



W05 – Poverty Neighbourhoods

Social mix and social interaction: do residents living in different housing tenures mix?

Kathy Arthurson

karthurson@swin.edu.au



www.enhr2007rotterdam.nl

WORK IN PROGRESS - PLEASE DO NOT QUOTE WITHOUT THE AUTHOR'S PERMISSION

Paper presented to the ENHR Conference on Sustainable Urban Areas, 25-28 June 2007, Rotterdam

Social mix and social interaction: do residents living in different housing tenures mix?

Dr Kathy Arthurson – Senior Research Fellow, Institute for Social
Research, Swinburne University of Technology, Melbourne, Australia

karthurson@swin.edu.au

Abstract

The focus of this paper is the question of whether policy makers over estimate the benefits of social mix policies in estate regeneration projects. It is commonly anticipated that breaking down concentrations of disadvantaged residents and creating more socially mixed communities in estate regeneration enables heightened aspirations through providing access to middle income role models. However, recent international research suggests owners and renters lead disparate lifestyles and rarely meet, in order to achieve the anticipated benefits of social mix. While internationally this remains a contentious issue, Australian research is scant despite support for social mix policies in regeneration of social housing estates. Following a review of the international literature, the paper reports on the findings of a survey conducted across three neighbourhoods in Adelaide, South Australia. The areas were originally constructed as social housing estates during the post Second World War period. Until recently these neighbourhoods were characterised by high concentrations of social housing. Estate regeneration activities implemented by the State Housing Authority in partnership with other organisations have attracted home owners into the neighbourhoods with a key aim to create a more balanced 'social mix'. Within this context social mix refers to the idea of creating neighbourhoods with a blend of residents from across a diverse range of income levels and housing tenures types. The data provides further support for the contention that lifestyles differ - renters' social and family activities are more likely to take place in their homes and local neighbourhood than the world beyond, compared with owners that are more likely to spend most of their time outside of the local neighbourhood.

1. Introduction

Concerns about rising crime rates, high levels of unemployment and the anti-social behaviour of youth gangs within impoverished areas of cities has prompted renewed interest by governments in Australia and elsewhere in 'social mix policies'. These policies deconcentrate the poorest members of communities and create neighbourhoods with a blend of residents with different housing tenures and income

levels. Often in Australia these neighbourhoods comprise social housing estates built mainly on the fringe areas of cities after the post second world war period. Contemporary neighbourhood regeneration projects targeted at social housing estates usually incorporate goals to achieve a more balanced social mix. Generally the changes are achieved through demolition and replacement of obsolete social housing with private housing to attract higher income home buyers into the areas. In some Australian states regeneration also involves permanent relocation of social housing tenants to social housing in other neighbourhoods (Arthurson, 2002).

Sarkissian (1976) and more recently Arthurson (2007) detail that historically a continuing theme of the ideals set for social mix is about the necessity for propinquity between poor and better off residents. The underlying rationale is that propinquity enables the poor to become good citizens through the instrument of middle class leadership. Contemporary proponents of social mix policies claim that the benefits for disadvantaged residents of living amongst homeowners and working residents include access to broader formal and informal networks, including social networks that link disadvantaged residents to job opportunities and role models to become good citizens (Atkinson & Kintrea 2000; Arthurson 2002). Clearly, these goals are predicated on social interaction occurring between residents across different income levels and housing tenures. Yet the international literature suggests that these are aspirational goals, rather than being achievable in practice. Specifically, contemporary research studies of social interactions within neighbourhoods from the US, UK, Europe and Australia highlight the differing lifestyles of owners and renters questioning whether the anticipated interaction is likely to occur through changes made to social mix on large scale housing estates.

