant effects. Having or expecting a second or third child increases the propensity to move. Social and economic connectedness through friends and work also negatively affect the chance of leaving. Finally, the larger the dwelling the less likely a household is to move out of the central parts of Amsterdam. Other characteristics of the home and neighbourhood characteristics do not appear to have significant effects. The latter finding is also reflected in the estimated variances for the second and third levels (both: 0.000) compared with the first level.

Model 2
Among those families that stayed in the inner city, approximately one-fifth intended to move out in the second period. The second model demonstrates that for those households that did not move out of the city in the first two years of parenthood, the orientation of capital also affects their intentions of leaving Amsterdam. When compared with households with high volumes of economic capital and low shares of cultural capital, households that have little of either type have a much smaller chance of moving out of the city. The second type (high cultural, low economic) also has a lower propensity to leave. The third type, with relatively high volumes of both types of capital, also has a smaller chance of moving out of central Amsterdam, albeit only at significance level of 0.1.

Among the variables that were controlled for in the second model, several have effects. Age and having family in Amsterdam negatively affect the intention to leave. Finally, the size of the dwelling in 2010 also matters: a larger current home leads to a smaller chance of moving out. Neighbourhood characteristics have no significant effects, as reflected in the estimated variance for the second (0.059) and third levels (0.002) compared with the first level.

Comparison of the two models
Although the orientation of capital has similar effects in both models, the effect of the control variables differs. Apparently, having a second child is more relevant.
in making the decision to move out of the city in the first two years of parenthood than in the two following years. Perhaps connected to this variable, the age of the mother has a negative effect in the second model but not in the first. Another effect that only appears in the first model is the location of work. Apparently, decisions to move out because of work are more likely to be made in the first two years of parenthood. In the first model, having friends in the city is a strong predictor for moving behaviour; in the second model, friends do not have a significant effect. Having family in the city, however, does have an effect in the second model.

Interpretations

The analysis reveals that the orientation of capital of the various middle-class groups is a predictor for moving behaviour in the field of parenthood. The results demonstrate that households with high economic capital and low cultural capital are more likely to leave the inner city in the first two years and are also most likely to leave in the second period. In both periods, households with high shares of cultural capital and low economic capital are most likely to stay. This appears to confirm the hypotheses formulated at the beginning of this study. Nonetheless, some caveats apply. Firstly, several households previously anticipated their parenthood and moved out of the city before they fell pregnant. It may thus be expected that these ‘anticipators’ have a stronger non-urban residential orientation than those that (initially) stayed. Consequently, the effects of different orientations of capital may be underestimated. Another reason why the effects may be stronger than demonstrated here is that the variation of the households in this study is relatively limited. All the households are highly educated and have relatively high incomes and thus belong to the upper parts of the middle class. If middle and higher vocational education had been included as variables, the variation to be explained would probably have been larger. Furthermore, the models controlled for a range of variables that were expected to have impacts on residential mobility. This control also reduced some of the effects of the orientation of capital.

The control variables also had effect of their own. For example the size and tenure of the dwelling correlate with household type (data not shown), but the size of the dwelling also has an independent effect: families who lived in a small apartment in 2008 are more likely to have moved out. For households that stayed in the city in the first two years, the size of the dwelling is an even stronger incentive to move out of the central city in the second period. Apparently, the issue of space becomes even more acute. This effect may be associated with the fact that their children become much more mobile and active, which makes indoor space more important. Interestingly, living at ground level with access to private outdoor space does not have a significant effect on moving behaviour or intentions, mainly due to the fact that square meters, owner-occupancy and ground-floor housing are interrelated. When tenure is excluded, ground level does have a significant negative effect.
The results on social connectedness to the city confirm findings from the literature that social networks in the city constitute a reason to stay (Karsten, 2003, 2007). In the first two years, having best friends in the city decreases the chances of leaving; however, in the second model, this effect is no longer significant. Apparently, households that do not have their best friends in Amsterdam make the decision to leave in the first two years; after that time, this factor does not play an important role. For family relations, the opposite effect appears. Family in Amsterdam does not influence the decision to leave in the first two years, whereas in the second period, having family in Amsterdam significantly decreases the likelihood of leaving. Perhaps many households that have family in Amsterdam have developed new support relationships with the family. Grandparents may, for example, take on child care, which makes these families dependent on grandparental support. Additional analyses demonstrated that for households with family in the city, 38% rely on grandparental child care for at least one day per week, whereas for households with no family in the city, this rate is 20% (data not shown).

In addition to social networks, economic ties also play a part. Having a job in the central city leads to a smaller chance of leaving the central part of the city, with respect to both partners’ jobs. It appears that having a job in Amsterdam primarily affects the decision to move out in the first two years. In the second model, having an Amsterdam-based job does not have a significant effect. One might expect that having a job in the creative industries would correlate with the location of that job; however, additional analysis revealed that this is not the case. Generally, creative and cultural sectors are overrepresented in Amsterdam; however, in this study, there is no significant difference in the locations of the respondents’ jobs in creative and other sectors.

Variables at the neighbourhood level do not have a significant effect in either model. Therefore, the results cannot confirm studies that have emphasised the importance of the neighbourhood. This appears to be associated with the fact that the differentiation among the inner-city neighbourhoods is not sufficiently important to produce significant effects. Furthermore, the household characteristics and the aspects of the dwelling account for much (all) of the variation at the neighbourhood level. The selective migration from and to neighbourhoods is associated with many factors that act simultaneously and are interconnected. In this study, controlling for the majority of the variables that also determine residential choice and constraints on the housing market removes the independent effect of neighbourhood characteristics. Of course, this is not to say that neighbourhood qualities do not matter. Based on other studies, it is evident that the neighbourhood context, as it provides access to various amenities—particularly schools—is very important. Furthermore, tenure, size, quality and price of housing are unequally spatially distributed. Choosing housing thus also involves choosing particular neighbourhoods and vice versa.
Conclusions

In dialogue with research about time-space trajectories of gentrifiers (Bridge, 2006) and the suggested urban habitus of new middle classes (Butler and Robson, 2003a), this study proposed to examine parenthood as a field in which middle-class households are faced with a new reality, with repercussions for various aspects of their lives. In the field of parenthood, the historically accumulated experiences that are rooted in the habitus are confronted with each other. This collision of practices and identities results in a differentiation of residential mobility among households with various social networks, ideas about good parenting and residential biographies as well as different positions in the fields of employment, consumption, housing and education.

Building on ideas about the habitus and forms of capital, this study demonstrates that the residential mobility of urban middle classes is differentiated by the orientation of capital: the reproduction of a class through economic capital appears to be more associated with suburbanisation, whereas households that have invested highly in cultural capital tend to remain urban. Furthermore, it was demonstrated that ‘classic’ variables in residential mobility research such as dwelling size, household size, and location of work are still useful for explaining the practices of middle-class families. However, many of these variables, notably dwelling size, are also correlated with the orientation of capital and tend to strengthen the relationship found between the orientation of capital and residential practices. These findings lend support to the idea that residential mobility should be understood as part of broader time-space trajectories that are associated with historical practices throughout the life course.

These time-space trajectories of middle classes, however, should not only be related to demand but should also be linked to the supply side of the metropolitan housing market. As Butler and Robson (2003a) report for London, the residential mobility of middle-class households is connected to the structure of the metropolitan housing market. As Bridge (2006) argues for Bristol, the local housing-market conditions of smaller cities may hinder middle-class mobility, causing households to remain urban when they become parents. In Amsterdam, the large social rent sector and the scarcity of larger dwellings in the private sector makes it difficult for Amsterdam middle-class households to find suitable family housing within the inner city. On the other hand, many suburban locations within Amsterdam and throughout the region may not be considered suitable carriers of ‘good taste’ (cultural capital).

These findings show that the majority of middle-class families initially stayed in central Amsterdam, but a considerable number moved out or reconsidered their residential location. For all households, residential location involves trade-offs among various fields. Family households that have large shares of economic capital and relatively less cultural capital appear to prioritise housing
and suburbanise relatively often, although they could afford family housing in the city. Households that have high shares of both economic and cultural capital do not need to compromise much on housing and appear to be connected to the city socially, economically and culturally and remain relatively often. Nonetheless, households with low shares of economic capital and high cultural capital are most urban in their orientation. They may live in the relatively smallest dwellings and often in lower-status neighbourhoods but they are attached to the city in symbolic and social ways.

The presence and residential mobility of middle-class families in the city of Amsterdam is a complex interplay of local housing-market conditions and a variety of practices of various middle-class habituses in the field of parenthood. Although all middle-class households in this study could be considered gentrifiers before they had children, this study demonstrates that gentrification should be connected with events in the life course. For some gentrifiers, the city is only temporarily a part of their time-space trajectory, whereas other households may continue living in the city and become ‘family gentrifiers’ in various parts of the city.
6b. **Box 4: Consumption**

In the preceding chapter the analysis was partly based on a definition of cultural capital, which was measured through education, employment, political orientation and consumption. In this dissertation no empirical chapter deals exclusively with patterns of consumption and how they had become altered by the transition to parenthood. This box will give a brief overview of some aspects of consumption of the households in the sample.

**Figure 6b.1. Car Ownership, (n=219)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No car</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One car</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one car</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6b.2. Type of Car, (n=219)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old car</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old timer</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New car</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own data.

Contrary to what one might expect, a vast majority of the households in this study own a car. Considering that all households lived in the inner-city of Amsterdam, the fact that 15% has two cars is even more remarkable. Most car-owners drive a relatively old car, but about a quarter of all households drives a new car.

Another form of cultural consumption, which plays a role for distinction is the subscription to a newspaper. Although printed media are struggling, a majority of the households in this study was subscribed to one or more newspapers. Figure 6b.3 shows that 42% of all households were subscribed to daily newspapers De Volkskrant and/or NRC Handelsblad, which are generally considered the quality newspapers in the Netherlands. Furthermore, Figure 6b.4 shows that a high share of respondents prefer to watch public television channels and in particular VPRO, which is also generally recognised as broadcaster for intellectuals (Kuipers, 2006).
Figure 6b.3. Newspaper Subscription, (n=232)  Figure 6b.4. TV preferences, (n=232)

![Figure 6b.3: Newspaper Subscription](image)
![Figure 6b.4: TV preferences](image)

Source: own data.

Although political orientation is not consumption per se, voting behaviour is strongly connected to life style and an important marker of identity and distinctive practices (Bourdieu, 1984; Ley, 1994). In the Dutch context middle classes tend to vote relatively often for progressive parties and tend to lean toward the left of the political spectrum. The participants of this research confirm this. Figure 6b.5 shows that Greens (Groen Links), a relatively marginal party (6.7% of national vote in 2010), has the strongest support among middle-class families, followed by the right-wing liberals VVD and the social liberals D66.
Most of the consumption patterns discussed in this Box have not been altered because of becoming parents. Other forms of consumption that are more related to spare time and use of space, however, were changed significantly. Visiting theatres, bars, restaurants, concerts and exhibitions were all much less frequent for the young parents than they used to be. Also the use of space changed. Most parents indicated that much of their spare time activities took place in the neighbourhood and were often geared to the interests of the child. Among the top activities for the new parents were the Artis Amsterdam zoo, playgrounds in the neighbourhood, the goat’s farm in the Amsterdamse Bos and also outings in the Amsterdam region.
7. Conclusions

For most Amsterdam parents in this study, having children meant a fundamental change in their lives. Many described becoming a parent as entering a new world. This dissertation proposes that the period in which middle-class couples become parents could be conceived of as entering a new field: the field of parenthood. Entering the field of parenthood implies a range of new practices, such as caring for a child, but it also causes major changes in old practices, such as the task divisions of paid and unpaid work, seeing family and friends and activities undertaken in spare time. In the field of parenthood, differences within the middle classes that may not have been visible in the pre-parent phase become articulated. The new social realities young middle-class parents face in the field of parenthood are not dealt with in the same way. The main research question of this study was:

How do residential practices of urban middle classes change when they have children and how is their residential practice informed by their habitus?

