



GENTRIFICATION IN URBAN RENEWAL AND THE MARGINALIZATION OF LOW INCOME COMMUNITIES

Ahmad Fauzi

Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar, Indonesia

correspondence: ahmadfauzi157@gmail.com

Abstract

This article examines gentrification as an urban renewal process that can marginalize low income residents through rising land values, shifting neighborhood norms, and changing recognition within local social life. It develops a normative account of how redevelopment narratives legitimize selective belonging by linking respectability to consumption patterns and aesthetic order. The discussion argues that displacement often unfolds gradually, as households face accumulating costs, shrinking access to affordable services, and heightened administrative exposure. Even when residents remain in place, symbolic rebranding can erode attachment, weaken community solidarity, and reduce voice in neighborhood decision making. The paper highlights how public space regulation and intensified surveillance may redefine ordinary practices as disorder, producing exclusion without explicit removal. It also considers how tenure status shapes vulnerability, as renters confront insecurity while low income owners experience coercive market pressure and reputational strain. The central claim is that renewal becomes unjust when it converts homes into investment assets and treats long standing communities as obstacles to value creation. The article closes by outlining principles for equitable urban change grounded in affordability, procedural fairness, and social recognition.

Keywords: gentrification, urban renewal, low income residents, displacement, neighborhood change, housing justice, social recognition.

Introduction

Urban renewal is often understood as an effort to improve spatial quality, enhance orderliness, and provide better public services. In policy language, renewal appears as a promise of a safer environment, easier access, and a city image considered modern. Every major change in our environment will certainly influence how people think and act in daily life (Darmawan et al., 2021a). However, in the experience of residents, changes in urban space are rarely neutral because they touch upon homes, jobs, social networks, and the sense of belonging to the environment in which they live. When space is reshaped through arrangement projects, the meaning of who is "worthy" of living in an area also changes. Areas once considered ordinary can become high-value zones after being given new infrastructure, new aesthetics, and narratives that attract investment. This change produces a shift in the patterns of daily life, ranging from shopping habits and social interaction to the way residents access facilities. At a certain point, long-time residents may feel that their place of residence has become foreign, as if unwritten rules regarding behavior, appearance, and consumption have also changed. From this, it is evident that urban renewal is not merely a physical task, but a social process that rearranges relations between groups within urban space (Lees, 2008). This condition indicates that there is a wide gap between different social groups within a single urban area (Fauzi, 2021).

Gentrification is a term often used to explain the process of urban area change followed by an increase in spatial value and the influx of higher-income groups. This process is visible through building renovations, the growth of specific commercial businesses, and shifts in lifestyle promoted as the new standard. In daily life, these changes can be seen in rising rent prices, changes in the types of shops available, and changes in how public spaces are utilized. It is important to remember that every region possesses natural wealth and economic potential that could actually be developed to help the local community (Darmawan et al., 2021b). Low-income residents who have lived in the area for a long time often face a dilemma between staying and adapting or finding other more affordable places. This dilemma is not just a matter of the ability to pay, but a matter of losing the social security built over many years. Neighborhood networks, mutual aid systems, and proximity to sources of

livelihood become difficult things to replace if relocation occurs (Davidson, 2008). At the same time, the renewal narrative can position long-time residents as obstacles, as if their presence diminishes the value of the area. This narrative forms a subtle stigma that influences how institutions, investors, and newcomers treat poor urban communities. Inequality issues like this have actually existed for a long time and continue to make certain groups weaker than others (Gani, 2022).

The city is also an arena for the struggle over the meaning of habitable space. Governments, developers, and some middle-class residents often speak of order, security, and cleanliness as reasons for restructuring. Meanwhile, poor urban communities define space as a place for survival, a place to raise families, and a place to build solidarity. It is important for us to see how people try to balance their time between work and personal affairs amidst urban pressures (Eddine & Darmawan, 2022). When renewal projects emphasize aesthetics and image, the basic needs of long-time residents can be marginalized because they do not fit the city image intended to be displayed. This difference in meaning gives birth to tensions felt in space-use regulations, restrictions on informal economic activities, and tightened surveillance. Residents working in daily-income sectors are highly dependent on the proximity of work locations, access to transport, and affordability of living costs. If an area becomes more expensive, the burden of living increases slowly but surely. In the residents' experience, this pressure often appears cumulatively, starting from rent costs and shopping expenses to education costs that adjust to the new environment. Thus, gentrification needs to be understood as a social change that rearranges the viability of life through spatial value mechanisms and moral judgments about who is considered worthy of occupying the city (Glass, 1960). Unhealthy and unjust environmental conditions often become an additional burden for communities living on the periphery (Issalillah & Mardikaningsih, 2022).