2. The research evidence for mixing - does cross tenure mixing occur?

In a US case study of Lake Parc, a mixed income housing development, Rosenbaum et al (1998) found that little interaction occurred between different income groups. When interaction occurred it generally, involved less demanding forms of social interaction (less than 10 minutes). On this basis it was concluded that there was probably not enough interaction between different income groups for social learning to occur. Likewise, Brophy et al (1997) utilising seven case studies of mixed income housing developments found little evidence of interaction between different income groups. In effect, lower and higher income groups lived in the same neighbourhoods but did not mix. Briggs (1997) studied tenants that stayed in traditional public housing neighbourhoods compared to those that moved to scattered sites where public housing was inter-dispersed amongst home owners. He concluded that although the new neighbourhoods were safer there was little evidence of interaction between the low income movers and their new neighbours – some movers maintained ties with previous neighbourhoods, attending church or socialising there. Schwartz et al (2001) in comparing mixed income developments in New York, Chicago, the Bronx, Massachusetts and California also found little evidence that social mix impacted through social interaction and social networks. In another study Smith (2002) argues that there is little evidence that tenants in mixed income developments interact in ways that may lead to potential social benefits. The interaction that does occur seems to be between residents across only a modest range of incomes. Where larger income differences exist the probability of interaction appears more remote. Popkin, Harris and Cuningham (2002) undertook a qualitative study of 'Moving To Opportunity' (MTO) sites, in five US cities. The MTO projects relocate low income households from 'distressed' neighbourhoods of concentrated poverty to areas with wider socioeconomic mix and a

wider range of housing tenures. They found that few movers formed deep relationships in their new neighbourhood and while most had strong networks these existed outside of the new neighbourhood. Goetz (2002) in a study involving interviews with 600 households involuntarily and voluntarily displaced from public housing neighbourhoods also found that dispersed families lacked integration in the new neighbourhoods. Galster (2007: 35) argues that policy makers have given little thought to how advantaged and disadvantaged groups will interact within socially engineered mixed income neighbourhoods. He suggests that at the moment support for social mix policies is based "more on faith than fact"

In studies of three Scottish social housing estates where owner occupation was introduced, Atkinson and Kintrea (2000) found that renters had fewer contacts beyond the estate than owners, although few were absolutely isolated. Owners were less part of the local community as they spent more time away from the estates, used local services less often, and their employment placed them in different social networks. In this study there were only small income difference between owners and renters suggesting that with bigger gaps in income even less mixing would occur. Hiscock (2001) in a large postal survey (almost 3,000 responses) in Glasgow and the Clyde Valley also found little interaction occurred between homeowners and renters. Beekman, Lyons and Scott (2001) examined social networks between owners and renters in ten case study areas where tenure diversification had taken place. They found a direct relationship between the level of spatial integration and contact between tenants and home owners. Generally, owners and renters did not mind living near each other but resistance increased exponentially as the proximity between tenures increased. In part tensions seemed caused by different values and lifestyles.

English studies of socially mixed areas have found similar results to the US and Scottish research. In a study of ten mixed tenure estates, involving interviews with over 1,000 residents, Jupp (1999) found that the figures were higher for knowing residents in different tenures in social rental dominated estates than for owner occupied ones. They were lowest on estates dominated by one tenure. Sixty nine per cent of tenants said they could rely on another resident for help or advice but only seventeen per cent said that this included people from another tenure. Only four per cent of residents in mixed tenures thought they could rely on someone in a different tenure for assistance that might improve their socioeconomic circumstances, help them find a job, deal with problems at work or get advice about money or assistance in filling in forms. The findings suggest that the street is a more meaningful social scale of analysis than the estate. As the private and social housing was generally located on different streets little mixing was facilitated between the different tenure groups and people with different social backgrounds.

Dutch studies, as reviewed by Kleinhans (2004) also find little interaction between home owners and renters. For instance, Van Beckhoven and Van Kempen (2003) in a study of two pre-war industrial estates, in Amsterdam and Utrecht that had undergone changes in social mix, found that the majority of old and new residents undertook activities outside of the areas, including shopping, recreation and visits to friends and relatives

To date there is a dearth of Australian studies that investigate these issues of cross tenure mixing, which form part of the rationale for implementing social mix policies. One recent case study of a Newcastle suburb (NSW) found that both social housing tenants and home owners, felt that tenure separated and distinguished the local geographical community (Ruming et al 2004). The authors concluded that in relation to social mix,

public tenants are not readily accepted into communities dominated by private owners and that there is little mixing between residents across different housing tenures.