This concluding chapter will address this question in the following manner: First, I will demonstrate how residential practices in the field of education, consumption, employment and housing change in the transition to parenthood. Secondly, I will establish a link between residential practices and the variegated habituses of the middle classes. The third part of this chapter will bring the findings into perspective and present an agenda for further research.

Changes in the fields

Changes in the Field of Housing

The most obvious example of the way having children affects the residential practices of urban middle classes are changes in the field of housing. As shown in Chapter six, 45% of all the families in this study moved in the first two years of their parenthood, and 39% intended to move (again) in the next two years. Only 23% of all households in the study did not intend to move. In spite of this high residential mobility, only 35% of all families left the central city areas.

Even so, nearly all the households that had moved managed to improve their housing conditions in terms of square metres. In addition, most of the moves coincided with a transition from renting to homeownership. Of the middle-class parents who still lived in the city, 67% owned their home, which is very high in the Amsterdam context, where only 26% of the dwellings are owner-occupied (O&S, 2008). A significant minority still lived in the rental sectors.
As was suggested in Chapter 4, the various forms of capital that households command are associated with different strategies and tactics for obtaining a home. Households that live in social rental housing, for instance, do not accumulate economic capital (or lose it, for that matter) through homeownership. In the booming Amsterdam housing market before the economic crisis, this meant that it was harder for social tenants to 'get out' of this sector and move into homeownership (should they want to). Their choices of housing are relatively limited, which also affects the area they can live in. On the other hand, cheap housing (often social rent) may enable these households to organise their lives in other ways. Low rents may provide the opportunity to work fewer hours, make less use of formal child care and spend more time with their children than households with high monthly housing expenses (often homeowners). Housing trajectories are shaped by the habitus and the positions in various fields, which, in turn, reinforce particular aspects of the habitus. Specific middle-class habituses are therefore associated with various housing pathways (see Clapham, 2005).

The role of housing as an investment and a stage for the accumulation of particular forms of capital should always be linked with broader time-space trajectories through physical and social space. Hence, they are also about the location of the housing and how the home positions the households in other fields, such as education and employment. Housing also shapes everyday routines in time and space. Family households, particularly dual-income households who have to juggle various responsibilities, generally have tight time budgets. The location of the home is crucial to the way they organise their lives around work, care and other obligations.

In Chapter 2, it was shown that the increase in the number of middle-class families in Amsterdam is taking place in the central parts of the city. It suggested that this increase should be linked to the time advantages the central location offers to a specific type of middle-class family household. The emergence of urban-orientated dual-income households is the result of demographic changes, such as the postponement of childbearing, the rise in higher education and the emancipation of women on the labour market. Moreover, the growth in middle-class families should also be linked to the gentrification of the central parts of Amsterdam. The findings of this study support the idea that the gentrification of the city also spreads into subsequent stages of the life course.

Although in Amsterdam, most middle-class families live in the most suburban parts of the municipality and the suburban communities in the region host many more, the central areas of Amsterdam appear to offer particular residential environments that are increasingly popular among specific middle-class groups. Although most of the families considered in this study seem to prefer larger dwellings with private outdoor space, the behaviour of the respondents deviated in one important respect from the literature on middle-class families: a large majority remained in the central parts of Amsterdam, and approximately 50% of...
them expressed the intention to stay in the future as well. Despite the tight housing market and high prices for centrally located, larger dwellings, many households continued to be urbanites.

**Changes in Consumption**

The families in this research indicated that the things they did in their spare time and the places they went were different after having children. Obviously, many of these changes are associated with the lack of time and the fact that not all activities are suitable for children. If partners want to do something by themselves, it automatically involves some kind of negotiation. Some households buy time through the consumption of particular services such as child care, delivery, or babysitting. Other parents invoke the help of others, such as neighbours, friends and family, to take some time for themselves.

In spite of monetising and outsourcing strategies, most parents spent less time on their own ‘private’ activities. Box 4 provided an overview of some of these changes in consumption. For example, most spent less time on (fun) shopping, theatre and museum visits, sports, going to the movies and other forms of consumption. Consuming less of particular services and goods has also implications for the use of (urban) space. Many of the places associated with particular consumption activities, such as clubbing or eating out, are frequented less. The use of urban space has also changed; many new parents indicated that they spend more time in their own neighbourhoods and visited other parts of the city much less frequently.

**Changes in the Field of Employment**

Most of the respondents in this study, both men and women, worked at full-time or large part-time jobs before they became parents. When they had their first child, most mothers reduced the number of hours that they worked, albeit with a much smaller reduction than the Dutch average. Correspondingly, most men also reduced the number of hours that they worked. Generally speaking, most of the families in this study maintained a more symmetrical division of labour than is common in the Netherlands as a whole. Nevertheless, divisions of labour also differed among the middle-class families in Amsterdam: some couples chose a traditional male breadwinner model; most had some kind of semi-symmetrical model in which men worked more hours than women while both had serious careers; and a few households were dual full-time.

A family’s particular methods of labour division are the result of the interplay of, among other things, ideas about gender, the sector of employment, and economic behaviour at the level of the household, optimising the household income and time budget for other tasks. Working in the public sector, private sector or being self-employed influences how easy it is in financial, practical and symbolic terms to work fewer hours. On the other hand, the division of labour...
has consequences for the household’s income and, therefore, for opportunities in the housing market and other forms of consumption. Chapter 3 has shown that the division of labour is associated with the sorting of households into different neighbourhoods. Dual full-time families tend to be overrepresented in the affluent areas of the central city, while dual part-timers can often be found in the gentrifying neighbourhoods of the 19th century and early 20th century belts. The most common Dutch arrangement (man full-time, woman 16-24 hours a week) is highly overrepresented in the suburban fringes of Amsterdam. It is suggested that in Amsterdam, families tend to be sorted geographically according to the division of paid work.

Chapter 2 also provided evidence that particular middle-class households sort into different areas. Much of this pattern can be explained by the households’ incomes and purchasing power on the housing market. Notwithstanding the impact of economic capital, it is important to realise that gender ideologies and consumption patterns via the division of labour impact economic capital itself. Economic capital is at least partially the result of other practices that are informed by the habitus. Prior decisions about education and job type strongly affect income, as does the role that work plays in one’s identity. Furthermore, embodied ideas about how to be a good parent affect work practices and the use of childcare, division of caregiving tasks, use of parental leave arrangements and so forth. The division of labour within households is therefore a nexus for the way the practices of urban middle classes may diverge once its members have children.

Changes in the Field of Education
When members of the middle classes become parents, they must eventually think about where their children will go to school. For many parents, the field of education is very new; others may already have a level of personal experience with the Amsterdam educational landscape. Chapter 5 has shown that schools are an important topic for Amsterdam parents. Most of the parents in this study were already gathering information on schools via the Internet, official sources and their social networks. Some had already taken action by enrolling their children. Although many parents were interested in the location and quality of the schools and their learning methods, the crucial concern of most of the respondents was the issue of ‘black’ and ‘white’ schools in the city. Although the majority genuinely seemed to prefer mixing at the level of the school, they also saw ethnic and social class diversity as a threat to the intergenerational transfer of their own class position through good education. All families expressed that they wanted an environment that would enable their child to thrive academically and socially. However, the degree to which they experienced the necessity of compromises toward this ideal and their willingness to make those compromises differed.

In the Amsterdam context of free school choice, the neighbourhood and school are less tightly interconnected than, for example, in the UK. However,
in response to increasing demand, particular schools have tightened their enrolment policies, strengthening the ties between the neighbourhood and the school population. This dawning system of school-catchment areas is changing the rules of the field of education and housing in Amsterdam. Furthermore, the absence of an alternative circuit of private education makes the choice of the right public school a precarious affair that is closely linked to the choice of the right neighbourhood.

Chapter 5 has shown how middle-class parents have various strategies for dealing with different neighbourhood contexts in Amsterdam. Five types of strategies utilised by middle-class parents were identified. The first strategy involves moving to another municipality with good schools. A similar strategy involves moving into an Amsterdam neighbourhood where access to good schools is almost guaranteed. Middle-class parents who are not able or unwilling to pursue the first two strategies can act in three other ways. They either choose the most suitable local school or they can choose a school elsewhere, which implies commuting to school. The fourth strategy is to actively shape the conditions of education by ‘mixing’ the school population by canvassing for support among middle-class peers to send children to the same neighbourhood school. The last strategy is to send the children to a local ‘black’ school for ideological or practical reasons.

Although Amsterdam currently has a relatively free school-choice context, it has become evident that school choice is a very precarious affair for middle-class families. Its interconnectedness with neighbourhood choice means that assuming a position in the field of education has important repercussions for residential practices. How these practices become differentiated, however, is related to positions in the other fields and the habitus.

Residential Practices and Middle-Class Habitus

The second part of the overall research question is concerned with the role of habitus in explaining the various residential practices. It was expected that when middle-class couples have children, the differences between the habituses will become much more apparent than before. In other words, the middle-class habitus is articulated very differently in the new field of parenthood. This is particularly associated with the fact that in the field of parenthood, the main stake becomes ensuring that children attain at least the same social position in life as the parents. Ideas about how to achieve this are strongly related to residential practices.

Capital and Residential Practices

This study has provided evidence that middle classes with different orientations of capital have various residential practices in the field of parenthood. Chapter
6 has shown that the time-space trajectories of members of the middle classes diverge when they become parents, differentiated by their orientations of capital: reproduction of class through economic capital appears to be more associated with suburbanisation, whereas strategies that emphasise cultural capital seem to thrive in urban environments. These findings confirm other studies that have emphasised that various class reproduction strategies are associated with different residential environments (Bridge, 2003; Brun and Fagnani, 1994; De Wijs-Mulkens, 1999).

However, a suburb-city dichotomy as maintained in Chapter 6 does not entirely reflect the nuanced ways in which habitus and the residential environment are brought into accordance. Although the suburb-city dichotomy plays an important role for those households that stayed in the city to create distinction, various neighbourhoods within the metropolitan area make up a much more kaleidoscopic image. It would go too far to argue that households ‘naturally’ sort out into different areas. This type of ecological determinism is not suggested here. However, as Savage and others have argued, people seek to bring their habitus into correspondence with their residential environments (Savage et al., 2005).

As Butler and Robson showed for London, residential practices are the outcome of the interaction between the habitus and various fields (Butler and Robson, 2003a). The previous paragraphs have suggested that the position of middle classes in the field of education, employment, consumption and housing changes when its members become parents. The empirical chapters suggested that the changing positions in the various fields should be linked to the amount and orientation of their capital. It is mainly by considering the flows of various forms of capital that we can understand how the various fields are interconnected. The positions of men and women in the labour market, for example, have a powerful impact on the amount of economic capital. Although other forms of capital also explain access to housing, economic capital is the key currency that determines who lives where. As Chapters 2 and 5 have suggested, the position in the field of housing has, in turn, repercussions for access to good schools, distance to work and other amenities. Furthermore, positions in the housing field also shape patterns of consumption, and vice versa.

Therefore, the residential environment is selected for what it provides in a practical and symbolic sense and according to the financial and other forms of capital that the household commands. Capital is clearly an important factor for explaining residential practices. However, these practices are also the outcome of decisions related to bodily experiences: feelings of trust, security and belonging. Feelings of place are very closely related to historically embodied experiences contained in the habitus. Clearly, they have class dimensions as well and are therefore correlated with capital, but the experiences of place are also gendered and related to spatial histories.
Gender and residential practices
The residential practices of two-parent family households are informed by the habituses of both partners. Although parents still have their individual practices, which are informed by their own personal experiences, residential practices in the field of parenthood are the outcome of negotiations at the level of the household. Residential practices are not just influenced by the position of the household in various fields; they are also informed by the positions of the members of the households and the negotiations between them. When children get older, they also become stakeholders in this process.

