

Understanding the Neighbourhood Concept and Its Evolution: A Review

Environment and Urbanization ASIA

1–10

© 2019 National Institute
of Urban Affairs (NIUA)

Reprints and permissions:

in.sagepub.com/journals-permissions-india

DOI: 10.1177/0975425319859115

journals.sagepub.com/home/eua**Gideon Baffoe¹**

Abstract

Though the concept of neighbourhood continues to remain relevant both in scholarship and in policy circles, it remains fluid and contested, as there is no agreed definition on what exactly it is. It has variously been defined as a place, a community and a policy unit. This article, which is based on the review of relevant literature, reviews how it has evolved both as an academic concept and research unit and how it has been construed by scholars, in addition to understanding its relevance in policy and research circles. By synthesizing literature in these critical areas, the review provides a condensed knowledge, which help to shape our current theoretical understanding on the neighbourhood perspective.

Keywords

Neighbourhood, concept, review, evolution

Introduction

The complexities of cities, particularly in developing countries, make the understanding of the internal structure of urban centres challenging. Rapid urbanization with concomitant socioeconomic and environmental cost (e.g., poverty, climate change and informality) continues to take a negative toll on many cities, making most urban development policies either counter-productive or non-starter, in the process. Policies aimed at improving the general wellbeing of urban areas are likely to be effective, especially in developing countries, when tailored to the realities on the ground. Neighbourhood as a spatial unit undoubtedly offers the best lens to understand the anatomy of cities at a micro level.

The neighbourhood concept is widely recognized both in policy and research circles. In policy, neighbourhoods serve as ideal social laboratories for testing and implementing social policies of various kinds. For instance, governments are known to decentralize critical functions to the local level in the wake of finding solutions to pressing societal problems (Elwood & Leitner, 2003; Meegan & Mitchell, 2001). In the domain of research, they are often seen as the best places for understanding the political

¹ School of Social and Political Science, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK.

Corresponding author:

Gideon Baffoe, School of Social and Political Science, University of Glasgow, Rm 710 Adam Smith Building, 40 Bute Gardens, G12 8RS, Glasgow, United Kingdom.

E-mail: Gideon.Baffoe@Glasgow.ac.uk

economy of human life. Social scientists are particularly interested in this spatial unit because it offers an appropriate spatial unit to study social inequalities. Neighbourhoods, in the urban context, are regarded units of solidarity and social cohesion (Golab, 1982). They are areas where urban life revolves, hence, critical in shaping the future of cities. Such spatial units are often distinct from one another by the immediate socioeconomic or physical characteristics (Rohe, 2009).

Although the concept continues to gain traction, it remains fluid and contested, given that it is influenced by array of factors, such as type of role, lifestyles and other contextual and, sometimes, latent issues. In this respect, it is argued that for research purposes, definition has to reflect the issue being addressed (Forrest, 2009), underscoring the importance of context. This becomes more imperative especially in an attempt to develop a framework to guide a course of action (The Young Foundation, 2010). Given its fluidity with no specific and definable attributes, neighbourhoods can function as meaningful scholarly and social categories when they are regarded as the flexible, contingent, social and political products that they are (Martin, 2003). In essence, the contested nature of the concept does not in any way limit its potency in research and policy framings.

Neighbourhood research has focused on an array of topics, including physical, for example, income, housing; socioeconomic; and relational issues, for example, social networks, norms and behaviours (Holland, Burgess, Grogan-Kaylor, & Delva, 2010). Scholars have studied issues ranging from, for instance, redevelopment (Chitrakar, Baker & Guaralda, 2016; Wang & Shaw, 2018), residential segregation and neighbourhood effects (van Kempen & Wissink, 2014), informal enclaves (Agyei-Mensah & Owusu, 2009; Baffoe & Mutisya, 2015) to social capital (Liu, Wu, & Li, 2017; Miao, Wu, & Sun, 2018) in various urban contexts. This work is not intended to antagonize the current definitional discourse, but rather carefully review how the concept has evolved as an academic concept and research unit, how it has been constructed by scholars, in addition to understanding its relevance in policy and research circles. By synthesizing literature on these critical areas, this review provides a condensed knowledge, which adds to our current theoretical understanding on the neighbourhood perspective. Given the intricate nature of global south cities, it is expected that this review will offer a critical reflection for the neighbourhood research in developing countries. The work is based on the review of relevant literature, including articles, books and book chapters.