In summary, the literature suggests that where social interaction does take place in socially mixed neighbourhoods it is usually between residents with similar socio-economic characteristics, where owner and rental housing is spatially integrated or owners have connections or roots in the local area. As noted there is a deficit of research on this topic in the Australian context although social mix policies are commonly employed in estate regeneration activities with the underlying rationale that mixing or role modeling will occur. With this deficit in mind the current study explored the question of whether social interaction occurs - specifically whether homeowners and public tenants have similar patterns of daily living that make interaction more likely. In exploring this question particular aspects of interest are where residents are employed, where the services they use are located, how much time they spend inside or outside of the suburb, where their leisure activities are located and majority of friends and families live.

3. The research design

Data collection for the research commenced in mid 2005 with a survey of 800 households randomly sampled from postcode addresses across three suburbs; Mitchell Park, Hillcrest and Northfield, (the latter two are contiguous suburbs) all located within the metropolitan region of Adelaide, South Australia. These neighbourhoods previously had high concentrations of public housing and have been extensively revitalised over the past fifteen years. Changes have been made to the social mix of the areas through demolition and sales of public housing, urban infill and building of new housing to attract homeowners/buyers into the neighbourhoods. Prior to regeneration all three suburbs were similar in terms of key area characteristics including high levels of socio-economic disadvantage and concentrations of social housing. As shown in Table 1, Mitchell Park originally had a concentration of 75 per cent public housing that has been reduced over a period of fourteen years to 30 per cent. Similarly Northfield and Hillcrest have experienced significant reductions to the concentrations of public housing.

Table 1: Summary of key neighbourhood characteristics

Area Characteristics	Mitchell Park	Hillcrest/Northfield
Location	10 kms south of city centre	8.5 km north east of city centre
History	Build to service manufacturing industry – Chrysler (now Mitsubishi) late 1950s	Building commenced in early 1950s
Type of housing	Mainly semi-detached double units – large blocks	Mainly timber framed construction imported from Europe in prefab form
Regeneration	Commenced in 1986	Commenced in late 1990
Public Housing Concentration before (%)	75	60
Public Housing Concentration after (%)	35	20

Of the eight hundred households sampled across the three neighbourhoods, three hundred and twenty five surveys were completed and returned. In considering the question of whether residents across different housing tenures were likely to come into contact with each other, the survey was designed to elicit a range of information about residents' lifestyle activities both inside and outside of the neighbourhoods. As shown in Table 2 the range of questions included *time spent in the suburb*, *location of employment* and other *services accessed* and where the *majority of friends and family lived*.

Table 2: Focus of the paper

<i>Patterns of daily life</i>	
Section	Outcomes examined
Activities and services inside and outside of the suburb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time Spent in suburb • Motor vehicle ownership • Use of public transport • Shopping • Appointments • Recreation and leisure activities
Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paid work • Volunteer work
Social networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where friends/family live • How often visit friends/family • Friendships within the suburb

Table 3 provides a breakdown of survey respondents' housing tenure. Of the 325 surveys filled out, there were 13 people that did not respond to this question. As shown, in total 67 per cent of respondents owned their home or were paying a mortgage, (36.3+30.8 respectively), 1.6 per cent paid board, 15.4 per cent were paying rent to the housing trust, and 9.2 per cent to private landlords. Compared with Census (2001) data for the suburbs, the sample was representative of the overall demographics of the study areas.