The transformation of areas toward gentrification often occurs alongside changes in regulatory frameworks, including business licensing, building standards, and ownership schemes. These changes may benefit certain parties, yet they can also tighten the requirements for long-time residents to remain. When building standards are raised without considering the residents' ability to renovate their homes, the risk of

eviction increases through administrative channels (Smith, 2002). When specific business permits are prioritized, small community businesses can be pushed out by more capital-intensive enterprises. In daily life, low-income residents often experience these changes as a loss of space for negotiation. Activities once considered normal may suddenly be deemed disruptive for instance, trading in front of one's house or gathering in open spaces at certain hours. This is certainly related to how the community can participate and have a voice in every decision-making process within their environment (Rojak, Khayru, & Darmawan, 2021). Such assessments form social pressures that are not always recorded in project documents but strongly influence the sense of security. At this point, gentrification works through two paths simultaneously: an economic path through rising costs and a social path through changes in spatial norms. Both interlock and push poor urban communities into increasingly vulnerable positions. Even family matters, such as the best protection for children, can be disrupted due to the uncertainty of living situations (Fajar, Darmawan, & El-Yunusi, 2021).

Gentrification is also linked to the symbolic transformation of an area the change in image and identity produced through promotion, media, and spatial design. Areas that were previously unremarkable may be positioned as new destinations, framed by narratives of being creative, tourist-friendly, or high-class. These narratives invite a flow of visitors and consumption, which then shifts the orientation of the space from a living space to a commodity space. In that process, the presence of long-time residents may be seen as inconsistent with the image being sold, leading to pressure to tidy up, discipline, or relocate. This pressure can manifest through parking regulations, restrictions on street vendors, or the clearing of housing deemed unfit. For poor urban communities, symbolic change can feel like a loss of recognition. They remain in the same place, yet their social value in the eyes of others diminishes because the area's identity has been replaced. A loss of recognition can trigger conflict between newcomers and long-time residents, especially when differences in lifestyle and noise standards become grounds for mutual blame (Zukin, 1987). Thus, gentrification does not merely displace people; it can also displace the meaning of who holds the moral right to urban space. Indeed, the reality remains that there are still many difficulties in

obtaining equal opportunities to progress, particularly regarding education (Rojak & Khayru, 2022).

The main problem in the discussion of gentrification and poor urban communities lies in the tension between the goals of renewal and the right to adequate housing. Renewal is often positioned as a common good, while its social consequences are treated as a reasonable cost. This way of thinking raises normative issues because it places low-income groups as parties who must adapt to changes they did not design. In many situations, adaptation means accepting an increase in the cost of living, accepting changes in services that are no longer affordable, or accepting displacement that severs social networks. When discussions about renewal emphasize increasing the economic value of an area, the rights of long-time residents are often reduced to administrative matters such as rental status or documentation completeness. This reduction ignores the social dimension of the home as a space of identity and a space of relationships (Marcuse, 1985). Consequently, the measurement of renewal success can become narrow, assessing success based on physical appearance and investment without examining whether poor urban communities can still live with dignity in the same area. We must realize that justice must be felt by everyone without exception so that no one feels left behind (Fraser, 2008). This issue drives the need for a conceptual description that places urban justice as a moral measure for spatial change.

Another problem arises from the way gentrification forms gradual marginalization, which is often difficult to recognize as forced displacement. Displacement is not always in the form of direct eviction, but can take the form of cost pressures that make staying impossible. When rent rises, service costs increase, and consumption needs change to follow the environment, low-income residents face a decline in their ability to survive. This gradual marginalization can appear as a voluntary decision to move, even though that decision is produced by price structures and changes in spatial norms. On the other hand, residents who remain may experience a decline in quality of life because they must reduce essential expenditures, increase working hours, or live in anxiety regarding the future of their residence. At the community level, gradual marginalization erodes solidarity as neighbors leave one by one, and mutual aid structures weaken. Essentially, we need concrete steps so that life in the city can be

fairer for anyone (Rojak & Khayru, 2022). Therefore, the discussion of gentrification requires an explanation of the subtle mechanisms that transform living space into a space of social selection.