Early Ideas of Neighbourhood

The concept of neighbourhood has evolved over time. Different disciplines tend to offer different perspectives on how the concept has emerged. Its emergence in planning is believed to have originated from Ebenezer Howard's vision of the 'Garden City' in the nineteenth century. The Garden City was advanced as a vehicle to tackle slum emergence and associated problems in the industrial world, particularly in London (Hall, 2002). Howard conceptualized the reorganization of city structure based on radiating concentric rings of avenues, housing, and businesses, revolving around a civic centre. In this concept, small-scale individual businesses were prioritized over large-scale factories, with the underlying motive that the small-scale enterprises would enhance the development of interpersonal relationships while building social cohesion among workers and residents. Howard's Garden City vision was limited in scales top, around 30,000 people living on 1,000 acres of land, surrounded by green belts of rural land uses (Anderson, 2017). It is widely recognized that Howard's underlying motive of developing a more socially equitable society through planning processes never materialized. However, the concept is thought to have played an important role in influencing planned communities across Europe and in the United States (Anderson, 2017). The neighbourhood term, originally coined by sociologist and planner,

Clarence Perry, emerged from Howard's concept. Perry strongly called for the criticality of design in shaping the neighbourhood identity in planned communities (Perry, 1929).

In the field of anthropology, the concept is associated with the work of Chicago School of Sociology in the 1920s and 1930s (Konings, van Dijk, & Foeken, 2006, p. 1). The underlying approach that governed the work of school is referred to as 'ecological' (Hunter, 1974, p. 5), a term credited to Robert Park, who applied concepts of dominance, symbiosis and succession from plant ecology to urban living environments. Park believed and likened the fundamental structuring of urban areas to competition for space (Hannerz, 1980, p. 27). Hannerz encapsulated this approach as resembling a natural selection, by which 'the strongest inhabitants of the urban environment would occupy the most advantageous locations, and others would adjust to their demands' (Hannerz, 1980, p. 57). However, Hannerz is of the view that Chicago School's idea of formulating general theoretical models of urban transformation on the basis of their ethnographic studies in Chicago (spatial order assumed to be ubiquitous) was a premature generalization, which turned to be the major weakness of the school (Burawoy, 2000, p. 14). The suggestion here is that neighbourhoods cannot be the same everywhere. This is because such spatial units are influenced by a number of factors, which play a major role in shaping perceptions and ideas on what constitute a neighbourhood. In essence, context has to be prioritized in an attempt to objectively define a neighbourhood.

Neighbourhood also emerged strongly as a research unit. The genesis of scholarship can be traced back to the industrial era of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This period was characterized by active empirical research on the effects of urban residence on various forms of social life and peoples' relationships with their communities (Durkheim, 1964; Simmel, 1971; Tönnies, 1955). The Chicago School is widely credited for pioneering this line of research with its ethnographic studies, which sought to provide neighbourhood typologies and the cycles of land-use transformations change that precipitated temporal transitions of neighbourhoods (Park, Burgess & McKenzie, 1967). Hunter points out three main scholarship streams during the time; '(1) typologies, (2) stages of change, and (3) functions which include economic, administrative, political and social functions' (1979, p. 267). Although the typological approach, derived from the Chicago School, identifies the core demographic (e.g., ethnicity, age and sex) physical (e.g., housing stock) and environmental characteristics that together form a neighbourhood type, the stages approach (also associated with the Chicago School) deals with the neighbourhood development from the perspective of economic growth and human mobility within urban areas. The functional stream, on the other hand, studies neighbourhoods through the functions they perform, including various administrative, economic and social functions (Hunter, 1979). In respect of the latter, Castells (1977) points out that urban neighbourhoods have a primary function as a locus of social production and reproduction of labour, with government taking the responsibility of providing critical services (e.g., recreational centres, parks, hospitals and clinics and schools) to enhance the liveability of urban areas.

