



URBAN SPRAWL, DAILY MOBILITY, AND COMMUNITY COHESION IN SUBURBAN FRINGE AREAS

Nugrahini Susantinah Wisnujati, Rahayu Mardikaningsih

Universitas Wijaya Kusuma, Surabaya, Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya

correspondence: rahayumardikaningsih@gmail.com

Abstract

This article presents a qualitative literature review on urban sprawl and social life in suburban fringe areas. The review synthesizes scholarship on how dispersed urban form, functional separation, and gated residential patterns reshape everyday interaction, neighboring practices, and community cohesion. The findings indicate that longer distances and car-oriented layouts reduce incidental encounters, shift sociability toward scheduled meetings, and foster segmented networks tied to schools, workplaces, and managed facilities. Sprawl-related mobility regimes intensify time scarcity, fatigue, and uneven access to participation, particularly for households without private vehicles, caregivers with chained trips, youth, and older adults. These conditions weaken shared routines that sustain trust, collective efficacy, and inclusive decision making at neighborhood scale. The review also shows that privatized security and semi-public commercial spaces can increase perceived order while narrowing cross-group mingling. The article concludes by proposing a conceptual linkage between spatial dispersion, mobility constraints, and the social production of belonging, highlighting the need for planning that supports walkable local amenities, reliable public transport, and genuinely public meeting places. Future research can operationalize these propositions through comparative suburban cases and mixed indicators of interaction frequency and civic participation overall.

Keywords: urban sprawl, suburbanization, social interaction, daily mobility, community cohesion, gated communities, peri-urban areas.

Introduction

The expansion of urban areas in many large cities proceeds through the formation of new residential enclaves that cross administrative boundaries and spread into peripheral areas. This process is often initiated by the need for housing space, rising land prices in the center, and the push of the housing market offering landed houses with increasingly easy road access. For residents, moving to the periphery is often interpreted as an opportunity to obtain more private space, a quieter environment, and security of ownership (Benedetto et al., 2017). However, the daily experience in this sprawling space presents social conditions that differ from the city center environment. Distances between activities increase, travel time becomes a dominant part of the daily rhythm, and social encounters tend to be planned. In a phenomenological reading, peripheral space is not merely a physical backdrop, but a field of experience that shapes how people view neighbors, assess safety, and feel closeness (Ewing et al., 2014; Frenkel & Ashkenazi, 2008). Therefore, the discussion of urban sprawl is relevant when attention is directed toward the changes in lifestyle experienced by residents, not solely on building growth.

Urban expansion generally produces low-density spatial forms, segregated land use, and vehicle-oriented street patterns. Settlements, shopping centers, schools, and workplaces are often located in distant zones, making travel a requirement to meet basic needs (Reillo, 2017). This type of spatial structure affects the possibility of spontaneous encounters, as public activities shift from easily accessible street spaces toward specific nodes such as shopping centers or gated facilities (Tsai, 2005; Brueckner & Largey, 2008). At the experiential level, residents may feel that geographical proximity does not automatically translate into social proximity, especially when the design of the area encourages life behind fences, garages, and indoor spaces. When public spaces are difficult to reach on foot, the light interactions that usually maintain familiarity can diminish. Consequently, social life depends more on schedules, group memberships, or school- and work-based relationships. This change demands an understanding that positions spatial form, mobility, and relationship patterns as interconnected sequences.

In the suburbs, daily mobility is often an experience that is both exhausting and decisive. Time spent commuting to work, dropping off

children, shopping, and accessing healthcare services extends the duration spent on the road (Christian et al., 2012; Niedzielski & Kucharski, 2019). In everyday experience, long journeys can reduce the opportunity to be present at communal activities, attend community meetings, or simply have casual conversations with neighbors. When travel becomes dominant, social relationships have the potential to shift into functional relationships tied to practical goals, such as carpooling, coordinating childcare, or communicating through digital media. Dependence on private vehicles also creates differences in experience among residents. Those with vehicle access perceive urban space as open, while those relying on public transport face limitations in routes, time, and cost. This difference forms an uneven sense of connectivity toward facilities and social networks (Farber & Li, 2013). Therefore, literature studies need to examine how mobility within sprawling spaces becomes a mechanism that shapes the intensity of encounters and the structure of relations.

Changes in residential patterns in the periphery are often followed by subtle yet real social fragmentation (Hamel & Keil, 2018). Many new areas develop through housing clusters with physical boundaries and internal management, so that access for outsiders becomes limited (Le Goix & Webster, 2008; Landman, 2004). In the experience of residents, these boundaries can foster a sense of security and order, but also build social distance from the surrounding environment. Interaction with neighbors more often occurs in semi-private spaces such as security posts, parking areas, or activities organized by management. Meanwhile, residents of old settlements around the new areas may experience changes in traffic flow, rising land prices, and shifts in economic activity centers. This rapid regional development often demands stricter regulations so that the environment remains preserved and does not disadvantage any party (Nuraini et al., 2021). Social tension can emerge through differing perceptions of rights to space, noise, and the use of facilities. In a phenomenological perspective, these changes present as an experience of "who belongs" and "who is on the outside," which then influences the practices of greeting, mutual trust, and building solidarity. Understanding community cohesion needs to look at how spatial boundaries and social boundaries are formed simultaneously.

Community cohesion in the periphery is also influenced by rapid demographic dynamics. High in-migration, variations in employment status, and differences in educational backgrounds can create a diverse environment, yet they do not always result in strong social ties (Uslaner, 2010; Nguyen, 2010). In addition to the issue of human relations, good environmental management is also a key factor so that new and old residents can coexist comfortably (Nuraini et al., 2021). New residents often bring social networks from their previous locations, while long-time residents maintain relationship patterns based on kinship or long-standing proximity. The meeting of these two patterns can produce complementary relationships, but it can also lead to a sense of alienation if there is no adequate encounter space. Communal activities that previously relied on open spaces, community halls, or local rites may undergo changes in form, for instance, shifting into thematic activities limited to specific groups. The experience of "community" then becomes layered, depending on who has the time, access, and willingness to be involved. Therefore, cooperation between the community and the authorities is greatly needed to create order in this developing environment (Nuraini et al., 2021). Consequently, literature studies need to position urban sprawl as a process that changes the way residents feel togetherness, establish neighboring norms, and interpret the identity of the peripheral area.