The outcome of these negotiations depends on many specifics of the particular households. This study has only briefly touched upon the negotiations within households and the possible conflicts between spouses. Furthermore, the study has gathered more detailed data on mothers than on fathers, which would bias the findings. Nevertheless, several findings presented in this study indicate the gender dimension of residential practices. It is known from the literature that class and gender are interrelated, but it appears that entering the field of parenthood accentuates specific aspects of the habitus that cannot be attributed to social class alone. Entering the field of parenthood may have consequences for the balance of power within households. This shifting balance within households results in a repositioning of men and women in various fields. For example, different gender ideologies result in various divisions of paid and unpaid work. Although men are most commonly the main breadwinner, compared to the Netherlands as a whole a large share of the parents in this study divide labour symmetrically. This the result of a high share of mothers with serious working careers (large part-time or full-time jobs) and a high share of part-time working men. Also a significant group chooses the most common Dutch task division in which women work in smaller part-time jobs and men work fulltime. These different divisions have consequences for the financial and time-space budget of families and thus influence residential practices, but also for the position of men and women in other fields. For example, during the interviews, decisions concerning child care and school choice seemed to be made primarily by the mother when she was primarily responsible for caring tasks. Hence, it appears that becoming parent has different effects on households with various ideas about gender.

Spatial aspects of the habitus
Another aspect of the habitus that is linked to both gender and class but also has an independent effect on residential practices is the spatial dimension. The development of the spatial aspects of the habitus, that is, embodied dispositions accumulated in spatial contexts, are the product of historical practices in space. For some of the respondents, living in the city implied having new experiences; for others, the urban context implied a continuation of previous experiences. Generally, changes in employment and a rise in higher education have created
an ever-larger group of middle-class people who live in cities for a considerable part of their lives. Over a long period of time, these people have accumulated experiences in the city and could be claimed to have built up an urban habitus. However, most members of the urban middle classes are not originally from Amsterdam or another larger city and also have embodied experiences from other stages of their lives. Their habitus may have become somewhat ‘urbanised’ by their stay in Amsterdam, but it is also informed by their previous experiences (Blaauboer, 2011; Blaauboer et al., 2011). Furthermore, the fact that many have accumulated experiences in Amsterdam does not inherently predispose them to stay.

Although the analysis in Chapter 6 did not demonstrate the independent effect of residential background, other factors that affect the chance of moving out of the city are related to housing histories. People that grew up or lived for long periods in Amsterdam are more likely to have family and friends in the city, which makes them less likely to leave. Correspondingly, people that have only relatively recently moved to the city are more likely to have social networks elsewhere. Generally, the longer one has lived in the city, the more tacit and explicit knowledge one possesses about that city. It could be argued that this knowledge of the city constitutes a specific form of cultural capital, which shapes the practices of every life. This feel for the city has both practical and symbolic aspects.

Another aspect of housing history that influences residential mobility is tenure. People who grew up in Amsterdam are more likely to have established a good position in the field of social housing. Most people that move to Amsterdam during their studies or for work have primarily been engaged in private housing sectors. The housing price booms of the late nineties and mid two thousands have enabled some of the homeowner households in this study to accumulate considerable sums of economic capital. To some extent, this is an effect of economic cycles, but as suggested in Chapter 4, attitudes towards homeownership are also influenced by the habitus. The housing pathways of the respondents are shaped by the dispositions, which are learned in the social environment and influenced by the spatial context.

Perspectives

Amsterdam perspectives
As a second-tier global city embedded in a strongly regulated free-market regime, contemporary Amsterdam is shaped by forces of globalisation and, for the past century, by a rather socialist local and national governance. Its post-war socio-political history, in which housing was treated as a public good, has given way to more pro-growth-oriented policies. Gentrification has been integrated into official housing policies (Van Gent, forthcoming). Partly due to the deregulation of
the rental housing stock, the inner-city boroughs of Amsterdam are increasingly inhabited by young middle-class households. When these middle classes have children, most of them still suburbanise, but this study has shown that, in particular, the centrally located areas are increasingly inhabited by middle-class families.

This increase in middle-class family households is fuelled by demographic and socio-economic changes. The pool of potential middle-class families has increased significantly over the past decades as rising numbers of higher-educated young singles and couple-households have moved into the city. When these households move on in the life course, most of them will leave the inner-city. Nonetheless, because the middle classes are generally growing, more middle-class families are also staying in the city.

Apart from the simple matter of numbers, there seems also to be a stronger penchant among these families to stay in the city. This should be linked to the general process of gentrification, which has literally and figuratively created more space for the middle classes in the city. Many working-class and immigrant districts are both increasingly populated with the middle classes and are symbolically being redefined as middle-class territory. This is perhaps most visible in the changing consumption spaces, in the explosion of the number of coffee bars, delicatessen, and restaurants and in practices such as claiming the sidewalk (Karsten, 2008), changing transportation practices (cycling!) (O&S, 2011a) and increasing attention to urban design and maintenance. The changing symbolic landscape of the inner-city districts of Amsterdam affects the residential practices of members of the middle classes when they enter the field of parenthood. It may tip the balance for some middle-class households that may have previously decided to leave the city. Correspondingly, the gentrification of the city may cause various types of displacement of other households (Slater, 2009). Lower-class households may experience displacement pressure due to the changing symbolic landscape: they no longer feel at home in their neighbourhoods. Moreover, rising housing prices and the reduction of the social rental sector create both direct displacement and exclusionary forms.

Displacement is not only an issue for lower class households; displacement of middle-class households is also taking place. In particular, single-parent families and other single-earner families may have difficulty affording the increasingly expensive housing in the private sector in the central parts of the city. Paradoxically, however, while the poorest families may be able to occupy family housing in the social sector, middle-income families are often unable to access this type of housing because their incomes are too high. Some of these families, described elsewhere as middle-middle classes (Watt, 2005), are squeezed in the middle. Although Chapter 4 showed that the middle classes also have other forms of capital that they use to find and occupy a home, some middle-class families do not have enough economic capital to afford a suitable dwelling in the central part of
the city or to access other housing through the deployment of social and cultural capital. Although these processes have larger repercussions in some areas than others, the central boroughs of Amsterdam are all affected by it to some degree.

The social geography of Amsterdam’s middle-class families is therefore shaped by contradictory forces. On the one hand, it is increasingly difficult for middle-class families to access the social rent sector, but on the other hand, the processes of gentrification lead to decreases in the affordability of centrally located family housing in the private sector. The structure of the Amsterdam housing market contributes to a further differentiation of middle-class habitus in the field of parenthood: households with high shares of economic capital and cultural capital appear to prefer to settle in the expensive and centrally located areas of Watergraafsmeer, Oud Zuid, Oostelijk Havengebied and the Historical Centre, whereas households with high levels of economic capital but less cultural capital tend to leave the city and settle in various suburban municipalities. Households with high levels of cultural capital but a lack of economic means tend to ‘colonise’ non-middle-class areas within the city, either by moving into lower-class family areas such as Amsterdam Noord or by staying in (marginally) gentrifying areas such as De Baarsjes, Indische Buurt, and Westerpark. Finally, the middle-middle classes appear to have the most difficulty finding suitable accommodations in central Amsterdam. Some of them may move to newly developed areas at the fringes, such as De Aker and IJburg, while others leave the city and suburbanise (see Figure 7.1).
Conclusions

Theoretical perspectives
This study of urban middle classes in the field of parenthood has contributed to 1) demographic literature on the life course and, more specifically, the relation between the transition to parenthood and residential mobility; and 2) the more general discussion of the transformations of urban space associated with the reorientation of the middle classes towards the city and, more specifically, on gentrification and the life course.

Residential Mobility and Parenthood
In demographic literature, the transition to parenthood is typically associated with residential mobility (Clark and Dieleman, 1996; Rossi, 1955). This study has confirmed that most newly formed families experience new housing needs, of which the size, location and tenure of the dwelling are important factors. A significant segment of the respondents moved out of their dwellings, and the majority moved into homeownership. At the second measurement, another group of families intended to move, of which a significant part wished to suburbanise. Eventually, the majority of the studied households was residentially mobile in the first years of their parenthood, although a considerable group stayed in the central parts of the city.

However, although all the households experienced the same demographic transition and all belonged to the middle classes, their residential practices were still differentiated. This is partly explained by known factors, such as tenure (Mulder, 1996, 2006), economic and social connectedness (Van Diepen and Musterd, 2009) and individual characteristics such as age, number of children, and income (Clark and Dieleman, 1996). However, this study has also identified the strong effect of the role of cultural capital on residential practices. The different residential practices of middle classes should also be attributed to various forms of taste, which have become embodied through the habitus. This embodied taste is primarily associated with the meaning of living at a particular location and how it provides symbolic capital. Moreover, many of the variables included in residential mobility studies are treated as independent. This study has shown that housing is a field that is interconnected with other fields in which middle classes assume positions in line with their habitus. Historical practices in various fields are accumulated in the habitus which inform new practices. Housing choices in the field of parenthood are part of historically developed pathways that are chosen according to the capital people command. This study suggests that to understand residential practices in the field of parenthood, the entire set of historically embodied experiences should be considered.

Class and Urban Space: Family Gentrification
Various scholars have shown that the urban lifestyle of new middle-class households is challenged by the birth of children (Bridge, 2006). Many of
these gentrifiers suburbanise when they have children, often due to changing housing needs and concerns with the quality of primary education (Butler and Hamnett, 2007; Butler and Robson, 2003a). This study has provided evidence that many middle-class families do suburbanise or intend to do so. However, a considerable number of middle-class households continue to be urbanites when they have children. This group, which has been referred to as family gentrifiers (Karsten, 2003), is growing both absolutely and relatively in Amsterdam. Family gentrification, however, comes in various forms.

Some gentrifiers settle down in the areas that they had inhabited previously. The households that entered particular neighbourhoods in Amsterdam when they were still singles or couples entered their parenthood in those neighbourhoods. When these people have children, they may decide to stay in the area, with or without making changes to their housing conditions. This incumbent form of family gentrification fits into stage-model conceptualisations of gentrification in which urban areas are gradually transformed from working-class districts into middle-class areas with increasingly risk-averse populations (Clay, 1979; Gale, 1980). This type of neighbourhood transformation is associated with increasing real estate values, rising rents, and an increasingly affluent population. Evidence from research in progress suggests that most of the gentrification in Amsterdam is associated with incumbent upgrading (Teernstra, research in progress). The maturing of gentrification in these areas should therefore be understood both figuratively and literally as the population ‘matures’ and settles down. This type of family gentrification may be taking place in neighbourhoods like Scheldebuurt and Oosterparkbuurt.

A second understanding of family gentrification is associated with direct middle class migration. Gentrifiers who have children and cannot or do not want to stay in the area may consider moving into other urban areas as families. Some of these areas may be working-class areas in which lower-class families are being replaced or displaced by more affluent middle-class family households. Examples of this direct family gentrification can be witnessed in Amsteldorp and in parts of Amsterdam Noord.

A third form of family gentrification is related to the migration of middle-class households into traditional middle-class areas, augmenting the concentrations of middle-class families in specific areas. This phenomenon of moving into areas that are relatively homogeneous in terms of class and ethnicity should, perhaps, not be labelled gentrification, as it does not refer to the processes of invasion of lower-class areas by middle-class groups. However, because this process takes place in central urban areas and is accompanied by the replacement and (exclusionary) displacement of the lower classes, it is at least closely related to gentrification. The areas of Middenmeer, Willemspark and Museumkwartier could be viewed as the clearest examples of this phenomenon.