Defining Neighbourhood

Attempts by scholars to define and understand the complexity of neighbourhood as a spatial unit have yielded several boundary typologies by which it can be viewed. Physical landmarks and critical resources (e.g., river and park), the spatial extent of social interactions and/or analysis of residents' cognitive imagination of their immediate environment (Coulton, Korbin, & Su, 1996; Downs & Stea, 1973) have all been described as critical in defining the boundary of a neighbourhood. The various boundary typologies are discussed below.

Neighbourhood as a Place

It is widely recognized that neighbourhoods are where people reside and spend much of their time. For people living in urban areas, it is argued that neighbourhoods are places that determine their quality of life and economic standing (Logan & Molotch, 1987). Agnew (1987, 1989) defines place as locale (site of daily life), location (a site with connections and relations to broader social, political and economic processes at varying levels) and a sense of belonging (affective feelings). According to Escobar (2001), places are created through two processes: political economy and humanistic sense of a place. Although political economy shapes places through local and global economic processes of capital investment, sense of place reflects the sentiments people feel about a place, derived principally through experiences, personal attachments and social relations. Places are shaped by social interactions (Gotham, 2003) that allow residents to build attachment and social identity. Importantly, people build their sense of place and in turn determines how such places fit into their social identity (Stedman, 2002).

The critical role of a place in shaping life has been demonstrated empirically, as a report by the UK Department of Health stresses the impact of a neighbourhood (as a place) on health and general well-being. The report highlights that in a neighbourhood where people know and trust one another, and where they have opinion on community affairs, residents always find support in coping with daily life stresses and shocks (Morrow, 1999, p. 745 as cited in Forrest, 2009). Places of this nature clearly exhibit neighbourhood resilience, given their strong social capital. It is likely that social cohesion was also a key attribute in the neighbourhoods where the Chicago School conducted their research. According to Martin (2003), the neighbourhoods studied by the Chicago School were places where people lived and worked as well as worshipped, echoing possible local attachment and social bonds. A neighbourhood as a place may be based on the dominant housing age and type, employment, race, health or transport systems of an area (Hopkins, 2016). The housing typology is more dominant in many countries, for example, public housing estates in Glasgow city, gated communities in Rwanda and Ghana and condominiums in Tokyo. Also, most gated communities and condominiums are private.

Neighbourhood as a Community

The distinction between a neighbourhood and a community remains unclear, as the two are often presented as synonymous. However, Aitken (2000, p. 74) is of the opinion that the fundamental difference lies within their boundaries. Although communities have clearly defined borders and boundaries, neighbourhoods do not, as most neighbourhoods are subjective in nature. Community invokes strong unity, including shared beliefs and concerns, which may not be present in a neighbourhood as a place (Chaskin, 1997), underscoring its centrality to the work of social scientists and policy makers, particularly in deprived areas, where people are often presented as either having strong sense of community or lacking it, due to degraded social capital (Forrest, 2009). Geographically demarcated neighbourhoods as communities remain the most prevalent in urban and community studies (Forrest & Kearns, 2001; Raco & Flint, 2001). This can be explained by the fact that communities are easily identified, due to the recognized delineated borders, which make data collection and accessibility relatively easier. Given that neighbourhoods are lower units, and subjectively created in most cases, data generation remains ad hoc, unlike in communities, where the boundaries can serve as a guide for sampling purposes. Neighbourhood as a community is more formal in nature, and especially preferred for urban governance and management system. The officially recognized boundaries allow for effective decentralized administration at the lowest level. For instance, China and Rwanda have similar

administrative divisions, comprising of provincial, districts, sectors, cells and villages. The villages are the lowest administrative units. Elsewhere in Scotland, neighbourhood administration is done at the city level. The situation is similar in Ghana, where decisions at the community (widely used term instead of neighbourhood) level are taken at the district level (lowest unit of administration). Essentially, a neighbourhood (as a place) can be reclassified as a community when they are given official definitions based on physical or administrative boundaries, for example, census areas and tracts (Holland et al., 2010).