Sprawling urban expansion poses problems for the quality of social relationships that maintain the order of communal life on a daily basis. When the distance and design of an area reduce spontaneous encounters, there is a risk of diminishing social familiarity that is usually born from routine greetings, shared activities in public spaces, and informal habits of mutual help. In such situations, trust between neighbors may develop more slowly because interactions are dominated by scheduled meetings or relations based on practical needs (Wood et al., 2010; Freeman, 2001). In some areas, the restriction of access through gates and security can strengthen social separation between cluster residents and the surrounding community. This separation can give rise to stereotypes, suspicion, and unbalanced assessments regarding safety and the appropriateness of space use. When shared space narrows or becomes difficult to reach, collective activities may weaken, and commitment to environmental interests

becomes uneven. This issue touches the core of social life in the periphery: the way togetherness is practiced in an increasingly dispersed space.

Another issue relates to mobility, which becomes a prerequisite for almost all activities, thereby producing inequalities in social experience based on transport access and leisure time. Long journeys can trigger fatigue, suppress opportunities for socialization, and change the patterns of resident participation in community activities. Certain groups, such as workers with long hours, women with caregiving burdens, the elderly, and teenagers without vehicles, may experience limited access to public facilities, gathering spaces, and social networks outside the home (Delmelle et al., 2013; Lucas, 2012). When access differs, the opportunity to build cross-regional friendship networks becomes unequal, and community cohesion is easily locked into small, homogeneous circles. In some peripheries, commercial spaces replace public spaces as interaction sites, making social encounters dependent on purchasing power and consumption choices. This situation has the potential to form fragile social relationships, as social ties become more difficult to maintain through shared activities that are inexpensive, open, and routine.

A literature review on urban expansion is essential at this time because the formation of peripheral areas is progressing rapidly, while local social institutions are often left behind by changes in spatial planning, transportation systems, and residential patterns. These changes affect how residents build closeness, maintain trust, and negotiate the use of shared space. This study aims to formulate a conceptual understanding of the relationship between dispersed spatial forms and changes in social interaction, daily mobility, and community cohesion in the urban periphery. Theoretically, this paper constructs a framework of the links between distance, access, and encounter intensity as a basis for re-reading social capital in peri-urban areas (Wolday et al., 2019; Mouratidis, 2018). Practically, the results of the study provide guidance for planners and local governments to assess the social consequences of housing policies, road networks, and the provision of public facilities through indicators that can be translated into program recommendations. The scope includes a review of key works on urban sprawl, urban sociology, and mobility studies, then synthesizes the

findings into propositions that can be tested in subsequent research without requiring field data collection at this stage in various large cities.

The objective of this study is to determine how urban expansion shapes changes in social interaction patterns and the structure of neighboring relations in peripheral urban areas. Furthermore, it aims to understand how daily mobility patterns triggered by low-density spaces affect community cohesion and resident participation in communal life. Comprehensively, this study seeks to capture whether such spatial transformations give birth to new, adaptive forms of solidarity or, conversely, trigger social fractures due to the loss of intensity in encounters between residents.

Method

This research employs a qualitative literature study with a directed review design that positions scientific publications as the primary data source. The workflow follows the principles of an integrative literature review as formulated by Torraco (2005), which involves collecting, organizing, and then synthesizing findings to produce a coherent conceptual framework. The search stage was conducted through academic databases and scientific indexing engines using keywords related to urban sprawl, suburbanization, social interaction, daily mobility, social capital, community cohesion, and peripheral settlements. The selection framework refers to the typology and objectives of literature reviews explained by Grant and Booth (2009) to ensure the choice of review type aligns with the goals of conceptual synthesis. The article filtering process was carried out in stages through the reading of titles, abstracts, and full texts, then recorded in an extraction matrix containing study locations, operational definitions, theoretical approaches, main findings, and study limitations, as recommended by Fink (2014) to maintain traceability and consistency.

The synthesis was conducted using qualitative thematic analysis of the document content, emphasizing the grouping of concepts, comparison of finding patterns, and the derivation of propositions. The coding techniques and thematic organization follow the guidelines of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014), starting from initial codes based on key terms, followed by merging codes into categories, and finally mapping the relationships between categories into analytical themes. To

strengthen rigor, document analysis was treated as a systematic process evaluating credibility, authorial intent, and the adequacy of evidence within the manuscripts, in line with Bowen's (2009) recommendations. The assessment of study quality and feasibility was conducted by examining design suitability, clarity of definitions, and consistency of arguments, with an orientation toward the quality of qualitative reasoning as discussed by Creswell (2013). Through these steps, the results of the study are directed toward answering the research problems through a conceptual synthesis that is accountable, without the collection of interview data or field observations.

Result and Discussion

Urban Expansion and Changes in Social Interaction Patterns in the Periphery

Urban expansion shapes the social environment of the periphery through changes in spatial structure that affect how residents are present in each other's daily lives. As settlements grow away from activity centers and are separated by road corridors, the experience of neighboring is no longer primarily built through spontaneous encounters. Social relations tend to originate from scheduled introductions, such as community meetings, children's school activities, or religious events designed by committees. This pattern produces more selective interactions, as people meet primarily with those who share the same goals at specific times and places. Consequently, relational networks in the periphery often develop as a collection of small, overlapping circles rather than a unified community bound by shared routines (Yasin et al., 2021). In such conditions, casual greetings on the street or brief conversations in public spaces diminish, making the process of building trust take much longer. Social closeness becomes something consciously nurtured, rather than something formed automatically due to the proximity of homes.

Low-density area designs affect the intensity of interaction because the distance between houses, building setbacks from the roadside, and the dominance of fences and carports limit the possibilities for informal communication. Many residents undergo a transition from the private space of the home directly to a vehicle without passing through an intervening space that allows for conversation (Kim & Kaplan, 2004).

Neighborhood streets often function as transit paths rather than shared living spaces; thus, social engagement that was once born from activities on porches, yards, or front rooms undergoes contraction. When easily accessible communal spaces are limited, residents tend to rely on specific locations deemed safe and comfortable, such as small parks within a cluster or internal facilities with restricted access. This pattern makes interaction more centered on residents who share social compatibility and the same housing status. For residents outside these areas, spatial proximity does not lead to social closeness. The experience of neighboring then becomes a fragmented experience based on access boundaries and spatial management.