This study aims to organize a conceptual understanding of gentrification as a social process that accompanies urban renewal and can marginalize poor urban communities. Without an orderly understanding, renewal is easily treated as a technical and aesthetic agenda, while changes in social relations and the distribution of life viability are less visible. A normative description is needed to assess the fairness of changes in spatial value, the fairness of the distribution of the burden of change, and the moral obligations of public institutions and market actors toward residents who have long built their lives in an area. Furthermore, this type of writing helps distinguish physical improvements that truly enhance the dignity of residents from changes that rearrange the city solely for the interests of consumption and investment. By clarifying the mechanisms of gradual marginalization, this writing can also strengthen an adequate academic language to explain the loss of social networks, the loss of a sense of belonging, and changes in regional identity as part of the issue of urban justice (Valli, 2015). Each of these arguments seeks to answer the challenge of how a modern city can still provide space for social justice.

The purpose of this writing is to formulate a conceptual framework regarding gentrification as an urban renewal process that can marginalize low-income indigenous populations through economic, symbolic, and institutional mechanisms. The description is directed toward explaining how spatial values and regional norms change, and how these changes shift the ability of the urban poor to survive, maintain social networks, and maintain recognition as a legitimate part of the area. This objective also emphasizes the normative implications regarding urban justice, especially concerning the fairness of the distribution of renewal benefits and the fairness of the distribution of its social burdens. The results of this writing are expected to provide a rationale for more responsible renewal policies and provide conceptual tools for readers to evaluate urban change from the perspective of the right to housing and community dignity.

Method

Method This study employs a qualitative literature review to build normative arguments regarding gentrification and the marginalization of poor urban communities. The search for sources is directed toward academic works discussing urban renewal, shifts in spatial value, gradual displacement, and changes in regional identity. The selection of materials emphasizes conceptual clarity and reasoning coherence to ensure the discussion does not get trapped in development slogans. Singleton and Straits (2018) emphasize that social research requires an orderly design, particularly in aligning research questions with the methods of selecting and organizing sources. Kalof and Dan (2008) highlight the importance of conceptual precision in social research, as vague concepts will yield conclusions that are easily contested. In this study, repetitive readings were conducted to identify core themes, distinguish between similar terms, and map the relationships between ideas such as spatial value, the right to the city, social recognition, and changes in regional norms.

The processing of materials is carried out through thematic synthesis, which organizes arguments into several clusters, such as cost-increase mechanisms, regulatory changes, symbolic shifts, and changes in community social networks. Bailey (2008) emphasizes the need for methodological discipline in separating descriptive statements from explanatory statements, allowing the scientific narrative to demonstrate how social processes operate. Fowler Jr (2013) outlines the principle of rigor in survey research, which in this study is used as a reference to understand the importance of clear definitions, reliable categories, and caution in drawing conclusions from written sources. The validity of the argumentation is maintained through logical consistency, the traceability of the reasoning flow, and cross-checking between sources that contain differing viewpoints. Because this writing is normative and does not present numerical data, its primary strength lies in the precision of categories and the ability to conceptually explain the mechanisms of marginalization.

Result and Discussion

Gentrification can be understood as a process of regional change that combines physical rejuvenation, a shift in social composition, and a change in meaning regarding the suitability of living (Bereitschaft, 2020). This

process does not occur as a single, easily marked event, but rather as a series of mutually reinforcing changes. Physical changes such as road repairs, building renovations, or the presence of new commercial spaces are often accompanied by narratives of quality improvement. These narratives shape the perception that an area is "moving up," and this perception drives changes in market behavior toward the space. As the perception of upward mobility strengthens, rental and sale values tend to move according to profit expectations. In such conditions, the urban poor face changes that test their ability to survive, because the home is no longer treated as a place to live, but as an investment asset. At the social level, this change shifts relations between residents because newcomers bring different norms regarding cleanliness, noise, and the use of public space. Social inequality issues like this are indeed a major challenge when we try to build harmony in the midst of a constantly developing city (Mardikaningsih, 2021). Thus, gentrification forms a social selection that works through prices and norms simultaneously, so that marginalization can occur without the need for visible or harsh displacement actions.