Neighbourhood as a Policy Unit

The urgency to understand and address local-level problems in planning initiatives necessitates the incorporation of neighbourhood peculiarities in decision-making processes. Neo-liberal forms of governance, which stress inclusiveness and delegated government functions (Elwood & Leitner 2003), have contributed to reinforcing participatory local-level policy and decision making (Martin, 2003). At the neighbourhood level, policy makers and planners solicit resident's inputs on matters concerning their general welfare (Meegan & Mitchell, 2001; Raco & Flint, 2001). However, influencing neighbourhoods through policy becomes difficult when hidden political agendas crush local interests. Martin (2003) argues that a neighbourhood (based on common interests) can emerge through activism as a counter-group to fight government imposition. Such a neighbourhood clearly is shaped by residents' sentiments and events (Meegan & Mitchell, 2001, p. 2174). Robinson's (2001) work illustrates this scenario. The study explored the reaction of people to a proposed road in Glasgow, which according to residents, would hinder access to a local recreational park, in addition to worsening an already-deteriorated economic context. Residents expressed 'fears of exclusion and segregation' about the proposed land-use change and the resistance resulted in a new, more rigid boundary for the neighbourhood (Robinson, 2001, p. 101).

The desire by governments and donor agencies to effectively redistribute limited resources across space also influences neighbourhoods creation. The actions usually result in cluster typologies (for resource distribution purposes). Such neighbourhoods tend to be subjective in nature, as they are characterized by special attributes (e.g., race, housing type and or economic activity). They are particularly evident in informal settlements in developing countries, where service provision usually lacks any defined pattern.

Neighbourhood Matters

The relevance of neighbourhoods in scholarship, policy and social relations is well established. Evidence has shown that social processes such as immigration, lifestyle, crime, unemployment and housing quality are best studied and understood at the neighbourhood level (Kawachi & Subramanian, 2007). Neighbourhoods create social identity and meaning (Forrest, 2009). Thus, they provide a useful lens and scale not only for studying, but also for understanding social dynamics of everyday life (Healey, 1998). Although critical in shaping cities' futures (Temkin & Rohe, 1996), neighbourhoods produce the necessary environments that encourage interaction among residents, which aid in building vital societal notions about community, in addition to understanding peoples' perception of their social environment (Swatt, Varano, Uchida, & Solomon 2012) and promoting public participation.

The relevance of neighbourhoods also becomes evident in population sampling for research purposes. Grouping observations into neighbourhoods help to avoid the problem of spatial autocorrelation in a sample. Thus, a well-defined neighbourhood has the potential in ensuring unbiased spatial units sampling (Getis, 2015), with higher degree of independence.

Healthy neighbourhoods (those that provide access to basic services while offering opportunities for residents to be active) also affects the broader urban society. Neighbourhoods are specially favoured for social policies because of their potential in serving as a laboratory to understand and solve social problems. In this respect, the creation of mixed neighbourhoods has been strongly advocated (Arthurson, 2012; Bolt & van Kempen, 2013). For instance, the likes of the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal in the UK, the Socially Integrative City programme in Germany and the policies for 'hometown making' (Furusato-Zukuri) in Japan (Wissink & Hazelzet, 2012), which seek to tackle social canker while fostering a sense of belonging and strengthening social interaction, have been promoted (van Kempen & Wissink, 2014).

Neighbourhoods play an important role in understanding the behavioural characteristics of people. People's actions and inactions are better appreciated when contextualized (Subramanian, Jones, & Duncan, 2003). Given that people spend much of their time and lives in the neighbourhood, the spatial unit plays a significant role in determining life outcomes, particularly social behaviour and economic success (Sedaghatnia, Ghahramanpouri, Hasanuddin, & Sapura, 2013). Neighbourhoods are places where people and organizations, including government agencies, give meaning to their sociocultural and economic realities (Thomas & Thomas, 1928).

The relevance of neighbourhoods in building social cohesion cannot be over emphasized. With the advent of information technology, including virtual mediums (including various social media platforms such as Facebook and Instagram) with their associated superficial human relations, social bonds among people have been eroding at an alarming rate (Forrest, 2009). The deteriorated social cohesion, particularly in urban settings has given an impetus to such spatial units while reinforcing its importance as a critical space for rebuilding and strengthening social relations. Putnam's works (1993a, 1993b) on social capital are well noted for influencing policy on the criticality of social networks in creating and revitalizing local communities at the neighbourhood level.

Furthermore, neighbourhoods are core units of planning and development strategies. Various urban services deemed critical for improving wellbeing are effectively tested and implemented at the neighbourhood level (Olowoporoku, Salami, & Akintifonbo, 2017). Redevelopment strategies, particularly regarding community participatory-driven affordable housing are best pioneered and implemented at the neighbourhood level.