Urban expansion often gives rise to a separation of land functions that places daily activities in far-flung locations (Reillo, 2017). When workplaces, schools, shopping, and recreation are scattered, social encounters occur more frequently at functional activity nodes rather than in residential neighborhood spaces. This changes the character of neighboring relations into "thinner" relations, as socialization needs are met through coworkers, hobby communities, or school networks that span across regions (Ewing et al., 2014; Hamidi & Ewing, 2014). Residents may feel they have many connections, yet these connections are not necessarily tied to their place of residence, causing neighborhood solidarity to weaken when needed for collective action. In certain situations, everyday assistance such as house sitting, borrowing tools, or supervising children becomes more difficult because people do not know their neighbors sufficiently. Interactions tied to the place of residence become limited to administrative matters or extraordinary events, rather than stable shared habits.

The development of cluster housing and gated communities in the periphery creates a form of relationship built on the logic of security and access control (Ferguson & Ferguson, 2016). The existence of security posts, access cards, and internal rules regulates who is allowed to enter and how shared spaces are used (Vesselinov et al., 2007; Atkinson & Flint, 2004). For residents, these rules can strengthen a sense of order, but simultaneously change how others are assessed through the categories of "resident" and "non-resident." Neighboring relations within the area tend to develop in an atmosphere of subtle surveillance, for example, through internal communication groups, security reports, and mutually

maintained norms of propriety. Meanwhile, relationships with surrounding settlements are more easily formed as transactional relationships, such as through cleaning services, security services, or daily economic activities. When cross-border relationships mostly take the form of transactions, the opportunity to build empathy and mutual trust across groups decreases. Physical boundaries then intertwine with social boundaries, influencing how residents interpret togetherness.

In fast-growing peripheries, the population composition is often heterogeneous because residents come from various occupational backgrounds, origins, and family cycle stages. This diversity can enrich social life, yet it often exists without sufficient encounter mechanisms to transform differences into closeness (Letki, 2008; Hickman, 2013). New residents bring habits, rhythms, and privacy standards that do not always align with those of other residents. In one area, some residents consider intense interaction a hallmark of good neighboring, while others view social distance as a form of politeness. These differing perceptions can lead to misunderstandings, for example, regarding noise levels, the use of parking spaces, or activities in front areas. Such minor conflicts often do not emerge as open confrontations, but rather as withdrawal and reduced contact. Consequently, social networks develop in parallel without many bridges, making environmental cohesion difficult to cultivate despite increasing population density.

Urban expansion also changes the meaning of public space for peripheral residents. Classic public spaces, such as town squares, vibrant sidewalks, or local markets near the home, are often replaced by managed semi-public spaces, such as shopping centers or paid commercial areas. In such spaces, social interaction takes place within an atmosphere of consumption and management rules, making encounters more orderly but less open. Visiting residents tend to come for specific purposes and then leave without building bonds with the people they meet. Meanwhile, truly open public spaces often fail to meet comfort standards, for instance, due to unsafe pedestrian access, minimal lighting, or excessive distance. As a result, opportunities for residents from different backgrounds to mingle decrease. When cross-group meeting spaces shrink, social relations easily harden into mutually estranged groups. The experience of living together

becomes divided according to different gathering places, making the sense of belonging to a single neighborhood difficult to maintain.

Changes in social interaction in the periphery are also influenced by the division of time absorbed by commuting, work, and household management (Korcelli-Olejniczak & Piotrowski, 2018). When days are filled with tight schedules, participation in neighborhood activities is often seen as an additional burden rather than a social necessity (Mattisson et al., 2015). Consequently, community organizational structures may be filled by groups with more flexible time, while other groups become onlookers who only appear when there is a direct interest. This disparity in participation can create the perception that neighborhood decisions are controlled by a few, thereby decreasing trust in collective mechanisms. At the same time, digital communication accelerates the spread of information but often replaces face-to-face meetings that build relational warmth. Messaging groups can be effective for coordination, but they easily trigger misinterpretations because written messages do not convey tone and expression. In this condition, social interaction becomes more efficient, but the quality of closeness may decline due to the lack of nuanced encounters.

Neighboring relations in the periphery are often formed by intermediary institutions, especially schools, places of worship, and sports facilities. Many parental friendships are born from meetings during school drop-offs/pick-ups or school committee activities (Small, 2009; Mazumdar et al., 2018). This pattern creates strong networks around families at similar life stages but leaves out other groups such as singles, the elderly, or workers who are rarely present during those hours. As a result, neighborhood social networks have an uneven and easily segmented structure. Religious activities can serve as more inclusive meeting spaces, but their accessibility depends on distance and transport access, so participation remains stratified. Sports and recreation facilities provide opportunities for casual interaction but are often fee-based or located in specific areas, so not all residents feel the benefits. Thus, intermediary institutions help build relations, but those relations tend to form through shared activities and status, rather than through spatial proximity alone.

Urban expansion also influences how residents interpret neighborhood identity and their sense of belonging to their place of

residence. In new settlements, identity is often formed through housing brands, management rules, and the promoted image of the area. This type of identity can foster pride, but it is oriented more toward property ownership than the experience of togetherness (Ujang, 2012). Conversely, in long-established settlements, identity is often linked to local history, kinship networks, and repetitive social practices. When these two types of identity meet, negotiations arise regarding who has the right to determine neighborhood norms and how shared spaces are used. If negotiations proceed without adequate space for dialogue, the result is the existence of two communities living side-by-side without attachment. The sense of belonging then becomes limited to areas considered "one's own," rather than the wider environment. In the long term, this can decrease residents' capacity for collective action, as emotional ties to the environment do not develop evenly.

Household economic aspects and consumption patterns in the periphery also shape social networks. When access to public services is limited, residents who can afford it tend to purchase private services, such as additional security, children's tutoring, or paid recreational facilities. This practice widens social distance because daily life experiences differ between groups (Kenworthy, 2011). Residents who rely on public services may feel marginalized when public facilities are inadequate, while those who opt for private services reduce their dependence on shared mechanisms. Social interaction thus moves into spaces that correspond with the ability to pay, weakening the opportunity for cross-class encounters. In certain situations, local economic activities such as small stalls (*warung*), mini-markets, and home-based services can serve as social bridges by providing routine meetings. However, if an area is dominated by centralized modern retail, such encounters diminish. Consequently, the social networks usually formed from familiar daily transactions are replaced by impersonal transactions that do not foster closeness.