Table 3: Housing Tenure of Survey Respondents

Tenure	N	Percent
Social Housing	50	15.4
Private Rental	30	9.2
Home owner	118	36.3
Home Pay buyer	100	30.8

Boarding	5	1.5
Other	9	2.8
Total	312	96.0
Did not answer	13	4.0
Total	325	100

4. Activities and Services in the Suburb

4.1 Time Spent in the neighbourhood

Survey respondents were asked about how much time in an average week, excluding sleep, they spend at home or within the suburb. We used the word *suburb* rather than *neighbourhood* as conceptually it draws a more precise and familiar boundary, which both service providers and residents relate to and are familiar with. Alternatively, the use of neighbourhood in this context, especially given the contiguous nature of Hillcrest and Northfield was likely to become confusing and could represent a lesser or greater area than the suburb, which has a geographical boundary. Table 4 provides a breakdown of responses by housing tenure, suggesting that compared to other residents public housing tenants spend “almost all the week in the suburb”. For example, 40 per cent of public housing tenants said that they spend most or all of their time in the suburb compared to 6.7 per cent of private renters and 23 per cent of home owners and 19 per cent of home buyers. Further reflecting this trend, only a low number, 8 per cent, of public tenants said they do not spend much of the week in the suburb compared with 23.3 per cent of private renters, 10.3 per cent of home owners and 16 per cent of home buyers. These findings concur with other studies that find higher rates of outward movements for homebuyers/owners than public housing tenants in mixed tenure areas (Atkinson & Kintrea 2002), suggesting that public tenants’ lifestyles are more tied to the local area than for residents in other housing tenures.

Table 4: Time Spent in Neighbourhood by Housing Tenure (%)

Housing Tenure	Time (%)					Total %
	Almost all the week	Much of the week	About half of the week	Not much of the week	Very little of the week	
Public Housing	40.	30.	18.	8	4	100
Private Rental	6.7	26.7	30	23.3	13.33	100
Home Owners	23	39.3	24.8	10.3	2.6	100
Home Buyers	19.	30.	34.	16.	1.	100
Board	20.	40.	20.	20.0	0	100
Other	22.2	22.2	44.4	11.1	0.	100

4.2 Motor vehicle ownership

It was thought that in part the lower levels of movement out of the neighbourhood by public housing tenants could reflect lower levels of vehicle ownership amongst this population group. Other studies suggest that accessing local services is more important for public housing tenants given their generally limited financial resources and lower levels of car ownership than the wider population (Johnson et al 2002; Atkinson & Kintrea 2000). In Australia some regions of concentrated public housing have double the national average of households without a motor vehicle (ABS 2002). The current study also identified this trend as shown in Table 5, illustrating a typical finding that public tenants have lower levels of car ownership than residents in other housing tenures. For instance, 36.17 per cent of public tenant households in the three case study areas have no private motor vehicle compared to 3.5 per cent of private rental tenants, 5.4 per cent of home owners and 1. per cent of home buyers.

Table 5: Motor Vehicle Ownership by Housing Tenure

Tenure	No's of vehicles %						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	7
Public Housing	36.17	48.9	12.7	2.1	0	0	0
Private Rental	3.5	66.	20.6	6.9	3.5	0	0
Home Owners	5.4	54.	31.2	5.3	1.8	0.9	0.9
Home Buyers	1.0	39.3	44.4	12.1	1.0	2.0	0
Board	0	40.0	20.0	40.0	0	0	0

4.3 Public transport usage

The pattern of lower mobility out of the suburbs by public housing tenants could be related to a number of factors. As a further investigation, Table 6 examines the data for the question of how often residents across different housing tenures use public transport.

Table 6: Use of Public Transport (bus, train, tram) by Housing Tenure

	No of Times					Total
	Daily	Weekly	Fortnightly	Once in a while	Never	
Public Housing	11.90 (5)	30.95 (13)	7.14 (3)	26.19 (11)	23.81 (10)	(42)
Private Rental	17.86 (5)	0.00 (0)	3.57 (1)	46.43 (13)	32.14 (9)	(28)
Home	9.68	15.05	5.38	41.94	27.96	

Owner	(9)	(14)	(5)	(39)	(26)	(93)
Home buyer	3.53 (3)	8.24 (7)	0.00 (0)	47.06 (40)	41.18 (35)	(85)
Board	20.00 (1)	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	60.00 (3)	20.00 (1)	(5)
Other	28.57 (2)	0.00 (0)	14.29 (1)	28.57 (2)	28.57 (2)	(7)
Total	9.62	13.08	3.85	41.54	31.92	
Percent	(25)	(0)	(10)	(108)	(83)	(260)

The findings show that for respondents accessing public transport, there are some differences in comparative usage by public housing, home ownership and homebuyer tenures. While 11.9 per cent of public tenants use public transport daily, 9.68 per cent of homeowners and 3.53 per cent of home buyers also access it daily. Conversely, boarders (20 per cent) and other categories (28.57 per cent) are higher daily users of public transport.