Conclusion

This article aimed to review the evolution, definitional construct and the relevance of the concept of neighbourhood. In terms of origin and evolution, the concept is grounded in planning and anthropology. Although planners associate the origin of neighbourhood with Ebenezer Howard's concept of the 'Garden City', anthropologists trace the origin to the works of the Chicago School of Sociology in the 1920s and 1930s. The latter is widely credited for pioneering neighbourhood effects. It is revealed that the concept defies a singular definition, as different people perceive it differently. It has variously been defined as a place, a community and as a policy unit. Particularly as a policy unit, the review argues that neighbourhoods can also develop as a result of governments' and donor agencies' desire to distribute limited resources across spatial units. This is largely achieved by clustering, for instance, on the bases of

race, employment or housing structure. Such neighbourhoods, it is noted, turned to be characterized by subjective boundaries, as they are based on special characteristics, other than recognized physical or administrative borders and boundaries. In view of the contestations, the review further argues that definitions be it subjective or physical should be context driven, negotiated, consented and embraced by interested parties (e.g., residents, planners and development practitioners). This, it is believed, would improve social acceptability while ensuring objectivity.

In relation to relevance, the review reveals that neighbourhoods are widely recognized as the best geographical units for studying and understanding behavioural characteristics and social processes, such as immigration, crime and unemployment. In the area of research, they play a major role in avoiding the problem of spatial autocorrelation associated with the spatial sampling. More so, they are critical in building local-level social cohesion, in addition to serving as an ideal space for developing, experimenting and evaluating various planning and developmental initiatives.

A key observation is that most of the seminal theoretical and empirical contributions have come from scholars in the global north. Studies in developing countries tend to be applied in nature, with few contributions in spatial delineation of neighbourhood. Particularly, empirical analysis tends to follow somewhat different orientation, given that contexts are different. For instance, in the area of housing, while social and public housing, regeneration and redevelopment have dominated the global north scholarship landscape, slum upgrading, informality and affordable housing form the major topics in the global south literature. Many challenges, ranging from definitional struggles, data availability to methodological approaches in studying, particularly neighbourhood effects, plague research in the global south. In the context of Africa, for instance, a UN-Habitat report has stressed that inadequate data availability has created a vacuum, which has led to a limited understanding of neighbourhood perspective on the continent (UN-Habitat, 2010, p. 2 as cited in Arguello, Grant, Oteng-Ababio, & Ayele, 2013). These challenges coupled with inadequate research infrastructure and boundary fluidity make use of the neighbourhood as a unit to understand the internal structure of cities challenging. Consequently, however, most empirical studies adopt case study approach while remaining silent on boundaries. Given that every city has its unique characteristics, it might be a good strategy for studies aiming to make empirical contribution using neighbourhoods as unit of analysis.

Acknowledgement

Special thanks to Professor Ya Ping Wang and Professor Keith Kintrea of the University of Glasgow for their comments on the draft.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

Funding

This work was conducted as part of the GCRF Centre for Sustainable, Healthy and Learning Cities and Neighbourhoods (SHLC) activities. SHLC is funded via UK Research and Innovation as part of the UK Government's Global Challenges Research Fund.

References

- Agnew, J. A. (1987). *Place and politics*. Boston, MA: Allen and Unwin.
- . (1989). The devaluation of place in social science. In J. A. Agnew & J. S. Duncan (Eds.), *The power of place* (pp. 9–29). Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.