Perceptions of risk and safety become important factors directing the social behavior of peripheral residents (Cho & Lim, 2019). When an area is perceived as a vulnerable space, residents tend to limit outdoor activities, reduce interaction with strangers, and strengthen internal social controls (Foster et al., 2014; Lorenc et al., 2012). This pattern can increase alertness but also fosters social distance as people assess their environment through

suspicion. Children more often play in private spaces or enclosed facilities, so the process of learning to neighbor and building friendships across households becomes limited. Adults, too, more frequently socialize in spaces deemed safe and managed, leading to a decrease in encounters with residents outside their immediate network. On the other hand, if a sense of security is maintained through the presence of residents in outdoor spaces and the habit of mutual recognition, social interaction can become more open. Urban expansion frequently produces environments where safety norms are not yet stable, so residents are still seeking a balance between openness and self-protection. This search influences the intensity of greetings, the habit of sharing information, and the willingness to engage in communal affairs.

Urban expansion alters social interaction patterns in the periphery through a combination of dispersed spatial structures, environmental designs that emphasize privacy, and access mechanisms that form social boundaries. Spontaneous encounters decrease and are replaced by scheduled meetings that tend to be selective. Neighboring relations develop within networks segmented by activity, housing status, family cycle stage, and the ability to access meeting spaces. Open public spaces are often overshadowed by managed semi-public spaces, making cross-group interactions rarer and less fluid. Neighborhood identity is thus constructed through patterns of ownership and area management, which can strengthen the sense of security but weaken attachments across settlement boundaries (Mouratidis, 2018). In this condition, social cohesion at the neighborhood level does not collapse automatically, but it requires more specific prerequisites, particularly the availability of easily accessible meeting spaces, agreed-upon neighboring norms, and fair participation channels. In summary, sprawl shapes how residents meet, choose relations, and maintain togetherness within increasingly dispersed peripheral spaces.

Daily Mobility and Community Cohesion in Peri-Urban Areas

Daily mobility in peri-urban areas is a primary prerequisite for accessing employment, education, healthcare services, and consumption needs. When activity locations are scattered and route options are limited, travel becomes the foundational framework that organizes how residents live their days. This pattern forms a strict time discipline, as the success of

fulfilling family and work obligations depends on departure punctuality, resilience in facing congestion, and proficiency in managing transfers. In such conditions, social involvement in the residential environment is often understood as an additional activity for which time must be "found," rather than a natural part of the routine (Mouratidis, 2019; Nie & Chen, 2020). This poses a major challenge because an individual's perspective toward their environment is strongly influenced by psychological conditions in the era of modern society (Darmawan et al., 2021a). Community cohesion, which requires repeated encounters and mutual recognition, faces obstacles when productive hours are exhausted in transit. Mobility also shifts the orientation of residents' attention from the space around the home toward nodes encountered during travel, such as offices, road corridors, and mode transfer points. This condition shows that the way we move actually helps determine how human relationships in a region can be formed or, conversely, grow distant (Mardikaningsih, 2021). Consequently, repeated interactions actually occur with people who have similar schedules, while neighbors near the home may rarely be encountered at the same hours.

Dependence on private vehicles gives rise to strong differentiation in social experiences (Lupi & Musterd, 2006). "Smooth" mobility for vehicle owners is often accompanied by the ability to choose departure times, routes, and stopover points, so that daily needs can be met without much negotiation with others. In fact, teamwork and strong social capital are essential for a higher quality of community life (Putra et al., 2021). This pattern can reduce the intensity of cooperation among residents because many practical problems are solved individually through transportation access (Lucas et al., 2016; Mattioli et al., 2020). Conversely, residents without vehicles face constraints regarding public transport operating hours, travel costs, and walking distances from stop points. These differences in facilities make it difficult for residents to help each other equitably, even in simple matters such as managing local natural resource potential (Darmawan et al., 2021b). Such disparities in access produce inequalities in social participation. Residents with mobility difficulties tend to limit outdoor activities and rely more on immediate networks, such as the nuclear family or specific neighbors willing to help. When mobility assistance becomes a source of dependence, social relationships can transform into

burdensome ones, as transportation help involves time, cost, and a sense of social indebtedness. In the long term, mobility inequality hinders the formation of a sense of equality within the community.

Community cohesion is also determined by the synchronization of daily rhythms among residents. In peri-urban areas, departure and return times are often highly diverse, following scattered work locations and differing work hour policies. This rhythmic difference reduces the chance of meeting at the same time in the neighborhood, especially in the afternoon when some residents are still on the road and others are already at home (Schwanen, 2008; Järv et al., 2015). The busy nature of each individual sometimes causes shared neighborhood activities to be forgotten, even though resident engagement is a primary key to a democratic national life (Rojak et al., 2021). When rhythms are not aligned, it becomes difficult to agree on times for neighborhood activities that rely on collective presence. Resident meetings, communal work (*kerja bakti*), or holiday celebrations require compromises that often result in limited participation. Those who rarely attend are then perceived as less caring, even though the cause is mobility patterns and travel burdens. Such perceptions can lower social trust, as moral judgments are cast upon something that is actually structural in nature (Knies, 2009). Therefore, it is very important to reunify local wisdom with modern life requirements so that a sense of togetherness is maintained amidst busy schedules (Nurmalasari & Nuraini, 2021). Healthy cohesion requires a shared understanding of time constraints, yet such understanding does not always develop if opportunities for face-to-face dialogue are rare.

Trip chaining patterns, such as dropping off children, stopping for groceries, and then heading to work, form complex mobility structures for peri-urban families. This complexity demands internal household coordination and often gives rise to a division of tasks based on gender, age, and vehicle ownership (Hensher & Reyes, 2000; McGuckin & Nakamoto, 2005). When one family member becomes the primary controller of mobility, other members have a greater dependency on the established schedule. This condition affects social autonomy, especially for teenagers, the elderly, or family members who do not drive. Limited mobility autonomy can restrict opportunities to build local friendships, participate in community activities, or access public spaces independently.

Ultimately, we must realize that the smooth movement of every individual is the primary capital for building a harmonious and mutually supportive environment (Mardikaningsih, 2021; Nurmalasari & Nuraini, 2021). Consequently, community cohesion loses the contributions of groups whose mobility is restricted, even though these groups often serve as the backbone of social activities when access is adequate. When mobility dependency is high, social relationships may strengthen within the nuclear family, but cross-household ties become more difficult to maintain because meetings require complicated arrangements and high time costs.