**Agenda for Future Research**

By conceptualising parenthood as the interaction of habitus and fields, this dissertation has proposed viewing the transition to parenthood as entering a new field: the field of parenthood. Although this study has explained how positions in the field of housing, education, consumption and employment change in the field of parenthood and how they are related to residential practices, the field of parenthood extends much further than is covered in this study. I would like to emphasise three aspects of the relationships between habitus, practices and the field of parenthood that deserve further attention in future research: 1) The relationship between parenthood, housing pathways and habitus; 2) the relation between gender and urban space and how this changes in the field of parenthood; and 3) the concept of parenthood as a field as children grow older.

A first issue that emerged from this study is the relationship between habitus and housing pathways. The residential choices of middle-class households in the field of parenthood are strongly influenced by historical events. Not only are ideas about good parenting practices and residential environments informed by the household members’ own childhood experiences, the choice of particular types of housing, tenure and residential environment is also strongly affected by historical practices in the field of housing. This dissertation has tentatively explained how various forms of capital play a role in different strategies and tactics used to gain access to housing. By integrating this perspective more closely with research on the life course and the intergenerational transfer of capital—in both its economic and cultural forms—we could arrive at a more comprehensive account of housing pathways and their relationships with social class. Some of the data that were collected for this study could be used to identify how ideas about housing and parenthood are influenced by residential and social backgrounds.

The second issue that deserves future attention is the gendered aspect of the habitus and the relationship between gender and urban space. This study has suggested that gender ideologies influence ideas about good parenting and, therefore, ideas about suitable residential environments in which to bring up children. Furthermore, the findings of this dissertation suggest that the urban environment is particularly suitable for households that have a relatively symmetrical division of labour. The causality and direction of the causal relationship have not been thoroughly established in this research. Future research should investigate the extent to which this is related to selection effects or whether independent area effects exist. The SSB dataset utilised in Chapter 2 is currently being used in analyses that will provide more definite information on the direction of this causality. Furthermore, some self-collected but underexploited data contain more detailed information on the labour market positions of men and women.
and how these positions are altered in the transition to parenthood. The structure of the local labour market and the training and sectors in which middle-class households are active appear particularly important in this respect.

However, the most apparent question that is raised by this study is: is the presence of middle-class families in the inner city a temporary or a more permanent phenomenon, and further, how do middle-class parents deal with their residential environment when their children grow older? In both time and scope, the middle-class parents in this study have only taken their first steps into the field of parenthood. The fact that a relatively large group of middle-class families stayed in the city in the first years of parenthood does not necessarily mean that they will remain there for the rest of their lives. The factors that may lead to a reconsideration of their residential context are associated with the compatibility of housing and household size. As many parents in this study expressed, their current housing situation may be adequate when the first child is still young, but when the family expands and the children grow older they may need more (other) space. Some of these issues could be explored by drawing on previously unused data collected during this study based on questionnaires given to women who were pregnant with a second or third child.

As households proceed in the field of parenthood, many new aspects of the relationship between parenting and the environment will become apparent. Parents will, for instance, need to relate to the changing geography of education in Amsterdam, initially in primary education but later in secondary education as well. Furthermore, as children grow older, their own consumption will become increasingly important, and they will use urban space in a different and increasingly independent way. How the use of space is negotiated within the family depends on ideas about good parenting, which are directly related to the habitus.

Future research should include further longitudinal studies of how middle-class family households’ positions in the fields of employment, education, consumption and housing change when they advance in the field of parenthood. Long-term longitudinal studies would enable a further understanding of why, when and how the urban middle classes change their residential practices when they become parents.
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Appendix 1: Questionnaire 1

Questionnaire Families in the City

Important!

This research project wants to look at change in residential practice before and after people have children. Therefore, I ask people to fill out a questionnaire now, and a very short one after two years.

It is very important for the research that I will be able to contact you at a later moment (in two years).

Please, be so kind to give your email address or mail address or telephone number so that I may contact you. Perhaps, needless to say: your personal data will be treated completely confidentially.

I am very grateful for your collaboration,

Willem Boterman
wboterman@fmg.uva.nl
020 5254258

Your email: __________________________
Your address: __________________________
Your telephone: __________________________
First part: Household, dwelling, and neighbourhood

1. What is the age of the members of your household?
   You       ___________
   Your partner ___________
   (other),       ___________
   (other),       ___________
   (other),       ___________

2. How many weeks are you pregnant?
   □ What is your post code?  –

3. For how long have you been living on your current address?
   _______ years

4. For how long have you been living in Amsterdam?
   _______ years

5. For how long have you been living in the Netherlands?
   _______ years

6. In which municipality did you grow up? (Where did you spend most of your childhood)
   ________________________________

7. What are the postal codes of the addresses you lived since you moved out of your parents home? (if not in the Netherlands, mention just the name of the town.)
   – ____________________________________________________
   – ____________________________________________________
   – ____________________________________________________
8. How many rooms and how many square meters has your dwelling?
   Number of rooms ___________ m² ____

9. What type of dwelling do you live in?
   □ Apartment without balcony or roof terrace
   □ Apartment with balcony or roof terrace
   □ Apartment without private outdoor space
   □ Apartment with private outdoor space
   □ Other, namely ______________________

10. Do you own or rent your dwelling?
    □ Own ➔ ga naar de volgende vraag
    □ Private rent ➔ ga naar vraag 13
    □ Social rent (woningbouw) ➔ ga naar vraag 13

11. What is the WOZ value of your dwelling? (value according to tax regulations)
    □ Less than 200,000 Euro
    □ 200,000 to 275,000 euro
    □ 275,000 to 350,000 euro
    □ 350,000 to 500,000 euro
    □ More than 500,000 euro

12. What is the net monthly rent?
    □ Less than 330 euro
    □ 330-600 euro
    □ 600- euro tot 1000 euro
    □ More than 1000 euro

13. When choosing your current dwelling, did you take into account the possibility of having children?
    □ Yes
    □ No

14. Do you or your partner have family... (multiple answers allowed)
    In your street? □ yes □ no
    In your neighbourhood? □ yes □ no
    In the rest of your stadsdeel? □ yes □ no
    In Amsterdam? □ yes □ no
    In the region Amsterdam? □ yes □ no
    Elsewhere in Holland? □ yes □ no
    Abroad □ yes □ no
15. **Do you or your partner have friends...**
   - In your street? □ yes □ no
   - In your neighbourhood? □ yes □ no
   - In the rest of your stadsdeel? □ yes □ no
   - In Amsterdam? □ yes □ no
   - In the region Amsterdam? □ yes □ no
   - Elsewhere in Holland? □ yes □ no
   - Abroad □ yes □ no

16. **Who is generally responsible for the following:**
   - Groceries □ You □ Your partner □ Someone else
   - Preparing dinner □ You □ Your partner □ Someone else
   - Cleaning □ You □ Your partner □ Someone else
   - Laundry □ You □ Your partner □ Someone else
   - Chores □ You □ Your partner □ Someone else
   - (in and around the house)
   - Finances and tax □ You □ Your partner □ Someone else

17. **Do you make use of the following services:**
   - Take away and meal delivery □ yes □ no
   - Laundry and dry cleaning □ yes □ no
   - Handyman □ yes □ no
   - Grocery service □ yes □ no
   - Domestic worker (cleaning) □ yes □ no

18. **Do you have a subscription to a newspaper?**
   - □ I am not subscribed to a newspaper
   - □ De Telegraaf
   - □ AD
   - □ Trouw
   - □ De Volkskrant
   - □ Het Parool
   - □ NRC Handelsblad
   - □ NRC Next
   - □ FD
   - □ Other, namely __________________
19. Which Dutch broadcasting organisation/channel do you prefer to watch? (just one answer please!!)
   □ I rarely/never watch television
   □ I do not watch Dutch tv
   □ KRO
   □ NRCV
   □ EO
   □ VARA
   □ VPRO
   □ NPS
   □ AVRO
   □ TROS
   □ RTL 4
   □ RTL 5
   □ SBS 6
   □ Net 5
   □ Veronica
   □ CANVAS

20. What political party enjoys your preference? (not necessary to vote in the Netherlands) (multiple answers allowed)
   □ CDA (Christian democrats)
   □ PvdA (labour)
   □ VVD (conservative liberals)
   □ SP (socialist party)
   □ PVV (Wilders) (nationalist)
   □ Groen Links (greens)
   □ Christen Unie (Christian conservative)
   □ D66 (liberals)
   □ SGP (Christian conservative)
   □ PvdD (Party for the animals)
   □ Other, namely ______________
21. **Do you or your partner posses a car?**
   - Yes, one ➔ which type, brand and year of construction?
   - 1 ________________________________
   - Yes, several ➔ which type, brand and year of construction?
   - 1 ________________________________
   - 2 ________________________________
   - No, but I share a car/green wheels
   - No

22. **To what extent do you agree with the following statements?**
   - I am very attached to my neighbourhood
     - I agree completely ☐ I agree ☐ I disagree ☐ Neutral
   - I am a real urbanite
     - I agree completely ☐ I agree ☐ I disagree ☐ Neutral
   - I do not want to leave Amsterdam
     - I agree completely ☐ I agree ☐ I disagree ☐ Neutral
   - My home is more important than my neighbourhood
     - I agree completely ☐ I agree ☐ I disagree ☐ Neutral
   - The city is not a suitable place to raise children
     - I agree completely ☐ I agree ☐ I disagree ☐ Neutral
   - I rather live in Amsterdam than in Almere
     - I agree completely ☐ I agree ☐ I disagree ☐ Neutral
Second part: changes since your pregnancy

The following questions will ask you to compare the period before your pregnancy with the situation now.

23. Could you indicate how domestic tasks were divided between You and your partner, before your pregnancy?

24. You _____%  Partner _____%  (together 100%)

b) Do you feel this has changed now you are pregnant?
   □ No
   □ Yes, my partner does more
   □ Yes, I do more

25. Could you indicate how often you visited the following places before your pregnancy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Monthly-yearly</th>
<th>Weekly – monthly</th>
<th>daily-weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical concerts</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafe</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallery</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping (no groceries)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports (active/passive)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Do you feel this has changed now you are pregnant?
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☐ No
☐ Yes → Please indicate what has become more frequented and what less.

26. **How many times every week, did you meet up with friends or family before your pregnancy?**
   - [ ] Seldom or never
   - [ ] Once or twice
   - [ ] Three to four times
   - [ ] (almost) daily

b) Do you feel this has changed now you are pregnant?
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Yes, I see my friends/family less often
   - [ ] Yes, I see my friends/family more often

27. **Could you indicate what you considered important aspects of your neighbourhood before your pregnancy?**
   - **Proximity friends**
     - [ ] Very important
     - [ ] Important
     - [ ] Not very important
     - [ ] Irrelevant
   - **Quiet neighbourhood**
     - [ ] Very important
     - [ ] Important
     - [ ] Not very important
     - [ ] Irrelevant
   - **Green areas**
     - [ ] Very important
     - [ ] Important
     - [ ] Not very important
     - [ ] Irrelevant
   - **Close to the motorway**
     - [ ] Very important
     - [ ] Important
     - [ ] Not very important
     - [ ] Irrelevant
   - **Close to a public transport node**
     - [ ] Very important
     - [ ] Important
     - [ ] Not very important
     - [ ] Irrelevant
   - **Diversity of population**
     - [ ] Very important
     - [ ] Important
     - [ ] Not very important
     - [ ] Irrelevant
   - **Close to my work**
     - [ ] Very important
     - [ ] Important
     - [ ] Not very important
     - [ ] Irrelevant
   - **Close to within the city centre**
     - [ ] Very important
     - [ ] Important
     - [ ] Not very important
     - [ ] Irrelevant
b) Do you feel this has changed now you are pregnant?
- No
- Yes, I deem some aspects less and other more important now

Less important: ____________________________________________
More important: ____________________________________________

28. Could you indicate whether you would have liked to live in the following
neighbourhoods, before your pregnancy?

- Jordaan
  - Yes, please
  - No, rather not

- Buitenveldert
  - Yes, please
  - No, rather not

- Indische Buurt
  - Yes, please
  - No, rather not

- Concertgebouwbuurt
  - Yes, please
  - No, rather not

- IJburg
  - Yes, please
  - No, rather not

- Osdorp
  - Yes, please
  - No, rather not

- Almere
  - Yes, please
  - No, rather not

- Haarlem
  - Yes, please
  - No, rather not
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- Yes, please
- No, rather not

☐ Yes, please  ☐ Yes, that's ok  ☐ Well, doesn’t matter
☐ No, rather not  ☐ no, never!