- Agyei-Mensah, S., & Owusu, G. (2009). Segregated by neighbourhoods? A portrait of ethnic diversity in the neighbourhoods of the Accra Metropolitan Area, Ghana. *Population, Space and Place*, 16(6), 499–516.
- Aitken, S. C. (2000). Mothers, communities and the scale of difference. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 1(1), 65–82.
- Anderson, M. B. (2017). Neighbourhood. In D. Richardson, N. Castree, M. F. Goodchild, A. Kobayashi, W. Liu, & R. A. Marston (Eds.), *The international encyclopaedia of geography*. Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- Arguello, J. E. M., Grant, R., Oteng-Ababio, M., & Ayele, B. M. (2013). Downgrading an overlooked reality in African cities: Reflections from an indigenous neighbourhood of Accra, Ghana. *Applied Geography*, 36, 23–30. doi:10.1016/j.apgeog.2012.04.012.
- Arthurson, K. (2012). *Social mix and the city: Challenging the mixed communities consensus in housing and urban planning policies*. Collingwood, VIC: CSIRO.
- Baffoe, G., & Mutisya, E. (2015). Social sustainability: A review of indicators and empirical application. *Environmental Management and Sustainable Development*, 4(2). doi:10.5296/emsd.4i2.83998399
- Bolt, G., & van Kempen, R. (2013). Mixing neighbourhoods: Success or failure? *Cities*, 35, 391–396.
- Burawoy, M. (2000). Introduction: Reaching for the global. In M. Burawoy, J. A. Blum, S. George, Z. Gille, T. Gowan, L. Haney, ... M. Thayer (Eds.), *Global ethnography: Forces, connections, and imaginations in a postmodern world* (pp. 1–40). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Castells, M. (1977). *The urban question: A Marxist approach*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Chaskin, R. T. (1997). Perspectives on neighbourhood and community: A review of the literature. *Social Service Review*, 71(4), 521–547.
- Chitrakar, R. M., Baker, D. C., & Guaralda, M. (2016). Urban growth and development of contemporary neighbourhood public space in Kathmandu Valley, Nepal. *Habitat International*, 53, 30–38. doi:10.1016/j.habitatint.2015.11.006
- Coulton, C. J., Korbin, J. E., & Su, M. (1996). Measuring neighbourhood context for young children in an urban area. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 24(1), 5–32.
- Downs, R. M., & Stea, D. (1973). Cognitive maps and spatial behaviour: Process and products. In R. M. Downs & D. Stea (Eds.), *Image and environment: Cognitive mapping and spatial behaviour* (pp. 8–26). Chicago, IL: Aldine Transaction.
- Durkheim, E. (1964). *The division of labor in society*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Elwood, S., & Leitner, H. (2003). Community-based planning and GIS: Aligning neighbourhood organizations with state priorities? *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 25(2), 139–157.
- Escobar, A. (2001). Culture sits in places: Reflections on globalism and subaltern strategies of localization. *Political Geography*, 20(2), 139–174.
- Forrest, R. (2009). *Why care about neighbourhoods?* Open Forum. New Jersey: Blackwell Publishing Limited.
- Forrest, R., & Kearns, A. (2001). Social cohesion, social capital and the neighbourhood. *Urban Studies*, 38(12), 2125–2143.
- Getis, A. (2015). Analytically derived neighbourhoods in a rapidly growing West African city: The case of Accra, Ghana. *Habitat International*, 45, 126–134. doi:10.1016/j.habitatint.2014.06.021.
- Golab, C. (1982). The geography of neighborhood. In R. Bayor (Ed.), *Neighborhoods in urban America* (pp. 70–85). Port Washington, NY: Kennikat.
- Gotham, K. F. (2003). Toward an understanding of the spatiality of urban poverty: The urban poor as spatial actors. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(3), 723.
- Hall, P. (2002). *Cities of tomorrow* (3rd ed.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Hannerz, U. (1980). *Exploring the city: Inquiries toward an urban anthropology*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Healey, P. (1998). Collaborative planning in a stakeholder society. *The Town Planning Review*, 69(1), 1–21.
- Holland, S., Burgess, S., Grogan-Kaylor, A., & Delva, J. (2010). Understanding neighbourhoods, communities and environments: New approaches for social work research. *British Journal of Social Work*, 41(4), 689–707. doi:10.1093/bjsw/bcq123.
- Hopkins, E. (2016). Understanding the different types of low-income neighbourhoods. *Community Investments*, 22(1), 13–36.