The availability and quality of public transportation in peri-urban areas affect whether a community is able to build inclusive meeting spaces (Lamanna et al., 2020). If transportation services are infrequent, routes are circuitous, or waiting times are uncertain, residents tend to avoid travel for activities not considered mandatory, including social activities (Currie & Stanley, 2008; Stanley et al., 2011). These difficulties in moving from place to place often trigger new problems, where the community finds it hard to unite due to differing perspectives and challenges in social integration within their environment (Fariz, 2021). As a result, the community becomes more closed off to groups with limited mobility, and social leadership often concentrates among residents with stable transportation access. This condition impacts the environmental decision-making process, as those present in meetings are those for whom it is easy to come and go. Meanwhile, residents relying on public transport may experience feelings of alienation, not due to a lack of concern, but because of time costs and travel uncertainty. This creates social distance, where disadvantaged groups or poor households find it increasingly difficult to participate in community activities because they must focus on meeting their basic needs (Mahmudah, 2021). In such communities, cohesion is easily split between "the mobile" and "the immobile." Fragile cohesion is also evident during urgent collective needs, as the distribution of information and physical assistance is hampered by travel access limitations.

Daily mobility affects the quality of social relations through the fatigue and psychological stress that accompany long commutes (Gonçalves et al., 2017). Repetitive travel, noise, traffic congestion, and travel time uncertainty can deplete the energy for interaction after arriving

home (Stutzer & Frey, 2008; Novaco & Gonzalez, 2009). This fatigue is felt most heavily, especially by working women, as they must divide their energy between office matters and accumulating household chores (Khairi, 2021). Residents may choose recovery in private spaces, leading to a decrease in opportunities to attend neighborhood meetings. Travel fatigue also affects how people respond to requests for help, as providing assistance often means adding travel time or changing routes. When the norm of mutual aid requires mobility costs, daily standards of generosity may become more limited and selective. Furthermore, travel stress can cause irritability that increases the potential for minor conflicts, such as those related to parking, vehicle noise, or the use of neighborhood roads. Therefore, a sense of collective responsibility is required so that social solidarity remains preserved even though each individual has their own busyness and freedom (Saputra & Darmawan, 2021). Community cohesion requires patience and good communication, but the burden of travel can erode that capacity.

Mobility shapes the geography of social networks, namely the locations where relationships are maintained and how far those networks stretch (Schwanen et al., 2015). In peri-urban areas, many important relationships are maintained outside the residential environment, such as at workplaces or distant activity centers (Larsen et al., 2006; Cass et al., 2005). Many residents ultimately prefer to befriend people who share the same hobbies or interests even if their locations are far away, rather than getting to know the neighbor next door (Rejeki, 2021). Sprawling networks can expand access to information and economic opportunities, but they can reduce emotional investment in the environment around the home. When social affiliation needs are met outside the neighborhood, the motivation to engage in local environmental affairs may decrease. On the other hand, networks that are too localized can also lead to isolation if mobility access is limited. This balance is crucial so that residents remain concerned about local issues, including small matters such as decision-making for a healthier and more environmentally friendly lifestyle at home (Halizah & Nuraini, 2021). Healthy community cohesion requires a balance between local ties and bridges to the outside. Heavy mobility tends to shift that balance, as social energy is allocated to relationships deemed most functional and easy to maintain.

Community cohesion in peri-urban areas is also influenced by the mobility patterns of children and adolescents. When schools and play facilities are located far away and walking access is unsafe, children's social activities are tied to parental drop-offs or specialized vehicles. This condition reduces the opportunities for children to build friendships that grow from casual encounters around the home. Socializing then shifts to school environments or tutoring communities, which are often scattered across regions (Karsten, 2005; Fyhri et al., 2011). This situation makes the role of mothers or women in the household very busy in managing the family's daily schedule so that all matters continue to run smoothly (Khairi, 2021; Halizah & Nuraini, 2021). Consequently, parents build relationships with other parents based on school networks, while relationships between close neighbors at home are not always strongly formed. At the community level, the reduction of children's activities in the space around the home diminishes the social dynamics that usually unite families, such as playing together, calling out to one another, and informal mutual supervision. Without such routine interactions, the sense of solidarity among residents can slowly disappear because everyone is more focused on their own private affairs (Saputra & Darmawan, 2021; Rejeki, 2021). When the space around the home is less occupied by children's activities, the sense of safety and togetherness arising from public presence also decreases. Thus, vehicle-dependent child mobility alters the structure of family social encounters in the periphery.

The mobility of women, especially those who bear the burden of caregiving and domestic work, often shows specific vulnerabilities in peri-urban areas (Halizah & Nuraini, 2021; Uteng & Lucas, 2017). Trip-chaining and the need to move to multiple locations on the same day add to the burden of time, cost, and coordination. If transportation support is limited, women's access to community activities may narrow, as priority is directed toward urgent household needs (Kawgan-Kagan, 2020). This condition often forces families to change shopping and food consumption habits to maintain household food security amidst time constraints (Aisyah & Issalillah, 2021). This affects cohesion, as many neighborhood activities depend on social work often undertaken by women, such as event coordination, managing children's activities, and daily support networks. When mobility limits involvement, the community's capacity to maintain

routine activities declines. Furthermore, dependence on other parties for travel access can create a sense of discomfort and reduce the initiative to attend meetings. Therefore, good public policy must be able to balance economic and social interests so that the residential environment remains comfortable for everyone (Mardikaningsih & Hariani, 2021). Sustainable community cohesion requires activity arrangements that consider the mobility burden of caregiving, including nearby meeting locations, times that do not clash with drop-off/pick-up hours, and forms of participation that allow for brief but meaningful attendance.

The mobility of the elderly in peri-urban areas often serves as an important indicator for the inclusivity of community cohesion (Berg et al., 2017). Elderly individuals who no longer drive or have physical limitations face the risk of being disconnected from social activities if health facilities, places of worship, and gathering spots are located far away. When travel access is difficult, the elderly tend to stay home longer and depend on specific family members or neighbors. This is deeply regrettable because vulnerable groups like the elderly often feel marginalized from social life due to environmental structures that do not support them (Hartono, 2021). This dependency can strengthen ties in one or two relationships, but simultaneously narrows social networks and increases feelings of loneliness. In a cohesive community, the elderly usually act as guardians of the neighborhood's social memory and a source of relational stability. If mobility restricts the involvement of the elderly, the community loses a source of experience and calming social supervision. In fact, within a group or organization, the attitudes and behaviors of every member greatly determine the harmony of the atmosphere therein (Darmawan, 2013). Furthermore, the reduced presence of the elderly in outdoor spaces decreases the variety of space users, making the environment feel quieter at certain hours. Collective loneliness can increase when less mobile groups are not visible in shared spaces. Thus, the quality of cohesion can be measured by how easily the elderly population maintains social routines without a heavy travel burden.