Amstelveen

- Yes, please
- No, rather not

☐ Yes, please  ☐ Yes, that's ok  ☐ Well, doesn’t matter
☐ No, rather not  ☐ no, never!

Het Gooi

- Yes, please
- No, rather not

☐ Yes, please  ☐ Yes, that's ok  ☐ Well, doesn’t matter
☐ No, rather not  ☐ no, never!

b) Do you feel this has changed now you are pregnant?

☐ No
☐ Yes, I prefer other neighborhoods now, other I would rather not live.

Less preferred: _____________________________________________

More preferred: ___________________________________________
Third part: Education and work

29. What is your highest completed level of education?
   - Primary school
   - Lower secondary school
   - Upper secondary school
   - Higher vocational
   - University (bachelors)
   - University (masters)
   - PhD

30. What are the names of the studies you completed?
   1. ________________________________
   2. ________________________________

31. What is the highest completed level of education of your partner?
   - does not apply ➔ Go to question 34
   - Primary school
   - Lower secondary school
   - Upper secondary school
   - Higher vocational
   - University (bachelors)
   - University (masters)
   - PhD

32. What are the names of the studies your partner completed?
   1. ________________________________
   2. ________________________________

33. What is the highest completed level of education of your father?
   - Primary school
   - Lower secondary school
   - Upper secondary school
   - Higher vocational
   - University (bachelors)
   - University (masters)
   - PhD
34. What is the highest completed level of education of your mother?
- [ ] Primary school
- [ ] Lower secondary school
- [ ] Upper secondary school
- [ ] Higher vocational
- [ ] University (bachelors)
- [ ] University (masters)
- [ ] PhD

35. How many hours do you work per week (paid)? And your partner?
Number of hours (You _______ Number hours (partner ______

36. Where is your work and that of your partner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the neighbourhood/at home</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the ring motorway in Amsterdam</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in the region Amsterdam</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in the Netherlands</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. How do you usually commute?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By foot</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By bike</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By car</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By tram, bus, tube</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By train (possible with additional transport)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differently, namely ___________________</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38. In which branch do You and your partner work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public service</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial services</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and retail</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business consultancy</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Entertainment</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, namely</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Please, describe as precisely as possible your profession, job, and the company/government branch you work for (for example: economist, data analyst at the sales department for Delta Lloyd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. What is the gross annual income of your household (Your income and that of your partner together)

- ☐ Less than 30.000 Euro per year (less than gross 2.300 Euro per month)
- ☐ 30.000 to 45.000 Euro per year (gross 2.300-3.500 Euro per month)
- ☐ 45.000 to 60.000 Euro per year (gross 3.500– 4.600 Euro per month)
- ☐ 60.000 to 90.000 Euro per year (gross 4.600 – 7.000 Euro per month)
- ☐ 90.000 to 150.000 Euro per year (gross 7.000-11.600 Euro per month)
- ☐ More than 150.000 Euro per year (more than gross 11.600 euro per month)
Part 4: Your future with your children

41. Do you plan to move the coming two years?
   - Yes
   - No ➔ Go to question 46

42. What is the most important reason to move?

43. Are you already looking for a new dwelling?
   - Yes, I am already preparing a bid/bought already a house
   - Yes, I am actively searching on the internet/through advertisements
   - Yes, I have a real estate agent looking for me
   - Yes, I am inscribed at Woningnet
   - Yes, I search in other manners
   - No ➔ Go to question 46

44. In what neighbourhood/area are you looking?
   - my own neighbourhood
   - A neighbourhood within the ring motor way, namely
   - A neighbourhood elsewhere in Amsterdam, namely
   - A municipality within the region of Amsterdam, namely
   - A municipality outside the region of Amsterdam, namely

45. How many hours do you think You and your partner will be working after the birth of your child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 35 hours per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-35 hours per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-23 hours per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 12 uur per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 hours: would quit doing paid labour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
46. **Do you intend to make use of paid child care?**
   - Yes, for all days I and my partner work
   - Yes, one or two days paid, the rest unpaid/informal (family/friends)
   - No, only unpaid/informal (family/friends)

47. **Could you indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:**
   - I am already looking for a crèche or other child care for my child
     - I agree completely
     - I agree
     - I disagree
     - I disagree completely
     - Neutral
   - When choosing my new residence, I take into account the presence of good schools
     - I agree completely
     - I agree
     - I disagree
     - I disagree completely
     - Neutral
   - I deem it important to live close to my parents (in law), when my child is born
     - I agree completely
     - I agree
     - I disagree
     - I disagree completely
     - Neutral
   - Actually, I am not really concerned yet with the period after the birth
     - I agree completely
     - I agree
     - I disagree
     - I disagree completely
     - Neutral
   - After I gave birth to my child, not much will change in the social life of me and my partner
     - I agree completely
     - I agree
     - I disagree
     - I disagree completely
     - Neutral
Finally,

I am looking for future parents that would like to participate in interviews as well. These interviews will deal with the same issues addressed in this questionnaire, but will offer much more space for your personal experiences and to discuss more deeply how you see your future as a parent, particularly in relation to your neighbourhood and home. Thank you so much for helping me out!

☐ Yes, I would like to participate!

Contact me on (telephone, email, post address)

☐ No thank you
Appendix 2. Topic list interviews

Social Background
Can you tell me something about the environment in which you grew up?
- type neighbourhood
- type dwelling/housing
- social position parents (job, education)
- spare time

Residential History
Can you tell me how you ended up in this home (and in Amsterdam)?
- What residential environments and why?
- alternatives?
- social capital
- other cities, countries
- anticipated on having children?

School/Work
Can you tell me about your education?
Can you tell me about your work?
- Secondary school
- Which study
- Choices of family/friends
- What employment career
- Current job

Relation to Amsterdam
To what extent do you consider yourself an Amsterdammmer?
- Places
- Activities
- Mobility
- Ever leaving?
- family/friends in the city?
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Children in the city
How do you think about bringing up children in the city?
- Advantages for you/for the child
- Disadvantages for you/for the child
- Own childhood experiences
- Anticipation on having children
- Day care/Schools

Division of Labour/gender
How do you divide your paid and unpaid work?
- Who does what?
- Outsourcing
- Division of paid work

Future
Where will you be in two/five years
- Where?
- Work?
- Children?
Appendix 3 Topic List second Interviews

Changes
What is the most important change since you had children?
How did you organise care and work?
– Sense of time
– Organising the household

What is the difference with one child (Only when pregnant or with second child)?
How does an average week look like?
– Work
– Organisation
– Shopping
– Preparing meals
– Fetching

How did your relationship with the city change?
– Relation to the city
– Ideas about parenting
– Use of Space
– Activities

How do you think about bringing up children in the city now?
– Advantages
– Disadvantages

Where do most of your friends/family live?
– Network?
– Support
– Peer pressure?
How do you think about schools?

- Type of school
- Quality
- School population
- Distance

**Future**

Where will you be in two/five years

- Where?
- Work?
- Children?
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Appendix 4 Internet-based second questionnaire

(Note: this questionnaire was posed in Dutch, translations may be not exactly mean the same)

Housing

1. What is your current household composition *
   Please choose at most 1 answers:
   ☐ cohabiting with partner and one child
   ☐ cohabiting with partner and one child and pregnant with second
   ☐ cohabiting with partner and two children
   ☐ single with child(ren)
   ☐ cohabiting with partner
   ☐ single
   ☐ other:

2. Did you move since last time (April/May 2008)? If yes, how often? *
   Please choose at most 1 answers:
   ☐ no, I did not move
   ☐ yes, I moved once
   ☐ yes, I moved twice or more

3. What is your current postcode *
   Fill out your postcode here:

4. What were the most important reasons to move? *
   Select what applies
   ☐ former dwelling was too small
   ☐ former dwelling was impractical
   ☐ former dwelling was not on ground level
   ☐ former dwelling had no outdoor space
   ☐ former dwelling was situated in the city
   ☐ former dwelling was situated impractically in relation to work
   ☐ we wanted to become homeowner
   ☐ we wanted to rent
   ☐ former dwelling was too expensive
   ☐ other:
5. How many rooms does the current dwelling have? *
   
   For instance: living room + two bedrooms is a 3 room dwelling.

6. What is the size of your current dwelling in square meters?

7. Is your current dwelling a owner-occupied, a private rent or a social rent home?
   - Owner-occupied
   - Private rent
   - Social Rent
   - Other:

8. In what type of home do you live?
   Please choose at most 1 answer:
   - apartment without outdoor space
   - apartment with outdoor space (roof terrace, balcony)
   - ground level apartment without outdoor space
   - ground level apartment with garden
   - single family home without garden
   - single family home with garden
   - other:

9. What are your net monthly expenses on housing?
   - less than 330 euro
   - between 330 and 600 euro
   - between 600 and 800 euro
   - between 800 and 1000 euro
   - between 1000 and 1500 euro
   - more than 1500 euro
Work

10. How many hours of paid work do you do weekly?

11. How many hours of paid work does your partner do weekly?

12. Please describe as detailed as possible your occupation, your current job position and the company or government sector you work for (for instance economist; data-analyst; at Delta Lloyd)

13. Please describe as detailed as possible the occupation, the current job position and the company or government sector your partner works for (for instance economist; data-analyst; at Delta Lloyd)

14. What is your current gross household income (your and your partner’s income together) *
   Please choose at most 1 answer:
   - less than 30.000 euro
   - 30.000 - 45.000 euro
   - 45.000 - 60.000 euro
   - 60.000 - 90.000 euro
   - 90.000 - 150.000 euro
   - 150.000 - 200.000 euro
   - more than 200.000 euro

15. Where is your work situated?
   Select what applies
   - at home/in the neighbourhood
   - Within the Amsterdam ring road
   - Elsewhere in the Amsterdam region
   - Elsewhere in Nederland
   - Other:

16. How long do you travel to your work?

   Calculate in minutes, both ways.
17. **Where is the work of your partner situated?**
   Select what applies
   - ☐ at home/in the neighbourhood
   - ☐ Within the Amsterdam ring road
   - ☐ Elsewhere in the Amsterdam region
   - ☐ Elsewhere in Nederland
   - ☐ Other:

18. **How long does your partner travel to his work?**
   Calculate in minutes, both ways

19. **How did you organize the day care for your children?**
   Please indicate who is responsible for children’s daycare during an average working week:
   - **Monday**:
   - **Tuesday**:
   - **Wednesday**:
   - **Thursday**:
   - **Friday**:
   For instance:
   Monday: mamma
   Tuesday: mamma
   Wednesday: day care
   Thursday: day care
   Friday: daddy
Appendices

Division of labour

20. **Could you indicate which share of the domestic work you do? (together 100%)**
You: ....
Your partner ...
(It is assumed that the female partner fills out the questionnaire!)

21. **Could you indicate which share of care for the children you do? (together 100%)**
Vul uw antwoord(en) hier in
You: ....
Your partner ...
(It is assumed that the female partner fills out the questionnaire!)