4.4 Shopping (inside and outside of the suburb)

Respondents were asked a series of questions about their activities outside of their suburb during the past week. Nearly seventy per cent (38+31.9) of respondents that left their suburb to undertake shopping were homeowners or paying a mortgage, whilst 23.8% (14.8+9.9) of respondents were renting (private or housing trust) (Table 7).

Table 7: Housing tenure by shopping outside of the suburb over the past week

Housing Tenure						Total
Pay rent to the Housing Trust	Pay rent to a private landlord	Own you own home / joint owner	Pay a mortgage / buying	Pay board	Other	
39	26	100	84	5	9	263
14.8%	9.9%	38.0%	31.9%	1.9%	3.4%	100.0%

As shown in Table 8, of those private rental tenants and homeowners/buyers that shopped outside of the neighbourhood over the past week they did so more often than public housing tenants. Forty four point seven per cent of public tenants shopped only once outside the neighbourhood over the last week compared to 15.3 per cent of private rental tenants and 32.2 per cent of home owners and 27.3 per cent of home buyers.

Table 8: Housing tenure by number of times shopped outside of the suburb over the past week

Tenure	Nos of time								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	10	
Public Housing	44.7	23.6	23.6	0	7.8	0	0	0	

Private Rental	15.3	50	26.9	7.6	0	0	0	0	
Home Owners	32.2	39.5	18.7	6.2	1	1	0	1	
Home Buyers	27.3	30.9	28.5	5.9	4.7	1.1	1.1	0	
Board	40	40	20	0	0	0	0	0	
Other	33.3	44.4	22.2	0	0	0	0	0	
Total									

While 69.2% (39.6+29.6) of respondents that went shopping within their suburb in the week prior to filling in the survey were homeowners or paying a mortgage, a smaller percentage, 27.2% (18.3+8.9) of people renting (housing trust and private) shopped within the suburb (Table 9).

Table 9: Housing tenure by shopping inside of the suburb over the past week

Housing Tenure						Total
Pay rent to the Housing Trust	Pay rent to a private landlord	Own you own home / joint owner	Pay a mortgage / buying	Pay board	Other	
31	15	67	50	1	5	169
18.3%	8.9%	39.6%	29.6%	.6%	3.0%	100.0%

In exploring the analysis further, while lower percentages of public housing tenants shopped inside the suburb over the past seven days, those that did so shopped more often than residents in other tenures (Table 10). This could be related to the lower levels of car ownership amongst this tenure perhaps necessitating visits to the shops more often to buy small numbers of items that could be carried home.

Table 10: Housing tenure by number of times shopped inside the suburb over the past week

Tenure	Nos of time					
	1	2	3	4	5	7
Public Housing	46.6	23.3	10	10	10	0
Private Rental	33.3	33.3	26.6	6.6	0	0
Home Owners	36.3	31.8	25.7	4.55	1.52	0
Home Buyers	32	44.	14.	4	4	2
Board	100	0	0	0	0	0
Other	60	40	0	0	0	0

4.5 Appointments

We also looked at the data relating to attending an appointment (eg. medical, haircut including accompanying someone else) outside of the suburb. The results show a similar trend of greater outward movement of home owners and home buyers than public housing tenants. For instance, 68.7% (40.1+28.6) of respondents that left their suburb for an appointment in the week prior to filling in the survey were homeowners or paying a mortgage, whilst 24.4% (12.2+12.2) of respondents were renting (private or housing trust) (Table 11).