The link between mobility and resident participation is clearly evident in the community's ability to organize collective action, such as communal work (*kerja bakti*), waste management, and handling neighborhood disturbances. When the majority of residents return late or

face long commutes, the responsibility for shared activities tends to fall on a handful of people whose mobility is lighter or who work nearby (Leviton-Reid et al., 2021; Ohmer, 2007). This imbalance of roles can trigger a sense of injustice in society, especially for those who feel already heavily burdened by the demands of earning a living (Aisyah & Issalillah, 2021; Hartono, 2021). The concentration of social work within a small group can lead to social fatigue, a sense of unfairness, and a decrease in motivation. At the same time, residents who are rarely present may feel marginalized from decisions, thus choosing not to get involved because they feel they have no voice. Mobility also affects the speed of collective response during sudden events, such as local flooding or security disturbances, as the coordination of physical assistance requires the ability to move quickly. This is where the importance of understanding how to work within a group lies, so that every environmental problem can be resolved together effectively (Darmawan, 2013). If the ability to move is uneven, the distribution of aid becomes slow and can give rise to mutual blaming. In such a structure, cohesion requires clear role-sharing mechanisms, adaptive scheduling of activities, and recognition that involvement can take the form of non-physical contributions that remain valuable to the community.

Daily mobility in peri-urban areas shapes community cohesion through time distribution, unequal transportation access, synchronization of daily rhythms, and the physical and psychological burdens of travel. When travel becomes dominant, social participation in the residential environment faces strong selection, such that those who are active tend to be groups with better mobility access or lighter travel burdens. We need to find real solutions so that environmental development does not only consider physical buildings but also pays attention to human relationships (Mardikaningsih & Hariani, 2021). Mobility inequality leads to an inequality of voice in meetings, an inequality of contribution in social work, and an inequality of opportunity to build relationships across age and gender groups. The mobility of children, female caregivers, and the elderly demonstrates how limited movement can decrease the inclusivity of togetherness. At the same time, social networks formed outside the neighborhood can expand individual opportunities but reduce investment in residence-based solidarity. It is crucial for us to realize that everyone has

a role in creating a harmonious environment, even though the challenges of daily life are not easy (Darmawan, 2013; Hartono, 2021). Thus, the reading of mobility needs to be positioned as an experiential structure that regulates who meets whom, when encounters occur, and how often shared habits can be maintained. This becomes the basis for understanding why community cohesion in the periphery is often fragile and layered.

Conclusion

This study confirms that sprawling urban expansion alters the social conditions for the formation of togetherness in the city periphery. Low-density spatial structures, functional separation, and the tendency toward privatization of residential areas encourage more scheduled and selective interactions, such that casual encounters which usually accelerate closeness are diminished. Relational networks tend to be organized as groups centered on school, work, and managed facilities, while neighboring relationships around the home develop more slowly and remain "thinner." At the same time, long daily mobility with high time costs suppresses resident involvement in communal activities, rendering participation uneven and widening the difference in experience between mobile residents and those with limited access. Physical boundaries and access rules may strengthen the sense of order for some residents, yet they narrow the opportunities for cross-group encounters necessary to foster trust and environmental solidarity. Thus, urban sprawl is intertwined with changes in interaction patterns, social orientation, and community cohesion at the settlement scale.

The theoretical implications of this study lie in the affirmation of the linked relationship between spatial dispersion, mobility regimes, and the formation of a sense of belonging at the neighborhood level. Community cohesion can be understood as the result of repetitive encounter routines, equal access to meeting spaces, and participation mechanisms that can be executed by residents with differing life rhythms. When space is dispersed, the time cost of being present increases; therefore, the quality of togetherness cannot be judged solely by population density or the number of local organizations. The practical implications point toward the need for peripheral urban planning that positions walkability, proximity to basic services, and truly open public

spaces as social prerequisites rather than merely physical complements. The management of residential areas needs to provide safe interaction spaces without building rigid social distances from surrounding settlements. Local governments and developers can use these conceptual findings to assess the social consequences of land use, neighborhood road design, and facility placement, as well as to prepare resident activity formats that are realistic regarding daily travel burdens.

Future research can test the propositions formulated in this study through a comparison of several types of peripheries, such as gated cluster areas, mixed settlements, and old settlements pressured by expansion. Measurements can be designed with indicators sensitive to daily life, such as the frequency of casual encounters, the variety of cross-age relationships, mutual aid patterns, and participation in environmental decisions. Further studies also need to pay attention to groups with limited mobility, as the quality of cohesion is often reflected in a community's ability to maintain their involvement without excessive burdens. From a policy perspective, peripheral urban planning should prioritize services near the home, safe pedestrian networks, and reliable transportation nodes so that residents' social time is not drained by travel. Community strengthening programs should not depend on long meetings at specific hours but instead provide staggered participation formats that allow for brief yet meaningful contributions. At the design level, the spaces between houses and streets, neighborhood parks, and shared facilities with equitable access can be treated as social infrastructure that maintains the sustainability of togetherness.

References

- Aisyah, N. & F. Issalillah. 2021. Changes in Food Consumption Patterns and Their Consequences for Household Food Security, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 249-274.
- Atkinson, R., & Flint, J. 2004. Fortress UK? Gated communities, the spatial segregation of the self-sufficient and the fragmentation of British cities. *European Journal of Housing Policy*, 4(2), 175-193.
- Benedetto, G. D., Germana, M. L., & Trapani, F. 2017. Peripheral Centralities: An Integrated Approach. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*, 37, 699-710. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PROENV.2017.03.056>
- Berg, P. P. van den, Sharmeen, F., & Weijs-Perrée, M. 2017. On the subjective quality of social Interactions: Influence of neighborhood walkability, social cohesion and