The economic mechanism that often stands out in gentrification is the shift in the cost of living that exceeds the income growth of long-time residents. The cost of living is not only related to rent but also to daily consumption, services, and the cost of accessing facilities that have changed. When shop types change and cheap options decrease, poor households face recurring expenditure pressures. When facing an uncertain economic situation, everyone is required to be able to adapt and find ways to survive (Arifin & Darmawan, 2022). This pressure reduces economic breathing room, forcing families to make decisions that sacrifice essential needs. In social experience, sacrifices can take the form of reducing food quality, delaying healthcare, or increasing working hours. Increased working hours decrease the time available to nurture family relationships and weaken participation in community activities. Double burdens like this are often felt more heavily, especially for women who must work while also managing the household (Khairi, 2021). At this point, gentrification changes the time structure of residents' lives. Time that was once used for mutual aid and maintaining the environment becomes time used to seek additional income. This change in time structure accelerates the fragility of local solidarity (Paulla & Wakhidah,

2020). Consequently, marginalization can occur through economic pathways that appear normal in the market but produce broad social consequences for the welfare and integration of poor urban communities.

Gentrification also works through institutional mechanisms that change residents' access to protection (Shaw & Hagemans, 2015). When an area is considered strategic, administrative attention increases, including building inspections, permit enforcement, and the enforcement of land-use regulations. Increased enforcement can be seen as an effort toward orderliness; however, for low-income residents living with limited resources, enforcement can become a source of threat. The application of environmental and legal rules should indeed be carried out fairly so that all parties feel protected (Nuraini et al., 2021). Homes built gradually with limited means can be treated as unfit, even though those homes are the result of long-term work and adaptation. In such situations, incomplete documentation or non-compliance with technical standards becomes an entry point for displacement. This mechanism is administrative in nature, thus appearing neutral, but its effects can be highly selective. Residents who have legal access and administrative knowledge are better able to survive, while those who are weak tend to lose their bargaining position. Without strong protection, the most vulnerable groups, such as street children, will find it increasingly difficult to break out of their cycle of problems (Aidan Bin Abdullah, 2021). This selective process demonstrates that gentrification is not merely the work of the market, but also the work of institutions that determine who is considered legitimate. Thus, the marginalization of poor urban communities can occur through rules that appear reasonable but are applied to unequal social conditions.

The symbolic change of an area is an element that often reinforces gentrification (Mironenko et al., 2020). When an area is promoted as a new destination, the old identity of the area can be regarded as an image burden. The old identity is often linked to the lives of workers, the informal economy, and simple forms of housing. In fact, maintaining traditions amidst the progress of the times is very important for indigenous people in urban areas (Amri & Khayru, 2022). In regional promotion, these elements may be erased or polished to suit specific consumption tastes. This symbolic erasure is not merely an aesthetic change, but a

change in recognition. Long-time residents may feel that their stories are no longer recognized as part of the area. When recognition declines, the moral position of long-time residents weakens in spatial conflicts for example, when they demand space for trading or activities. They can be viewed as disrupting the new order. Therefore, it is crucial for residents to participate in maintaining the environment and providing social support to one another (Zulkarnain et al., 2021). Here, marginalization takes place through stigma and judgment. Stigma makes the complaints of long-time residents less heard, while the complaints of newcomers are more quickly considered a regional problem. Thus, gentrification builds a hierarchy of voices. This hierarchy of voices influences decisions because those whose voices are deemed legitimate can more easily change the rules. Consequently, symbolic change accelerates social displacement, even if physical displacement has not yet occurred.