Social contacts

22. **Where do You and your partners closest family live?**
Please choose at most 1 answer:
- in the neighbourhood
- in Amsterdam
- in the Amsterdam region
- Elsewhere in the Netherlands
- abroad

23. **Where do your and your partner's closest friends live?**
Please choose at most 1 answer:
- in the neighbourhood
- in Amsterdam
- in the Amsterdam region
- Elsewhere in the Netherlands
- abroad
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24. Do you sometimes ask your neighbours:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To look after your child?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help you out with small chores?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To look after the pets/ water the plants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Do you ever ask your family or friends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To look after your child?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help you out with small chores?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To look after the pets/ water the plants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future

26. Do you intend to move within the next two years?
  - Yes
  - No

27. What would be the main reasons for you to move? *
  - Select what applies
  - dwelling is too small
  - dwelling is impractical
  - dwelling is not on ground level
  - dwelling has no outdoor space
  - dwelling is situated in the city
  - dwelling is situated impractically in relation to work
  - we want to become homeowner
  - we want to rent
  - dwelling is too expensive
  - other:
28. Are you looking for a new home yet?
☐ yes, I am already buying a new home
☐ yes, I search via internet, real estate agent or newspaper
☐ yes, I search via woningnet
☐ yes, I search via other channels
☐ No

29. Where do you look for a new home?
Select what applies and please comment
☐ my own neighbourhood, namely
☐ a neighbourhood within the inner-ringroad in Amsterdam, namely
☐ a neighbourhood elsewhere in Amsterdam, namely
☐ a municipality within the Amsterdam region, namely
☐ a municipality outside of the Amsterdam region, namely

Finally, some statements

30. Could you please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completely agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The city is not a suitable place to bring up children</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When selecting a place of residence I consider the presence of a good school</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for me to live close to my parents (in law)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the birth of our child(ren) nothing much changed in our social life</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

Introduction

This dissertation is about the changes in the lives of middle classes in Amsterdam when they become parents for the first time. It is about how becoming a parent affects their working life, their consumption patterns, and their social life. It is about how identities as new parents and city dwellers may conflict and coincide. It is also about how the way the household as an economic and social unit is organized and how the relationship between partners changes when couples become families. Above all, this study is about the decision where to live, and more specifically about the question whether to leave or to stay in the city.

Generally, for most middle classes the city does not seem to be the most attractive environment to raise their children. The (perceived) inconveniences of urban living and a lack of suitable and affordable family dwellings on the one hand, and the image of space, quietness and green of suburbia on the other, make many parents decide to leave the city for suburbia. Many believe that suburbanization of families is even a natural process and that any attempt to keep families in the city is doomed to fail. Although it is true that suburbanization of families has been the dominant trend for several decades, a substantial number of middle class families have always stayed in the city and some studies have suggested that this number is rising.

This increase appears to be connected to broader trends of gentrification of inner-cities and the growth in dual-earner households. Although several studies have shown that inner-city living for some middle-class families is part of their identity and their preferred way of coping with the opportunities and various constraints in their everyday lives, it remains unclear in which respects middle class families that stay in the city differ from middle class families that suburbanize. The goal of this study is to understand how various groups within the middle classes are affected differently by the transition to parenthood and how this translates into different residential practices. The main question addressed in this study is:

How do residential practices of urban middle classes change when they have children and how are their residential practices informed by their habitus?

In addressing this two-folded question, this dissertation mainly draws on two main strains of literature: demographic studies on the life course and residential mobility, and on literature on the urban orientation of new middle classes exemplified by gentrification. In bringing these literatures into dialogue with each other, this study makes use of concepts derived from the work of Bourdieu: habitus, field, capital and practice. The households of this study are considered
to have their own historically embodied experiences, which are rooted in what is
called the habitus. It portrays the transition to parenthood as entering a new social
world with new rules, new positions and new stakes: the field of parenthood. The
practices of middle class households, so not just what they say but also what they
actually do, are seen as being produced by the interaction between their habitus
and the various fields (housing, work, consumption, social life, education etc.)
in which they are engaged. This book consists of five smaller studies, which
each cover various aspects of the relationship between parenthood, middle class
habitus and urban space. Chapter 2 of this book shows the patterns and the
trends of middle-class family settlement in Amsterdam. Chapters 3, 4, and 5 deal
respectively with the fields of employment, housing and education. The final
empirical chapter synthesises some of the insights from the previous chapters
and presents a model for predicting the likelihood of residential mobility. The
conclusion brings all findings together and puts them into perspective.

Data and Methods

In order to study how practices of urban middle classes change when they become
parents, this research has collected a sample of middle class households that
lived in the boroughs within the ring road of Amsterdam, which were expecting
their first child. These households filled out two questionnaires, one in 2008 and
another in 2010. Furthermore, of these respondents 28 couples also participated
in two in-depth interviews in the same years. These two waves of both quantitative
and qualitative data allowed for a comprehensive analysis of how the lives of
middle class parents change when they have children that takes into account
the complexities of the various practices and identities of middle class parents.
Furthermore, this dissertation also draws on various datasets from Statistics
Netherlands (Social Statistical Database and Survey Labour Force) and from the
Department for Research and Statistics of the municipality of Amsterdam (Census
data and data from the Survey ‘Living in Amsterdam’).

Patterns and Trends of Middle-class Family Settlement in Amsterdam

Chapter 2 demonstrates that in the past two decades the number and share of
family households in the municipality of Amsterdam has increased considerably.
Although the majority of family households prefer the suburban parts of the
city and other communities in the region, centrally located neighborhoods have
shown the strongest increase. Based on data from the Living in Amsterdam
survey (WIA, 2007), this chapter has provided evidence that the increase in family
household in the city is to a substantial extent caused by higher educated families
with above modal incomes. This remarkable rise of middle class families in
Amsterdam is taking place in most central neighborhoods, but some areas stand
out in this respect: Watergraafsmeer and Oud Zuid, both traditional (upper-) middle class areas, have witnessed the most significant growth of middle-class family settlement. Also the newly developed areas of Osdorp de Aker, IJburg (both peripheral) and Oostelijk Havengebied (relatively central) have attracted large numbers of middle class families.

This chapter has linked this changing geography of middle class family households with two interrelated processes: 1) a general reorientation of middle-class groups to the city, gentrification; and 2) the role of place in balancing work, family, leisure and social obligations in the everyday lives of middle-class families.

In Amsterdam changes in employment and a rise in higher education have created a larger group of middle-class people who have been living in the city for a considerable part of their lives. It is argued that these people have accumulated experiences in the city and could be claimed to have built up an urban habitus. They have established social networks, may have various work experiences, and may derive parts of their identity from living in the city. They have accumulated a feel for the city, both metaphorically and practically. Consequently, there are more people with an urban lifestyle when they come to the stage of having children.

This chapter suggests that various middle-class fractions can be identified with a different habitus, who prefer different residential environments, depending on the amount and forms of capital they command, as well as how their residential location offers positions in the fields of employment, housing, consumption and education. We suggest that, in addition to these fields, the neighbourhood should also be analyzed for what advantages it might give in terms of time-budget and qualities of space.

Residential Environment and the Field of Employment
Chapter 3 specifically looks into the relationship between division of paid work within family households and their residential location. Based on data from the large Survey Labour Force (EBB, 2005) and the Social Statistical Database (SSB, 2006), this study suggests that family households with various arrangements for the divisions of paid work have different residential locations. Although this study has not identified independent neighbourhood effects, it seems that within Amsterdam specific spatial clusters of family household types exist. Three main types could be identified: 1) non-western minority families who work with a traditional division of labour who are spatially concentrated in social-housing estates in the post-war boroughs; 2) one-and-a-half earner families who are particularly oriented to the most suburban parts of the city; and 3) symmetrical or female-breadwinner households, who concentrate in centrally-located middle-class or gentrification areas.

This chapter argues that the clustering of particular household types should be explained by the interaction the structure of the housing market and choices made in relation to the time-space organisation of everyday life. Although it is
appreciated that economic resources play an important part, it is argued that income itself is the outcome of gendered negotiations at the level of the household concerning division of labour.

**Middle-Class Households and the Field of Housing**

Chapter 4 addresses a second field that plays an important role for the residential practices of middle classes: housing. Often housing is analysed from a housing market perspective in which supply and demand are key. Based on interview data on middle class housing histories and their strategies and tactics for finding and getting access to housing, Chapter 4 shows that in order to explain access to housing, it is necessary to investigate housing practices and to include other forms of capital than merely financial, such as social networks, embodied taste, and knowledge of the legal and institutional context.

Middle class households are often not only endowed with relatively much financial capital, but they also command other forms of capital that may help explaining their position in the field of housing. This chapter shows that various fractions of the middle class with various orientations of capital are both successful in getting access to housing but that they play different games and use other forms of capital to obtain their goals. In highly regulated housing fields, it seems that social capital and particular forms of cultural capital are sometimes more important than economic capital. But also in so called free market segments of the housing market, other forms of capital than merely financial play an important role.

It is argued that housing is not just consumption of a good, but that specific middle-class habituses are associated with specific strategies and tactics culminating in various housing pathways. Middle-class groups with a more economic habitus may follow housing pathways that are more focused on the free market sector. Other middle-class households with a less strong focus on the accumulation of economic capital may follow their housing pathway in the social sector, thereby making use of their social and cultural forms of capital.

**Middle-Class Families and the Field of Education**

Chapter 5 is a study about the relationship between residential environment, primary school choice and middle class habitus. Based on in-depth interviews it argues that when urban middle class parents start orientating for primary schools for their children ethnic diversity becomes a major concern.

This chapter demonstrates that although nearly all parents indicate to prefer a mixed school for their children, the more concrete the issue of schooling gets, the more other aspects of school choice such as type of education and also practical issues such as proximity seem to be eclipsed by issues of school quality, which are often associated with the social class and ethnic/racial composition of the school population. School choice in Amsterdam is a practice that lays bare the
half-hearted attitude middle-classes have towards diversity; most of the middle-
class parents in this study like the diversity of the city and also give voice to an
aversion to homogeneity that they associate with suburbs. The majority of the
respondents resent the parents that opt for a white elite school and so 'retreat'
from Amsterdam reality. Simultaneously, they see this diversity as a threat to the
intergenerational transfer of their own class position through good education. All
families expressed that they wanted an environment that would enable their child
to thrive academically and socially. Yet, the degree to which they experienced to
have to make compromises and were willing to make those compromises differed.
This study has identified five types of socio-spatial strategies for dealing with
the issue of school choice: 1) move out of diverse Amsterdam into homogeneous
suburbs; 2) move into relatively homogeneous areas with homogeneous schools
with a good reputation within the city; 3) stay in a diverse neighbourhood, but
commute for a good and homogeneous school; 4) stay in a diverse area and
develop strategies for ‘mixing’ (read: ‘whitening’) the local school population; and
5) stay in a diverse area and accept the (best) local school.

This study argues that these various strategies are associated with various
orientations of capital and thus with different middle class habituses. Although no
comprehensive analysis is made on the relationship between habitus and socio-
spatial strategies, this chapter suggest that middle class families that prioritise
economic capital tend to leave the city or if possible send their children to a ‘white’
school elsewhere in the city. Households that attach more value to an urban life
style and have significant amounts of economic capital may move into the stable
middle class areas of the city, where they likely have access to the right schools.
Parents that command relatively little economic capital but emphasise cultural
capital and the accumulation of specific symbolic capital ‘doing what is morally
right’ tend to choose ‘black’ neighbourhood schools.

Residential mobility of middle classes in the field of parenthood

The final empirical chapter (Chapter 6) combines the insights of the various
chapters and from other literature into one comprehensive analysis of the
residential mobility of middle class households in the period in which they become
parents. Building on work on urban middle classes, inspired by the theoretical
concepts of Bourdieu, this paper analyses through multi-level analysis how various
orientations of capital influence the decision whether to stay in the city or move out
to suburban areas. Drawing on the self-collected survey data a model is presented
that tests what factors can explain who moves out of central Amsterdam in the
period 2008-2010 and who stays. A second model is run to test moving intentions
for the households that initially stayed in the central city in the period 2010-2012.