- mobility choices. *Transportation Research Part A-Policy and Practice*, 106, 309-319. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TRA.2017.09.021>
- Bowen, G. A. 2009. Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40.
- Brueckner, J. K., & Largey, A. G. 2008. Social interaction and urban sprawl. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 64(1), 18-34.
- Cass, N., Shove, E., & Urry, J. 2005. Social exclusion, mobility and access. *The Sociological Review*, 53(3), 539-555.
- Cho, S., & Lim, U. 2019. Residential mobility and social trust in urban neighborhoods in the Seoul metropolitan area, Korea. *Annals of Regional Science*, 63(1), 117-145. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00168-019-00927-W>
- Christian, T. J. 2012. Trade-offs between commuting time and health-related activities. *Journal of urban health*, 89(5), 746-757.
- Creswell, J. W. 2013. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Currie, G., & Stanley, J. 2008. Investigating links between social capital and public transport. *Transport Reviews*, 28(4), 529-547.
- Darmawan, D. 2013. *Prinsip Prinsip Perilaku Organisasi*. Pena Semesta - PT. JePe Press Media Utama, Surabaya.
- Darmawan, D et al. 2021a. *Tanaman Perkebunan Prospektif Indonesia*. Penerbit Qiara Media, Pasuruan.
- Darmawan, D. et al. 2021b. *Psychological Perspective in Society 5.0*, Zahir Publishing, Jogjakarta.
- Delmelle, E. C., Haslauer, E., & Prinz, T. 2013. Social satisfaction, commuting and neighborhoods. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 30, 110-116.
- Farber, S., & Li, X. 2013. Urban sprawl and social interaction potential: an empirical analysis of large metropolitan regions in the United States. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 31, 267-277.
- Ewing, R., Meakins, G., Hamidi, S., & Nelson, A. C. 2014. Relationship between urban sprawl and physical activity, obesity, and morbidity-Update and refinement. *Health & place*, 26, 118-126.
- Ewing, R., & Hamidi, S. 2015. Compactness versus sprawl: A review of recent evidence from the United States. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 30(4), 413-432.
- Ewing, R., Hamidi, S., & Grace, J. B. 2016. Urban sprawl as a risk factor in motor vehicle crashes. *Urban Studies*, 53(2), 247-266.
- Fariz, F. A. B. M. 2021. Populist Ethno-Religious Nationalism: Challenges to Global Governance and Domestic Social Integration, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 75-92.
- Ferguson, B. K., & Ferguson, D. E. 2016. Architectural and personal influences on neighboring behaviors. *Collection of Frontiers of Architectural Research*, 5(2), 194-201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOAR.2016.03.001>

- Fink, A. 2014. *Conducting research literature reviews: From the internet to paper* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Foster, S., Giles-Corti, B., & Knuiaman, M. 2014. Does fear of crime discourage walkers? A social-ecological exploration of fear as a deterrent to walking. *Environment and behavior*, 46(6), 698-717.
- Freeman, L. 2001. The effects of sprawl on neighborhood social ties: An explanatory analysis. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 67(1), 69-77.
- Frenkel, A., & Ashkenazi, M. 2008. Measuring urban sprawl: how can we deal with it? *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 35(1), 56-79.
- Fyhri, A., Hjorthol, R., Mackett, R. L., Fotel, T., & Kytä, M. 2011. Children's active travel and independent mobility in four countries: Development, social variations and liberties. *Transport Policy*, 18(5), 703-710.
- Gonçalves, G., Ribeiro, P., & Ferreira, F. 2017. Assessing the impact of commuting on social capital: Evidence from a Portuguese metropolitan area. *Transportation Research Procedia*, 24, 218-225.
- Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. 2009. A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, 26(2), 91-108.
- Halizah, S. N. & R. Nuraini. 2021. Women's Household Involvement and Decisions on Green Consumption, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 177-192.
- Hamel, P., & Keil, R. 2018. Toward a comparative global suburbanism. 51-61. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315266442-5>
- Hartono, R. (2021). Social Exclusion and Marginalization of Vulnerable Groups in Social Structures. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 205-222.
- Hensher, D. A., & Reyes, A. J. 2000. Trip chaining as a barrier to the use of public transport. *Transportation*, 27(4), 341-361.
- Hickman, P. 2013. 'Third places' and social interaction in deprived neighbourhoods in Great Britain. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 28, 221-236.
- Järv, O., Müürisepp, K., Ahas, R., Derudder, B., & Witlox, F. 2015. Ethnic differences in activity spaces as a characteristic of segregation: A study based on mobile phone usage in Tallinn, Estonia. *Urban Studies*, 52(14), 2680-2698.
- Karsten, L. 2005. It all used to be better? Different generations on continuity and change in urban children's daily use of space. *Children's Geographies*, 3(3), 275-290.
- Kawgan-Kagan, I. 2020. Early motherhood as a transition to more sustainable mobility? The case of trip-chaining in Germany. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 5, 100142.
- Kenworthy, J. 2011. An international comparative perspective on fast-rising motorization and automobile dependence. In *Urban Transport in the Developing World*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Khairi, M. (2021). Career Women, Double Burden, and Gendered Structures in Feminist Sociological Perspective. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 173-186.
- Kim, J., & Kaplan, R. 2004. Physical and psychological factors in sense of community: New urbanist neighborhoods and traditional suburbs. *Environment and Behavior*, 36(3), 313-340.

- Knies, G. 2009. The Effects of Mobility on Neighbourhood Social Ties. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.1403140>
- Korcelli-Olejniczak, E., & Piotrowski, F. 2018. Neighbouring the different: Social interaction in a Warsaw subarea. *Bulletin of Geography. Socio-Economic Series*, 39(39), 53–63. <https://doi.org/10.2478/BOG-2018-0004>
- Lamanna, M., Klinger, C. A., Liu, A., & Mirza, R. M. 2020. The association between public transportation and social isolation in older adults: a scoping review of the literature. *Canadian Journal on Aging-Revue Canadienne Du Vieillessement*, 39(3), 393–405. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0714980819000345>
- Landman, K. 2004. Gated communities in South Africa: The challenge for spatial planning and social vicinity. *Town Planning Review*, 75(2), 151-172.
- Larsen, J., Urry, J., & Axhausen, K. 2006. Social networks and future mobilities. *Report to the Department for Transport*, University of Lancaster.
- Le Goix, R., & Webster, C. J. 2008. Gated communities. *Geography Compass*, 2(4), 1189-1214.
- Letki, N.2008. Does diversity erode social cohesion? Social capital and race in British neighbourhoods. *Political Studies*, 56(1), 99-126.
- Leviton-Reid, C., MacDonald, M., Matthew, R., & Syms, L. (2021). Marginalized Tenants, Poor Proximity? Market Rental Housing and Supportive Amenities and Services in a Regional Geography. *Journal of Rural & Community Development*, 16(3).
- Lorenc, T., Clayton, S., Neary, D., Steiner, H., Petticrew, M., Whitehead, M., ... & Renton, A. 2012. Crime, fear of crime, environment, and mental health and wellbeing: Mapping review of theories and causal pathways. *Health & Place*, 18(4), 757-765.
- Lucas, K. 2012. Transport and social exclusion: Where are we now? *Transport Policy*, 20, 105-113.
- Lucas, K., Mattioli, G., Verlinghieri, E., & Guzman, A. 2016. Transport poverty and its adverse social consequences. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers-Transport*, 169(6), 353-365.
- Lupi, T., & Musterd, S. 2006. The Suburban “Community Question.” *Urban Studies*, 43(4), 801–817. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980600597723>
- Mahmudah, S. 2021. Food Vulnerability of Poor Households in Densely Populated Urban Areas, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 125-140.
- Mardikaningsih, R. 2021. Urbanization and Social Inequality: Challenges in Building Social Cohesion in a City-Based Environment. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 135-140.
- Mardikaningsih, R., & Hariani, M. 2021. Realizing Sustainability in Public Policy: Building a Balance between Economy, Social, and Environment. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 191-196.
- Mattioli, G., Roberts, C., Steinberger, J. K., & Brown, A. 2020. The political economy of car dependence: A systems of provision approach. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 66, 101486.