Table 11: Housing tenure by attending appointments outside of the suburb over the past week

Housing tenure						
Pay rent to the Housing Trust	Pay rent to a private landlord	Own you own home / joint owner	Pay a mortgage / buying	Pay board	Other	
18	18	59	42	3	7	147
12.2%	12.2%	40.1%	28.6%	2.0%	4.8%	100.0%

4.6 Recreation sport and leisure

77% (38.5+38.5) of respondents that left their suburb for recreation, sport or leisure in the week prior to filling in the survey were homeowners or paying a mortgage, whilst 21% (7.7+13.3) of respondents were renting (private or housing trust).

Table 12: Housing tenure by recreation and sport outside of the suburb over the past week

Housing Tenure						Total
Pay rent to the Housing Trust	Pay rent to a private landlord	Own you own home / joint owner	Pay a mortgage / buying	Pay board	Other	
11	19	55	55	2	1	143
7.7%	13.3%	38.5%	38.5%	1.4%	.7%	100.0%

5. Employment

5.1 Employment – paid and volunteer work

The survey also explored employment status across tenure as others have suggested that residents in employment spent more time outside of the neighbourhood (Pawson & Bramley 2000). The current study asked residents if they had left the suburb to undertake paid work over the past week and also how many times they had done this.

Table 13: Housing tenure by paid work outside of the suburb over the past week

Housing Tenure						Total
Pay rent to the Housing Trust	Pay rent to a private landlord	Own you own home / joint owner	Pay a mortgage / buying	Pay board	Other	
8	14	41	74	2	5	144
5.6%	9.7%	28.5%	51.4%	1.4%	3.5%	100.0%

Table 13 above shows that 79.9% (28.5+51.4) of respondents that left their suburb for paid work in the week prior to filling in the survey were homeowners or paying a mortgage, whilst only 5.6% of housing trust residents left their suburb for paid work. Table 14 below suggests that those residents that work outside of the suburb leave the suburb for a similar numbers of times over the week with most leaving five times, supporting the Pawson et al contention that residents in employment leave the suburb often.

Table 14: Activities Outside – Number of Times Left the Suburb for Paid Work over Last Seven days

Tenure	Nos of times %						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Public Housing	0	12.5	12.5	0	62.5	0	12.5
Private Rental	0	0	0	7.1	71.4	14.2	7.1
Home Owners	2.5	12.5	12.5	7.5	57.5	5.0	2.5
Home Buyers	33.3	20.	30.	60.0	57.7	60.	0
Board	0	0	0	0	100.	0	0
Other	20.	40.	20	0	20.	0	0

Table 15: Housing tenure by paid work inside of the suburb over the past week

Housing Tenure					Total
Pay rent to the Housing Trust	Pay rent to a private landlord	Own you own home / joint owner	Pay a mortgage / buying	Other	
1	3	7	8	2	21
4.8%	14.3%	33.3%	38.1%	9.5%	100.0%

The results of the question about paid work inside the suburb shows that 71.4% (33.3+38.1) of respondents that remained in their suburb for paid work in the week prior to filling in the survey were homeowners or paying a mortgage, whilst 19.1% (4.8+14.3) of people renting (housing trust and private) remained in their suburb for paid work. It was also thought important to look at volunteer work activities. As shown in Table 16, the findings are similar to those for paid employment. Sixty two point five per cent (46.4+16.1) of respondents that left their suburb for volunteer work in the week prior to

filling in the survey were homeowners or paying a mortgage, whilst 21.4%% of housing trust residents left their suburb for volunteer work.

Table 16: Housing tenure by volunteer work outside of the suburb over the past week

	Housing tenure						Total
	Pay rent to the Housing Trust	Pay rent to a private landlord	Own you own home / joint owner	Pay a mortgage / buying	Pay board	Other	
Count	12	6	26	9	1	2	56
%	21.4%	10.7%	46.4%	16.1%	1.8%	3.6%	100.0%

52.6% of respondents that remained in their suburb for volunteer work in the week prior to filling in the survey were homeowners, whilst 57.4% (42.1+5.3) of people renting (housing trust and private) remained in their suburb for volunteer work.