The increase in spatial value often creates pressure on tenants, as the position of a tenant is usually more vulnerable than that of an owner. Tenants live in the uncertainty of contract renewals and the uncertainty of rent increases. When an area becomes attractive to investors, property owners have an incentive to replace old tenants with new ones who can afford to pay more. This process can take place through negotiations that appear voluntary but are actually driven by an imbalance of choices. It should be remembered that good public policy must be able to balance economic, social, and environmental affairs (Mardikaningsih & Hariani, 2021). Low-income tenants often have no equivalent alternatives, because proximity to work and social networks holds great value. When tenants are forced to move, they lose proximity to their children's schools, health facilities, and work routes that have been stable until now. This loss changes the cost of living and alters economic opportunities. Moreover, in suburban areas, daily mobility issues often make relationships between residents become distant (Wisnujati & Mardikaningsih, 2021). At the community level, tenant turnover weakens trust between neighbors, as people no longer know who lives around them. Trust is the social capital that maintains informal security and mutual aid. When trust weakens, an area can become more susceptible to conflict (Janoschka & Sequera, 2016). Thus, gentrification

marginalizes poor communities through pressure on tenants that undermines the stability of life and the stability of relationships.

For low-income homeowners, gentrification can appear as an opportunity because asset values increase (Shaw & Hagemans, 2015). However, an increase in asset value does not always mean an increase in the ability to survive, as maintenance costs, taxes, or service fees may also rise. In addition, social pressure to adapt the home to new aesthetic standards can create psychological and financial burdens. Homeowners who are unable to renovate may feel ashamed, watched, or perceived as damaging the area's image. This kind of pressure shows that gentrification operates in the realm of dignity. All these realities teach us that changes in the city are not just about buildings, but about how the people within them can continue to live decently (Aidan Bin Abdullah, 2021; Mardikaningsih, 2021). On the other hand, purchase offers may appear intensively, placing homeowners in an ambivalent situation between maintaining the home as a social heritage and letting it go for a seemingly large sum of money. This choice is not entirely a free one, as a more expensive regional future can make staying difficult. When owners sell their homes, the community loses the social anchors that have maintained continuity. Thus, marginalization is not always through eviction, but through decisions produced by accumulated economic and social pressures, so that even ownership does not always provide complete protection for the urban poor.

For low-income homeowners, gentrification can appear as an opportunity because asset values increase (Ernst & Doucet, 2014). However, an increase in asset value does not always mean an enhanced ability to survive, as maintenance costs, taxes, or service fees may also rise. In addition, social pressure to adapt the home to new aesthetic standards can create psychological and financial burdens. Homeowners who are unable to renovate may feel ashamed, watched, or perceived as damaging the area's image. This kind of pressure shows that gentrification operates in the realm of dignity. Amidst difficult situations, honesty and strong moral principles remain the most important things so that true justice can be achieved (Saktiawan et al., 2021). On the other hand, purchase offers may appear intensively, placing homeowners in an ambivalent situation between maintaining the home as a social heritage and letting it go for a

seemingly large sum of money. This choice is not entirely a free one, as a more expensive regional future can make staying difficult (Weller & Hulten, 2012). When owners sell their homes, the community loses the social anchors that have maintained continuity. Thus, marginalization is not always through eviction, but through decisions produced by accumulated economic and social pressures, so that even ownership does not always provide complete protection for the urban poor.

Gentrification can also change the relationship of residents with public space (Mazer & Rankin, 2011). Public spaces that were previously used for gathering, children's play, or community activities can be reorganized with stricter regulations (Gałkowski & Antosz, 2022). Regulations may emphasize cleanliness and security, but they can also restrict social practices that characterize the lives of long-time residents. In fact, the knowledge and way of life of local communities are actually very useful for maintaining our environmental sustainability (Nurmalasari & Nuraini, 2021). When gathering is considered disruptive, the community loses its place to nurture solidarity. When small-scale trading is restricted, families lose a source of additional income. Furthermore, increased surveillance can make long-time residents feel treated as suspects, especially if their appearance is deemed inconsistent with the area's image. The experience of being treated as such wounds dignity and reduces the sense of belonging. A sense of belonging is important because it encourages residents to look after the environment. Education that begins within the family environment also greatly helps in forming an attitude of caring for the surrounding nature (Safira et al., 2022). If the sense of belonging weakens, the residents' relationship with the area becomes fragile. Within a normative framework, public space should be a shared space that provides room for a diversity of social practices, not a space filtered for the convenience of a certain group. Thus, the change of public space in gentrification demonstrates how renewal can transform the right to the city into an implicit right for those who meet certain consumption and behavioral norms.