- Hunter, A. (1974). *Symbolic communities: The persistence and change of Chicago's local communities*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- . (1979). The urban neighbourhood: Its analytical and social contexts. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 14(3), 267–288.
- Kawachi, I., & Subramanian, S. V. (2007). Neighbourhood influences on health. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 61(1), 3–4.
- Konings, P., van Dijk, R., & Foeken, D. (2006). The African neighbourhood: An introduction. In P. Konings & D. Foeken (Eds.), *Crisis and creativity: Exploring the wealth of the African neighbourhood* (pp. 1–21). Leiden: Brill.
- Liu, Y., Wu, F., & Li, Z. (2017). Changing neighbourhood cohesion under the impact of urban redevelopment: A case study of Guangzhou, China. *Urban Geography*, 38(2), 266–290. doi:10.1080/02723638.2016.1152842
- Logan, J. R., & Molotch, H. L. (1987). *Urban fortunes: The political economy of place*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Martin, D. G. (2003). Enacting neighbourhood. *Urban Geography*, 24(5), 361–385.
- Meegan, R., & Mitchell, A. (2001). It's not community round here, it's neighbourhood: Neighbourhood change and cohesion in urban regeneration policies. *Urban Studies*, 38(12), 2167–2194.
- Miao, J., Wu, X., & Sun, X. (2018). Neighbourhood, social cohesion, and the elderly depression in Shanghai. *Social Science and Medicine*. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.08.022
- Morrow, V. (1999). Conceptualising social capital in relation to the wellbeing of children and young people: A critical review. *Sociological Review*, 47(4), 745–765.
- Olowoporoku, O., Salami, A., & Akintifonbo, O. (2017). Assessment of residents' neighbourhood confidence in an African traditional city: The Abeokuta experience. *Economic and Environmental Studies*, 17(4), 757–775. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.25167/ees.2017.44.8>
- Park, R. E., Burgess, E. W., & McKenzie, R. D. (Eds.). (1967). *The City*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Perry, C. (1929). *The neighbourhood unit: A scheme of arrangement for the family life community*. New York, NY: Regional Plan of New York and Its Environs.
- Putnam, R. (1993a). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . (1993b). The prosperous community: Social capital and economic growth. *American Prospect*, 13, 35–42.
- Raco, M., & Flint, J. (2001). Communities, places and institutional relations: Assessing the role of area-based community representation in local governance. *Political Geography*, 20(5), 585–612.
- Robinson, A. (2001). Framing Corkerhill: Identity, agency, and injustice. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 19(1), 81–101.
- Rohe, W. (2009). From local to global: One hundred years of neighborhood planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 75(2), 209–230. doi:10.1080/01944360902751077
- Sedaghatnia, S., Ghahramanpouri, A., Hasanuddin, L., & Sapura, M. (2013). An evaluation of residents' quality of life through neighbourhood satisfaction in Malaysia. *Environmental Management and Sustainable Development*, 2(1), 114–125.
- Simmel, G. (1971). *Individuality and social forms*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Stedman, R. C. (2002). Toward a social psychology of place: Predicting behaviour from place-based cognitions, attitude, and identity. *Environment and Behaviour*, 34(5), 561–581. doi:10.1177/0013916502034005001
- Subramanian, S. V., Jones, K., & Duncan, C. (2003). Multilevel methods for public health research, Chapter 4. In I. Kawachi & L. F. Berkman (Eds.), *Neighbourhoods and health* (pp. 65–111). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Swatt, L. M., Varano, S. P., Uchida, C. D., & Solomon, S. E. (2012). Fear of Crime, Incivilities and Collective Efficacy in Four Miami Neighbourhoods. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41(1), 1–11. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2012.09.004
- Temkin, K., & Rohe, W. (1996). Neighbourhood change and urban policy. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 15(3), 159–170.
- The Young Foundation. (2010). *How can neighbourhoods be understood and defined?* London, UK: The Young Foundation.

- Thomas, W. I., & Thomas, D. S. (1928). *The child in America: Behaviour problems and programs*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Tönnies, F. (1955). *Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft* [Community and association]. London, UK: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- UN-Habitat. (2010). *The State of the African cities report: Governance, inequality and urban land markets*. Nairobi: UN-HABITAT.
- van Kempen, R., & Wissink, B. (2014). Between places and flows: Towards a new agenda for neighbourhood research in an age of mobility. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 96(2), 95–108. doi:10.1111/geob.12039
- Wang, Y., & Shaw, D. (2018). The complexity of high-density neighbourhood development in China: Intensification, deregulation and social sustainability challenges. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 43, 578–586. doi:10.1016/j.scs.2018.08.024.
- Wissink, B., & Hazelzet, A. (2012). Social networks in neighbourhood Tokyo. *Urban Studies*, 49(7), 1527–1548.