Table 17: Housing tenure by volunteer work inside of the suburb over the past week

	Housing tenure			Total
	Pay rent to the Housing Trust	Pay rent to a private landlord	Own you own home / joint owner	
Count	8	1	10	19
%	42.1%	5.3%	52.6%	100.0%

6. Social networks in the suburbs

Table 18 shows the results of responses to the question of, “not including the people living in your house where do most of the people you have a close relationship with live”. The findings suggest that the public housing tenants have more close friends/relatives living inside the neighbourhood than residents in other tenures.

Table 18: Housing tenure by where people with close relationship live

Tenure	Mostly inside suburb	Mostly outside suburb	Equal nos inside/ outside of suburb	Total
Housing Trust	16.33% (8)	63.27% (31)	20.41% (10)	49
Private landlord	3.33%	86.67%	10.00%	

	(1)	(26)	(3)	30
Homeowner	7.63% (9)	72.88% (86)	19.49% (23)	118
Homebuyer	3.03% (3)	83.84% (83)	13.13% (13)	99
Boarder	20.00% (1)	80.00% (4)	0.00% (0)	5
Other	0.00% (0)	77.78% (7)	22.22% (2)	9
Total	22	237	51	310

In further support of this trend Table 19 shows that a higher percentage of home owners and home buyers 70% (36.2+33.8) than renters 25.4% (private or housing trust-14.1+11.3). Visited family and friends outside of the neighbourhood over the week prior to filling out the survey.

Table 19: Housing tenure by visit family and friends outside the suburb over the past week

Housing Tenure						Total
Pay rent to the Housing Trust	Pay rent to a private landlord	Own you own home / joint owner	Pay a mortgage / buying	Pay board	Other	
30	24	77	72	3	7	213
14.1%	11.3%	36.2%	33.8%	1.4%	3.3%	100.0%

Table 20: Housing tenure by visit family/ friends inside suburb over past seven days

Housing Tenure						Total
Pay rent to the Housing Trust	Pay rent to a private landlord	Own you own home / joint owner	Pay a mortgage / buying	Pay board	Other	
12	5	29	21	1	4	72
16.7%	6.9%	40.3%	29.2%	1.4%	5.6%	100.0%

69.5% (40.3+29.2) of respondents that remained in their suburb to visit friends or family in the week prior to filling in the survey were homeowners or paying a mortgage, whilst 23.6% (16.7+6.9) of people renting (housing trust and private) remained in their suburb to visit friends or family.

Table 21 illustrates that higher percentages of public housing tenants (38.29) strongly agree or agreed with the statement that they have lots of friends in the neighbourhood

than homeowners (25.66) and homebuyers (22.35) suggesting that the formers' social networks and ties are more focused within the local suburb.

Table 21: Agree with statement that I have lots of friends in this neighbourhood

Tenure	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	Strongly disagree	
Count	7	11	9	14	6	47
Housing Trust	14.89%	23.40%	19.15%	29.79%	12.77%	
Count	0	4	8	10	8	30
Private Rental	0.00%	13.33%	26.67%	33.33%	26.67%	
Count	6	23	35	37	12	113
Homeowner	5.31%	20.35%	30.97%	32.74%	10.62%	
Count	4	17	21	37	15	94
Homebuyer	4.26%	18.09%	22.34%	39.36%	15.96%	
Count	1	0	2	1	1	5
Boarder	20.00%	0.00%	40.00%	20.00%	20.00%	
Count	0	0	3	6	0	9
Other	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	
Count	18	55	78	105	42	298

Conclusion

There appears support from the findings that policy makers do over estimate the benefits of social mix policies in estate regeneration projects, at least in relation to the goal of enabling heightened aspirations, through providing access for disadvantaged residents to broader social networks and middle income role models. The current research supports the findings of recent international research that suggests owners and renters lead disparate lifestyles and rarely meet, in order to achieve these anticipated benefits of social mix. Indeed, there appears to be different levels of attachment at different spatial scales. Homeowners and homebuyers are more likely to spend most of their time outside of the local suburb than compared to public housing tenants whose social and family activities more often take place in their homes and local suburb than the world beyond. In concluding, in relation to the question of is there mixing across tenures, there does not appear to be much mixing in these socially mixed areas, which are well established. It appears that residents live in the same suburbs, even along side of each other, but with little contact.