The marginalization of poor urban communities often results in the displacement of social networks that previously functioned as informal protection systems (Chum, 2015). In many areas, neighborhood networks provide emergency assistance, job information, and childcare

support (Schnake-Mahl et al., 2020). These friendships usually grow because of shared hobbies or interests among urban residents (Rejeki, 2021). In addition, we must also pay attention to how today's society greets and gathers through a digital world that has begun to change (Darmawan, 2021). These networks are formed through proximity and trust maintained over a long period. When gentrification drives the displacement of residents one by one, those networks unravel. The unraveling of networks is not always realized by outsiders because it is not seen as physical damage. However, for residents, the damage to the network means a loss of security. When there are no known neighbors, people feel alone in facing daily risks. This sense of being alone increases vulnerability, especially for the elderly, single mothers, or daily workers. Furthermore, the loss of networks reduces the community's ability to convey a collective voice in local policy matters. Scattered residents find it difficult to gather and difficult to formulate common demands. Therefore, a sense of togetherness must be maintained even though every person has their own business and freedom (Saputra & Darmawan, 2021). Consequently, gentrification weakens the political capacity of poor urban communities. This process is normatively important because urban justice is not merely about the existence of services, but also about the ability of residents to maintain a dignified social life and their ability to participate in matters that determine their living space.

The shift in social norms between newcomers and long-time residents often triggers conflicts that appear trivial yet are repetitive (Vigdor, 2002). Conflicts can range from noise, hours of activity, waste disposal methods, to the way sidewalks are used. For newcomers, certain standards are considered reasonable because they align with their lifestyle and expectations for an area purchased at a high price. For long-time residents, specific daily practices are considered reasonable because they align with the community's work patterns and habits. Often, negative views toward certain groups actually make social inequality even harder to rectify (Sajjapong et al., 2022). When standards collide, the party with greater social influence tends to win the definition of "normal." This definition of normal is then translated into formal rules or informal enforcement. If long-time residents are deemed non-compliant, they may experience pressure to adapt or leave. This pressure is not always an explicit prohibition, but rather repeated

reprimands, complaints, or labeling. Labeling makes long-time residents feel unappreciated, leading them to withdraw from shared spaces. Withdrawal reduces their visibility and weakens their claim over the area. Thus, gentrification produces marginalization through normative conflicts that alter who is considered worthy of being present, who is considered a nuisance, and who is considered to have the moral right to determine the rules of communal living.

Urban renewal is often justified through the language of public interest; however, public interest needs to be defined fairly (Leeuwen, 2020). If public interest is understood merely as an increase in the economic value of an area, then groups unable to keep up with that economic value will be marginalized. Within a normative framework, public interest should encompass the protection of the right to stay, access to affordable services, and respect for the social networks that support the lives of the poor. When renewal ignores these aspects, it transforms into a redistribution mechanism that benefits groups with high purchasing power. This redistribution can occur without explicit ill intent because it is shaped by market logic and the logic of image. We must remember that justice and equal opportunity must be felt by anyone in both work and social life (Sajjapong et al., 2022). Yet, the consequence remains a matter of justice. Therefore, discussions of gentrification need to evaluate policy tools that allow price to regulate who is permitted to stay. If price becomes the sole filter, the city loses its social function as a space for shared living. In such circumstances, poor urban communities are displaced to the periphery, far from job opportunities and services, which then reinforces inequality. Ultimately, we all have a responsibility to help one another for the good of the many (Saputra & Darmawan, 2021). Thus, gentrification becomes a moral and political issue regarding the right to the city, not merely an aesthetic issue of renewal.

Gentrification often gives rise to a form of displacement that is psychological before it is physical (Shaw, 2008). Long-time residents may remain in place but feel they are no longer part of the area. They feel viewed as outsiders in the place they once built. This feeling arises from changes in symbols, changes in interaction, and changes in institutional responses to resident complaints. We must realize that technology and big data today also change the way we interact and perceive changes around us

(Wahyudi, Kabalmay, & Amri, 2021). When the complaints of long-time residents are dismissed, they learn that the value of their voice has diminished. When gathering spaces shrink, they lose the place to assert their community identity. When prices rise, they reduce their participation in neighborhood activities because they feel unable to keep up. Psychological displacement has serious consequences because it severs emotional ties to a place. Emotional ties are important for social health and for the motivation to care for the environment. If the bond is broken, residents live in an exhausting sense of transience. Within a normative framework, psychological displacement shows that the right to stay is not merely about physical presence, but the right to be recognized as an equal citizen. Gentrification threatens this equality when social recognition is filtered by lifestyle and purchasing power.