In the period of study about half of all households had changed their
residential location. Considering the difficult housing market because of the
global financial crisis, the residential mobility of these households is remarkably
high. Of all urban middle class households 24% moved out of the central parts of Amsterdam in the period 2008-2010; while 18% moved within the central parts of Amsterdam. Of those households that initially stayed another 21% intends to move out in the period 2010-2012.

Controlling for a range of individual and neighbourhood variables, this chapter shows that couples with high economic capital and relatively low cultural capital have a higher propensity to move out of the central city, while couples with high cultural capital and low economic capital have a smaller chance to suburbanize. Furthermore, this paper shows that the degree of social and economic connectedness through social networks and work in the city also play an important role in the propensity to move out. This paper demonstrates that apart from a range of ‘classical’ residential mobility variables, such as dwelling size, tenure, and job location, also orientation of capital differentiates the practices of middle classes when they enter the field of parenthood.

Conclusions

Although for all households becoming a family marks the beginning of a new life, this dissertation has shown that urban middle class households respond differently to the transition to parenthood. These different reactions to this transition are related to the various positions of these households in the fields of employment, housing, consumption, education as well as their social networks, their residential histories and identities. This study has shown that all these aspects are interconnected, and that they are all linked to the set of historically embodied experiences that are rooted in the habitus.

An important aspect of the habitus which can explain part of the differences between residential practices of middle class families is the amount and orientation of their capital. This study has shown that capital orientation provides different opportunities and imposes various constraints on middle classes, resulting in a differentiation of residential practices.

In spite of the evident effect of orientation of capital, two other important aspects of the habitus have been identified.

A first aspect of the habitus, which is also related to capital, is gender. Although most households in this study have a relatively equal division of paid and unpaid work, entering the field of parenthood often evoked or accentuated specific gender roles. The differences in residential practices between middle classes are directly related to gendered ideas about paid work and division of tasks between partners. Households with an symmetrical division of labour tend to be relatively urban in their residential location. This study suggests this may be facilitated by a specific urban opportunity structure, such as access to jobs and amenities.

In the second place it is clear that personal childhood experiences affect
middle class parents’ perceptions of space and ideas about good parenting. Furthermore, the relationship with Amsterdam or urban environments more generally is related to the duration and intensity of people’s experiences with and in the city. The longer people have lived in the city, the more tacit and explicit knowledge one possesses about that place. Moreover, a long stay in the city also increases the chance that one has built up meaningful social networks there. These spatial aspects of the habitus are interrelated with orientations of capital and also with gender, but they represent an autonomous dimension too.

Future Research

By conceptualising parenthood as the interaction of practices and fields this dissertation has proposed to see the transition to parenthood as entering a new field: the field of parenthood. Although this study has explained how positions in the field of housing, education, consumption and employment change in the field of parenthood and how they are related to residential practices, the field of parenthood stretches much further than what this study has covered. As households proceed further in the field of parenthood many new aspects of the relationship between parenting and the environment will come to the fore.

The most apparent question that is raised by this study is: is the presence of middle-class families a temporary or a more permanent phenomenon; and related, how do middle-class parents deal with their residential environment when their children grow older?

Future research should include further longitudinal studies of how the position in the fields of employment, education, consumption and housing changes when middle-class family households advance in the field of parenthood. Long-term longitudinal studies would enable a further understanding of why, when and how urban middle classes change their residential practices when they become parents.
Samenvatting

Inleiding

Dit proefschrift gaat over de veranderingen in het leven van leden van de middenklasse in Amsterdam wanneer ze voor de eerste keer ouders worden. Het gaat over hoe deze overgang hun arbeidsleven, hun consumptiepatronen, en hun sociale leven beïnvloedt. Het gaat over in hoeverre hun identiteiten als ouders en als stedelingen kunnen conflicteren en samenvallen. Het gaat ook over hoe de manier waarop het huishouden als een economische en sociale eenheid is georganiseerd en hoe de relatie tussen partners verandert als ze van een koppel een gezin worden.

Bovenal gaat dit onderzoek over de beslissing waar te wonen, en meer specifiek over de vraag of om te blijven of te vertrekken uit de stad.

In het algemeen lijkt voor de meeste leden van de middenklasse de stad niet de meest aantrekkelijke omgeving om hun kinderen in op te laten groeien. De (gepercepieerde) nadelen van stedelijk wonen en een gebrek aan geschikte en betaalbare eengezinswoningen aan de ene kant, en het beeld van ruimte, rust en groen in de voorsteden aan de andere kant, zorgen ervoor dat veel ouders besluiten om de stad te verlaten en in te ruilen voor de suburbs. Velen geloven zelfs dat suburbanisatie van gezinnen een natuurlijk proces is en dat elke poging om families te behouden voor de stad gedoemd is te mislukken. Hoewel het klopt dat suburbanisatie van gezinnen al tientallen jaren de dominantie trend is, heeft een aanzienlijk aantal middenklassegezinnen altijd in de stad gewoond en sommige studies laten zien dat dit aantal stijgt.

Deze stijging sluit aan bij bredere trends van gentrification en de toename van tweeverdieners. Ondanks dat verschillende studies hebben aangetoond dat het leven in de stad voor sommige middenklassegezinnen een onderdeel is van hun identiteit en een manier is om de verschillende aspecten van hun leven zo goed mogelijk te kunnen combineren, blijft het onduidelijk in welke opzichten stedelijke middenklassegezinnen verschillen van de middenklassegezinnen die suburbaniseren. Het doel van deze studie is om te begrijpen hoe verschillende groepen binnen de middenklasse op andere manieren worden beïnvloed door de overgang naar het ouderschap en hoe dit zich vertaalt in verschillende woonpraktijken. De belangrijkste vraag die in deze studie is:

Hoe veranderen woonpraktijken van de stedelijke middenklasse wanneer ze kinderen krijgen en hoe worden deze woonpraktijken bepaalt door hun habitus?

Bij de beantwoording van deze tweetelde vraag baseert dit proefschrift zich hoofdzakelijk op twee typen literatuur: demografische studies over de levensloop en residentiële mobiliteit en literatuur over de stedelijke oriëntatie van de nieuwe

Data en methoden
Om te onderzoeken hoe praktijken van de stedelijke middenklasse veranderen wanneer ze ouder worden, heeft dit onderzoek een steekproef genomen van middenklassehuishoudens die hun eerste kind verwachten die binnen de ringweg van Amsterdam woonden. Deze huishoudens hebben twee vragenlijsten ingevuld, één in 2008 en een tweede in 2010. Verder hebben 28 koppels van deze groep respondenten ook deelgenomen aan twee diepe-interviews in dezelfde jaren. Deze zowel kwantitatieve als kwalitatieve gegevens maken een analyse mogelijk van de manier waarop het leven van de middenklasse ouders verandert als ze kinderen krijgen, die rekening houdt met de complexiteit van de verschillende praktijken en identiteiten van de middenklasse ouders. Verder wordt in dit proefschrift maakt ook gebruik van verschillende datasets van Het Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (Sociaal Statistisch Bestand en de Enquete Beroepsbevolking) en van de afdeling Onderzoek en Statistiek van de gemeente Amsterdam (Gemeentelijke Basisadministratie-data en gegevens van de Wonen in Amsterdam enquête).
ste stijging zich juist voor in de centrale delen van de stad. Op basis van gegevens uit het onderzoek Wonen in Amsterdam (WIA, 2007), laat dit hoofdstuk zien dat de toename van gezinshuishoudens in de stad is in belangrijke mate veroorzaakt wordt door hoger opgeleide gezinnen met een bovenmodaal inkomen. Deze opmerkelijke opkomst van middenklassegezinnen in Amsterdam vindt vooral plaats in de meeste centrale wijken, maar sommige gebieden springen er uit: Watergraafsmeer en Oud Zuid, beide traditionele (hogere) middenklassewijken, hebben de meest significante groei van middenklassen laten zien. Ook de nieuw ontwikkelde gebieden van Osdorp de Aker en Ilburg (beide relatief perifere) en Oostelijk Havengebied (relatief centraal) hebben grote aantallen middenklassegezinnen aan zich gebonden.

In dit hoofdstuk wordt deze veranderende geografie van middenklassegezins-huishoudens in verband gebracht met twee onderling samenhangende processen: 1) een algemene heroriëntatie van middenklassegroepen naar de stad en gentrificatie, en 2) de rol die locatie speelt in het combineren van werk, gezin, vrije tijd en sociale verplichtingen in het dagelijks leven van de middenklassegezinnen.

In Amsterdam hebben veranderingen in de werkgelegenheid en een stijging in het hoger onderwijs ertoe geleid dat er een steeds grotere middenklasse in de stad woont voor een aanzienlijk deel van hun leven. Dit hoofdstuk suggereert dat deze mensen voor een lange periode ervaringen in de stad opdoen, waarmee zij een stedelijke habitus opbouwen. Ze hebben sociale netwerken in de stad, ze hebben verschillende werkervaringen in de stad, en ze ontlenen een deel van hun identiteit aan het leven in de stad. Ze hebben een gevoel voor de stad opgebouwd, zowel figuurlijk als praktisch. Dientengevolge zijn er meer mensen die al een zekere stedelijke lifestyle hebben, op het moment dat ze de volgende fase in hun leven bereiken: het krijgen van kinderen.

Dit hoofdstuk stelt dat er binnen de middenklasse verschillende fracties kunnen worden onderscheiden op basis van hun habitus, die de voorkeur geven verschillende woonmilieus. Die voorkeuren zijn afhankelijk van de hoeveelheid en de vormen van kapitaal waarover zij beschikken, en afhankelijk van hoe hun woonlocatie hun letterlijke en figuurlijk positioneert in de velden van werk, wonen, consumptie en onderwijs. Bovendien stelt dit hoofdstuk dat woonlocatie ook moet worden geanalyseerd op welke voordelen het zou kunnen geven in termen van tijd en de kwaliteit van de ruimte.

Woonomgeving en het veld van werk
ruimtelijke clusters van gezinstypes bestaan. De drie belangrijkste typen zijn: 1) niet-westers allochtonen gezinnen met een traditionele verdeling van betaalde arbeid, die ruimtelijk geconcentreerd zijn in de sociale-huurwoningen in de naoorlogse wijken, 2) anderhalf-verdienersgezinnen die zijn vooral georiënteerd lijken op de meest suburbane delen van de stad, en 3) symmetrische en vrouwelijke-kostwinner huishoudens, die oververtegenwoordigd zijn in de centraal gelegen middenklasse- of gentrification-gebieden.

Dit hoofdstuk stelt dat de clustering van bepaalde soorten gezinnen moet worden verklaard vanuit de interactie tussen de structuur van de woningmarkt en kruises die met betrekking tot de organisatie van het dagelijks leven in tijdruimtelijke zin. Hoewel het duidelijk moge zijn dat economische middelen een belangrijke rol spelen, wordt hier betoogd dat inkomen zelf het resultaat is van sterk gendered onderhandelingen met betrekking tot verdeling van arbeid binnen het huishouden.

Middenklassehuishoudens en het veld van wonen

Hoofdstuk 4 richt zich op een tweede veld dat een belangrijke rol speelt voor de residentiënêle praktijken van de middenklasse: huisvesting. Vaak wordt huisvesting geanalyseerd vanuit een perspectief op de woningmarkt waarin vraag en aanbod centraal staan. Dit hoofdstuk gaat, op basis van interviewgegevens, meer in op de woongeschiedenis van leden van de middenklasse en hun strategieën en tactieken voor het vinden en het krijgen van toegang tot huisvesting. Hoofdstuk 4 laat zien dat om te kunnen verklaren wie er toegang heeft tot weke woningen het noodzakelijk is om te onderzoeken wat mensen doen, dat wil zeggen hun woonpraktijken te onderzoeken, daarbij rekening houdend met andere vormen van kapitaal dan alleen zijn financiële, zoals sociale netwerken, smaak, en kennis van de juridische en institutionele context.