References

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2002) *General Social Survey*, Cat. No. 4159.0.55.006, Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Arthurson, K. (2002) "Creating Inclusive Communities through Balancing Social Mix: A Critical Relationship or Tenuous Link?" *Urban Policy and Research*, 20(3).

- Arthurson, K. (in press, 2007) Australian Public Housing and the Diverse Histories of Social Mix', *Journal of Urban History*.
- Atkinson, R & Kintrea, K. (2000) Owner Occupation, Social Mix and Neighbourhood Impacts, *Policy and Politics*, 28, pp. 93-108.
- Atkinson, R. & Kintrea, K. (2002) Area Effects: What Do They Mean for British Housing and Regeneration Policy? *European Journal of Housing Policy*, 2(2), pp. 147-166.
- Beekman, T., Lyons, F. & Scott, J (2001) Improving the Understanding of the Influence of owner occupiers in Mixed Tenure Neighbourhoods, Edinburgh, ODS Ltd for Scottish Homes.
- Briggs, Xavier de Souza (1997b) Yonkers Revisited: The Early Impacts of Scattered-Site Public Housing on Families and Neighbourhoods, Unpublished Report to the Ford Foundation.
- Brophy, P. & Smith, R. (1997) Mixed Income Housing Factors for Success, *CityScape* 3, 2, pp.3-32.
- Galster, G. (2007) Neighbourhood Social Mix as a Goal of Housing Policy: A Theoretical Analysis, *European Journal of Housing Policy*, 7(1), pp. 19-43.
- Goetz, E. (2002) Forced Relocation vs. Voluntary Mobility: the Effects of Dispersal Programs on Households, *Housing Studies* 17(1),: pp.107-23.
- Hiscock, R. (2001) Are Mixed Tenure Estates Likely to Enhance the Social Capital of their Resident's?, paper presented to the HAS conference, Cardiff, 3-4 September
- Johnson, M.P., Ladd, H.F. & Ludwig, J. (2002) The Benefits and Costs of Residential Mobility Programmes for the Poor, *Housing Studies* 17, 1, pp125-38.
- Jupp (1999) Jupp, B. (1999) *Living Together: Community Life on Mixed Housing Estates*, Demos, London.
- Kleinhans, R. (2004) Social Implications of Housing Diversification in Urban Renewal: A Review of Recent Literature, *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 19(4), 367–390.
- Pawson, H. and Bramley, G. (2000) Understanding recent trends in residential mobility in council housing in England. *Urban Studies* 37 (8) pp1231-1259*
- Rosenbaum, J, Stroh, L & Flynn, C. (1998) Lark Parc Place: A Study of Mixed-Income Housing, *Housing Policy Debate*, Vol. 9 Issue 4, pp. 703-72?
- Ruming, K., Mee, K. and McGuirk, P.(2004) "Questioning the Rhetoric of Social Mix: Courteous Community or Hidden Hostility?", *Australian Geographical Studies*, 42, 234-237.
- Popkin, S, Harris, J. & Cunningham, M. (2002) Families in Transition: A Qualitative Analysis of the MTO Experience, Final Report. Prepared for the US Department of Housing and Urban Development under a subcontract with Abt Associates Inc. Washington, DC; US Department of Housing and Urban Development
- Sarkissian, W. (1976) "The Idea of Social Mix in Town Planning: An Historical Overview", *Urban Studies* 13(3), 231-246.
- Schwartz, A. & Tajbakhsh, K. (1997) Mixed Income Housing: Unanswered Questions, *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development & Research*, vol3, no. 2 – US dept of Housing & Urban Development, Office of Policy & Development pp.71-92

Smith, J. (1999) Cleaning Up Public Housing by sweeping Out the Poor, HABITAT INTL. Vol. 23, no 1, pp.49-62, pp.49-62.

Van Beckhoven, E. & Van Kempen, R. (2003) Social effects of Urban Retsructuring: A case Study in Amsterdam and Utrecht, the Netherlands, *Housing Studies*, 18(6), pp. 853-875.