The process of gentrification is also related to changes in the forms of citizen participation in regional decision-making (Kohn, 2013). Renewal often involves resident meetings, consultation forums, or grievance mechanisms. However, access to these processes is not always equal. Low-income residents face time constraints, information limitations, and administrative capacity hurdles. Meanwhile, newcomers often possess the resources to follow the process, lodge objections, and influence the agenda. The government actually holds an important role in ensuring that all public services are truly directed toward the interests of the broader community (Rojak, 2021). When participation is unequal, regional decisions tend to reflect the preferences of the more capable group. These preferences may include restrictions on vendors, tightening of parking rules, or public space designs that are less friendly to the old community's activities. Within a normative framework, participation is a condition for the legitimacy of spatial change. If participation is merely a formality, renewal loses its moral foundation. Furthermore, inequality in participation alters the relationship between citizens and institutions, as long-time residents feel the procedures do not belong to them. This feeling reinforces apathy and accelerates marginalization. Thus, gentrification is closely linked to procedural justice specifically, who can influence the decisions that determine their living space.

The relationship between gentrification and security is often framed problematically (Marcuse, 2015). Renewal is frequently associated

with increased security, as if security can only be achieved through the disciplining of poor residents and the restriction of informal activities. This framing positions poverty as a threat rather than a social condition requiring protection. Therefore, every public policy must be based on strong legal rules to guarantee the welfare of all citizens (Rizky & Udjari, 2021). When security is understood as the removal of signs of poverty, enforcement can target long-time residents disproportionately. Residents active in public spaces may be deemed suspicious, even though they are simply conducting their daily lives. Within a normative framework, security should mean safety for everyone, including safety from eviction and safety from stigma. If security is built at the expense of the dignity of a specific group, security transforms into a privilege. Gentrification can reinforce this privilege through spatial designs that invite consumption and expel activities that are not aligned. Thus, the discussion needs to emphasize the difference between security as a collective right and security as a tool for social selection. This difference determines whether urban renewal supports justice or deepens marginalization.

Shifts in public service systems within areas undergoing gentrification often create a mismatch between the needs of long-time residents and the provision of services (Dastrup & Ellen, 2016; Zuk et al., 2018). Services may be reorganized to support the mobility of newcomers, such as paid parking, specific transit lanes, or new commercial spaces. However, the needs of long-time residents are often tied to affordable access, close proximity, and space for community activities. If services follow purchasing power, long-time residents will experience a decline in access even if the area appears to improve. This decline in access demonstrates that the quality of a city cannot be measured by physical appearance, but by affordability and equality of use. It must be remembered that effective regulations are greatly needed to ensure that small communities can still obtain proper access to health and education (Suwito et al., 2021). Within a normative framework, a good city is one that allows various groups to live together without being forced out by costs. When renewal raises the cost of living without protection, renewal becomes a mechanism of displacement. Additionally, changes in services can affect the relationship between citizens and the state. If long-time residents see public services responding more quickly

to the needs of newcomers, the sense of injustice strengthens. This sense of injustice can trigger social conflict. Thus, gentrification demands a reading of how public services and regional design shape the distribution of life viability.

Gentrification can also affect children's schooling patterns and social interactions. When the social composition of an area changes, educational norms, extracurricular activities, and social expectations change as well (Kohn, 2013). Low-income families may experience pressure to keep up with new, more expensive standards. This pressure arises through social comparison and changes in surrounding services, such as the emergence of paid activities that are deemed normal. Education outside of school is also very important to help the community progress and play a role in change (Warin, 2022). If a family is unable to keep up, children may experience feelings of being different and marginalized in their social circles. These feelings affect self-confidence and a sense of security. Furthermore, when families are forced to move, children lose friends, routines, and proximity to their schools. These changes disrupt developmental stability. Within a normative framework, the city should provide protection for childhood through residential stability and equal access to education. Every parent has a great responsibility to instill values of goodness in their children at home (Safira et al., 2022). If urban renewal reduces that stability for poor families, then renewal creates intergenerational injustice. Intergenerational injustice is important because it shows that gentrification is not just a problem of today, but a problem of a family's life trajectory. Thus, the marginalization of poor urban communities needs to be understood as the marginalization of future opportunities.