- Mattisson, K., Håkansson, C., & Jakobsson, K. 2015. Relationships between commuting and social capital among men and women in southern Sweden. *Environment and Behavior*, 47(7), 734-753.
- Mazumdar, S., Learnihan, V., Cochrane, T., & Davey, R. (2018). The built environment and social capital: A systematic review. *Environment and Behavior*, 50(2), 119-158.
- McGuckin, N., & Nakamoto, Y. 2005. Differences in trip chaining by men and women. *Transportation Research Record*, 1924(1), 49-56.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. 2014. *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Mouratidis, K. 2018. Built environment and social well-being: How does urban form affect social life and personal relationships? *Cities*, 74, 7-20.
- Mouratidis, K. 2019. Compact city, travel mode, and social activities: What is the role of built environment self-selection? *Transport Policy*, 81, 241-252.
- Nguyen, M. T. 2010. The Role of Physical Form in Promoting Native-Immigrant Social Ties: A Case Study of Gwinnett County, Georgia. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 94(2), 65-76.
- Nie, P., & Chen, Z. 2020. Commute time and social capital in China. *Journal of Transport & Health*, 18, 100880.
- Niedzielski, M. A., & Kucharski, R. 2019. Impact of commuting time on social capital: Evidence from Poland. *Transportation*, 46(5), 1561-1581.
- Novaco, R. W., & Gonzalez, O. I. 2009. Commuting and well-being. *Technology and Wellbeing*, 174-205.
- Nuraini, R., Handayani, S., Wisnujati, N. S., Darmawan, D., & Kurniawan, Y. 2021. Environmental Management and Law Enforcement. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 65-76.
- Nurmalasari, D., & Nuraini, R. 2021. The Role of Local Communities in Biodiversity Conservation: Challenges and Integration of Local Wisdom with Modern Science. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 99-104.
- Ohmer, M. L. 2007. Citizen participation in neighborhood organizations and its relationship to volunteers' self- and collective efficacy and sense of community. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35(1), 109-125.
- Putra, A. R., Mardikaningsih, R., & Darmawan, D. (2021). Organisational Social Capital and Team Collaboration as Supports for Total Quality Management, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 129-146.
- Reillo, F. C. 2017. Being closer in the remoteness. *The emergence of living environments in an urban periphery*. 17(2), 149. <https://doi.org/10.5565/REV/ATHENEA.1761>
- Rejeki, S. 2021. Social Network Formation Through Shared Interest Communities in Urban Areas, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 227-250.
- Rojak, J. A., R. K. Khayru, & D. Darmawan. 2021. Citizens' Political Participation in Electoral Democracy and the Dynamics of Civil Society Movements, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 161-176.

- Saputra, R. & D. Darmawan. 2021. Between Individual Freedom and Collective Responsibility: Dynamics of Social Solidarity in the Age of Individualism, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 251-274.
- Schwanen, T. 2008. Managing the gaps: The use of the mobile phone in everyday life. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 99(2), 244-248.
- Schwanen, T., Lucas, K., Akyelken, N., Solsona, D. C., Carrasco, J. A., & Neutens, T. 2015. Rethinking the links between social exclusion and transport disadvantage through the lens of social capital. *Transportation Research Part A-Policy and Practice*, 74, 123-135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TRA.2015.02.012>
- Small, M. L. 2009. *Unanticipated gains: Origins of network inequality in everyday life*. Oxford University Press. [Original research in *American Journal of Sociology*].
- Stanley, J. K., Hensher, D. A., Stanley, J. R., & Vella-Brodrick, D. 2011. Mobility, social exclusion and well-being: Exploring the links. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 45(8), 789-801.
- Stutzer, A., & Frey, B. S. 2008. Stress that doesn't pay: The commuting paradox. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 110(2), 339-366.
- Torraco, R. J. 2005. Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4(3), 356-367.
- Tsai, Y. H. 2005. Quantifying urban form: Compactness versus 'sprawl'. *Urban Studies*, 42(1), 141-161.
- Ujang, N. 2012. Place attachment and continuity of urban place identity. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 49, 156-167.
- Uslaner, E. M. 2010. Trust, diversity, and segregation in the United States and the United Kingdom. *Comparative Sociology*, 9(2), 159-181.
- Uteng, T. P., & Lucas, K. 2017. The trajectories of urban mobilities in the Global South : An introduction. 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315265094-1>
- Vesselinov, E., Cazessus, M. N., & Falk, W. 2007. Gated communities and spatial inequality. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 29(2), 109-127.
- Wolday, F., Næss, P., & Cao, X. J. 2019. Determinants of residential self-selection: An investigation of the causal relationships between residential preferences, life events and residential mobility. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 129, 35-48.
- Wood, L., Frank, L. D., & Giles-Corti, B. 2010. Sense of community and its relationship with walking and neighborhood design. *Social Science & Medicine*, 70(9), 1381-1390.
- Yasin, M. Y., Yusoff, M. M., Abdullah, J., Noor, N. B. M., & Noor, N. Hj. Mohd. 2021. Urban sprawl literature review: Definition and driving force. *Geografia: Malaysian Journal of Society and Space*, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.17576/GEO-2021-1702-10>