Middenklassegezinnen zijn vaak niet alleen behept met relatief veel financieel kapitaal, maar beschikken ook over andere vormen van kapitaal die hun positie in het veld van het wonen kunnen helpen verklaren. Dit hoofdstuk laat zien dat verschillende fracties van de middenklasse met verschillende oriëntaties van kapitaal succesvol kunnen zijn in het verkrijgen van toegang tot huisvesting, maar dat ze verschillende strategieën toepassen en gebruik maken van andere vormen van kapitaal om hun doelen te verkrijgen. In sterk gereguleerde woningvelden, lijkt het erop dat sociaal kapitaal en bepaalde vormen van cultureel kapitaal soms belangrijker zijn dan het economisch kapitaal. Maar ook in de zogenaamde ‘vrije markt’ spelen andere vormen van kapitaal dan alleen financiële een belangrijke rol.

Dit hoofdstuk betoogt dat wonen niet alleen de consumptie van een goed is, maar dat een specifieke middenklasse-habitus is geassocieerd met specifieke strategieën en tactieken die uitmonden in verschillende wooncarrières. Middenklassegroepen met een meer economische habitus lijken wooncarrières te volgen die meer gericht zijn op de vrije markt sector. Andere middenklassehuishoudens met een minder sterke focus op de accumulatie van economisch kapitaal
lijken hun wooncarrières ook af te stemmen op de sociale huursector, daarbij gebruikmakend van hun sociale en culturele vormen van kapitaal.

**Middenklassegezinnen in het veld van onderwijs**

Hoofdstuk 5 is een studie over de relatie tussen de woonomgeving, (basis)schoolkeuze en middenklasse-habitus. Op basis van diepe-interviews stelt dit hoofdstuk dat bij stedelijke middenklasse-ouders die zich gaan oriënteren op lagere scholen voor hun kinderen de etnische diversiteit van de stad een groter punt van zorg wordt.

Dit hoofdstuk toont aan dat zaken als nabijheid, schooltype en sfeer van belang zijn bij schoolkeuze. Verder geven bijna alle ouders aan de voorkeur te geven aan een gemengde school voor hun kinderen. Desalniettemin geldt dat hoe concreter de kwestie van schoolkeuze wordt, hoe belangrijker de kwaliteit van de school wordt gevonden. Andere aspecten van schoolkeuze worden dan overschaduwd door de schoolkwaliteit, die vaak wordt geassocieerd met de sociale klasse en etnische/raciale samenstelling van de leerlingen. Schoolkeuze in Amsterdam onthult de ambivalenties van middenklasse-ouders ten aanzien van etnische diversiteit: het grootste deel van de middenklasse-ouders in dit onderzoek houden van de diversiteit van de stad en hebben een bepaalde afkeer van de homogeniteit die zij associëren met de voorsteden. De meerderheid van de respondenten heeft moeite met ouders die kiezen voor een blanke elite school en zich zo ‘terugtrekken’ uit de Amsterdamse werkelijkheid. Tegelijkertijd zien ze deze diversiteit als een bedreiging voor de intergenerationele overdracht van hun eigen klassepositie door middel van goed onderwijs. Alle gezinnen geven aan dat zij een schoolomgeving zoeken waarin hun kind academisch en sociaal gedijt. Echter, de mate waarin zij ervaren compromissen te moeten sluiten en bereid zijn om deze compromissen te sluiten verschilt.

Deze studie heeft vijf verschillende sociaal-ruimtelijke strategieën voor het omgaan met het probleem van de schoolkeuze geïdentificeerd: 1) vertrekken uit Amsterdam naar homogene suburbane omgevingen in de regio, 2) verhuizen naar relatief homogene gebieden met homogene scholen met een goede reputatie binnen de stad, 3) blijven wonen in een diverse buurt, maar pendelen naar een goede en homogene school; 4), blijven in een diverse buurt om daar de buurtschool te mengen (lees: verwitten) en 5) blijven in een diverse wijk en de (minst slechte) lokale school accepteren.

Dit hoofdstuk laat zien dat deze verschillende strategieën verbonden zijn met verschillende oriëntaties van kapitaal en dus met een verschillende habitus. Ofschoon er geen uitgebreide analyse is gemaakt over de relatie tussen habitus en sociaal-ruimtelijke strategieën, lijkt deze studie aan te tonen dat middenklassegezinnen met relatief veel economisch kapitaal de neiging hebben om de stad te verlaten of indien mogelijk, hun kinderen naar een ‘witte’ scholen elders in de stad te sturen. Huishoudens die meer waarde hechten aan een stedelijke levensstijl en
over grote hoeveelheden economisch kapitaal beschikken hebben de mogelijkheid om naar de stabiele middenklassewijken van de stad te verhuizen, waar ze toegang hebben tot de juiste scholen. Ouders die relatief weinig economisch kapitaal hebben, maar de nadruk leggen op cultureel kapitaal en de accumulatie van specifieke vormen van symbolisch kapitaal (‘moreel juist handelen’) hebben de neiging om ‘zwarte’ buurtscholen te kiezen.

Residentiële mobiliteit van de middenklasse op het gebied van het ouderschap
Het laatste empirische hoofdstuk (hoofdstuk 6) combineert de inzichten van de verschillende hoofdstukken en van overige literatuur in een uitgebreide analyse van het verhuisgedrag van middenklassehuishoudens in de periode waarin zij ouders worden. Voortbouwend op andere studies over de stedelijke middenklasse die geënt zijn op de theoretische concepten van Bourdieu, analyseert dit hoofdstuk door middel van multi-level analyse hoe de verschillende kapitaaloriëntaties de beslissing beïnvloeden om te blijven in de stad of naar buiten te verhuizen. Op basis van eigen data wordt een model gepresenteerd dat test welke factoren kunnen verklaren wie er in de periode 2008-2010 naar buiten de centrale wijken van Amsterdam is verhuisd. Een tweede model schat voor de periode 2010-2012 de kans om naar buiten te verhuizen voor de huishoudens die in eerste instantie in de centrale stad waren blijven wonen.

In onderzoeksperiode is ongeveer de helft van alle huishoudens verhuisd. Gezien de moeilijke woningmarkt als gevolg van de wereldwijde financiële crisis, is de residentiële mobiliteit van deze huishoudens opvallend hoog. Van alle stedelijke middenklassehuishoudens is in de periode 2008-2010 24% weg verhuisd vanuit de centrale delen van Amsterdam, terwijl 18% binnen de centrale delen van Amsterdam is verhuisd. Van de huishoudens die in eerste instantie waren gebleven is in de periode 2010-2012 nog eens 21% van plan weg uit centraal Amsterdam te verhuizen.

Controlerend voor een reeks van individuele en omgevingsvariabelen laat dit hoofdstuk zien dat koppels met relatief veel economische kapitaal en relatief weinig cultureel kapitaal een hogere neiging om uit te gaan van de centrale stad hebben, terwijl koppels met een veel cultureel kapitaal en weinig economisch kapitaal een kleiner kans hebben om te suburbaniseren. Bovendien toont deze analyse aan dat de mate van sociale en economische verbondenheid via sociale netwerken en het werken in de stad ook een belangrijke rol speelt voor de kans op verhuizen. Deze studie laat dus zien dat, afgezien van een aantal ‘klassieke’ verhuisvariabelen, zoals woninggrootte, eigendomsituatie, en de locatie van het werk, ook de oriëntatie van het kapitaal van invloed is op de differentiatie van woonpraktijken van de middenklasse op het moment dat zij kinderen krijgen.
**Conclusies**

Hoewel voor alle huishoudens het worden van een gezin het begin van een nieuw leven markeert, heeft dit proefschrift aangetoond dat de stedelijke middenklassehuishoudens verschillend reageren op de overgang naar het ouderschap. Deze verscheidenheid aan reacties zijn direct verbonden met de verschillende posities van deze huishoudens op het gebied van werk, wonen, consumptie, onderwijs, en hun sociale netwerk, hun woongeschiedenis en hun identiteit. Deze studie heeft aangetoond dat al deze aspecten met elkaar zijn verbonden en dat ze zijn allemaal voortkomen uit historisch belichaamde ervaringen die geworteld zijn in de habitus.

Een belangrijk aspect van de habitus, dat een deel van de verschillen tussen woonpraktijken van de middenklassegezinnen kan verklaren, is de hoeveelheid en de oriëntatie van hun kapitaal. Deze studie heeft aangetoond dat oriëntatie van kapitaal samenhangt met verschillende mogelijkheden en verschillende beperkingen, resulterend in een differentiatie van woonpraktijken van verschillende middenklassegroepen. Ondanks de duidelijke invloed van de oriëntatie van het kapitaal, zijn nog twee andere belangrijke aspecten van de habitus geïdentificeerd.

Een eerste aspect van de habitus, dat ook samenhangt met kapitaal, is gender. Hoewel de meeste huishoudens in dit onderzoek een relatief gelijke verdeling van betaald en onbetaald werk hebben, leidt het betreden van het veld van ouderschap vaak tot specifieke rollenpatronen. De verschillen in woonpraktijken tussen de middenklasse zijn direct gerelateerd aan seksegebonden ideeën over betaald werk en de taakverdeling tussen de partners. Huishoudens met een symmetrische verdeling van arbeid hebben de neiging om relatief stedelijk te zijn in hun woonlocatie. Deze studie suggereert dat symmetrische taakverdeling wordt vergemakkelijkt door een specifiek stedelijk voorzieningenniveau, zoals de aanwezigheid van veel en specifieke banen.

In de tweede plaats is het duidelijk dat de ervaringen uit de kindertijd de perceptie van ruimte en ideeën over goed ouderschap van middenklasse-ouders hebben beïnvloed. Vervolgens is de relatie met Amsterdam of stedelijke omgevingen in het algemeen verbonden met de duur en intensiteit van de ervaringen met en in de stad. Hoe langer mensen in de stad leefden, des te meer stilzwijgende en expliciete kennis men bezit over die plek. Bovendien verhoogt een lang verblijf in de stad ook de kans dat men betekenisvolle sociale netwerken daar heeft opgebouwd. Ondanks dat deze ruimtelijke aspecten van de habitus in verband staan met zowel de oriëntatie van kapitaal als met gender, vertegenwoordigen ze ook een autonome dimensie.

**Agenda voor toekomstig onderzoek**

Door ouderschap te zien als de interactie van praktijk, habitus en veld heeft dit proefschrift de overgang naar het ouderschap geconceptualiseerd als het betreden van een nieuw veld: het veld van ouderschap. Deze studie heeft laten zien hoe de posi-
ties op het gebied van wonen, onderwijs, consumptie en werk veranderen in het veld van ouderschap en hoe deze verbonden zijn met woonpraktijken. Het gebied van het ouderschap strekt zich echter verder dan wat dit onderzoek heeft aangehoord. Als gezinnen verder het veld van ouderschap betreden komen allerlei nieuwe aspecten van de relatie tussen ouderschap en de ruimtelijke omgeving aan het licht.

De belangrijkste vraag die dit onderzoek niet heeft kunnen beantwoorden is: is de aanwezigheid van middenklassegezinnen een tijdelijk of een meer permanent fenomeen, en daarmee samenhangend, hoe gaan middenklasse-ouders om met hun woonomgeving wanneer hun kinderen ouder worden?

Toekomstig onderzoek zou zich moeten richten op de vraag hoe de positie in het veld van werk, onderwijs, consumptie en wonen verandert als middenklassegezinshuishoudens zich dieper begeven in het veld van ouderschap. Lange-termijn longitudinale studies zouden ons in staat moeten stellen om beter te begrijpen waarom, wanneer en hoe leden van de stedelijke middenklasse hun woonpraktijken veranderen als ze ouders worden.