The work patterns of the urban poor often depend on spatial proximity, whether it is proximity to markets, customers, or transport (Formoso et al., 2010). Gentrification that drives relocation to the periphery changes the structure of job opportunities. Travel time increases, transport costs rise, and flexibility decreases. For daily laborers, a small delay can mean a loss of income. Additionally, many informal jobs require local networks, such as regular customers or job information from neighbors. When these networks are severed, the ability to find work declines. The presence of new data and information in the present day

should help us understand these social issues better (Wahyudi, Kabalmay, & Amri, 2021). Within a normative framework, displacement that severs livelihoods is a form of impoverishment through spatial policy. This impoverishment can occur without a direct wage reduction because costs and access barriers increase. Thus, gentrification shifts the economic burden onto the most vulnerable families. Urban renewal that ignores local livelihood structures risks replacing one problem with another—namely, replacing a space that looks slum-like with a more hidden inequality. Therefore, the discussion of gentrification needs to emphasize the relationship between residence and livelihood as a unified life experience for the urban poor.

Changes in owner-tenant relationships are also part of the social system that shifts during gentrification (Paccoud, 2017). As the value of an area increases, relationships that were previously personal can transform into stricter contractual relations. Owners may place more emphasis on rules, fines, and requirements because the market provides many choices of tenants. Low-income tenants who previously had room for negotiation may lose that space. The loss of negotiation space leaves tenants living in tension, as a small mistake can lead to contract termination. Therefore, government governance oriented toward community service is greatly needed to mediate issues like this (Rojak, 2021). This tension affects health and the ability to work. Furthermore, harsh contractual relations can trigger avoidance for example, tenants being reluctant to report damages for fear of being seen as demanding. As a result, the quality of the housing declines. Within a normative framework, housing relations are not merely market relations but relations concerning basic rights. When relations become harsher without protection, injustice increases. Gentrification accelerates this change by shifting the orientation of ownership from providing a place to live to the acquisition of profit. Thus, the marginalization of poor urban communities can occur through shifts in social relations that appear legal and normal, yet produce chronic life insecurity.

The narrative of renewal success often emphasizes the reduction of slum conditions, but the term "slum" can oversimplify the reality of poor communities (Freeman, 2012). Many areas considered slums have organized social systems, strong solidarity, and economic patterns that

sustain life. When an area is labeled a slum, that label can be used to justify restructuring that provides no room for long-time residents. Such labels erase the ability of residents to tell the story of their own place. This shows how important it is for the community to obtain scholarships and assistance so they can continue to attend school and live healthily in their environment (Suwito et al., 2021). Within a normative framework, this kind of labeling is an issue of recognition. If residents are not recognized as subjects who possess knowledge of their space, then policies will tend to impose external standards. External standards often prioritize appearance and order, while ignoring affordability and social networks. Consequently, renewal produces spaces that look good but are unfriendly to long-time residents. Thus, gentrification can be driven by language that appears technical, even though that language contains moral judgments about who is considered worthy. Normative discussion needs to unravel how labels and policy narratives can function as social selection tools leading to marginalization.

Gentrification can also shape changes in class relations within urban spaces (Kohn, 2013). As an area becomes more exclusive, inter-class encounters may decrease or turn into mere service-based relationships. Long-time residents who remain may be positioned as service workers, such as parking attendants, cleaners, or other informal workers serving the consumption needs of newcomers. This relationship narrows the recognition of residents as equal neighbors. Through non-formal education, the community can actually learn to be more active and participate in building a better future together (Warin, 2022). In social experience, equal recognition is visible when people greet each other, respect one another, and give each other space. If relationships transform into those between users and service providers, the dignity of long-time residents can be eroded. Furthermore, changes between classes can affect how conflicts are resolved. Groups with greater influence tend to have access to formal channels, ensuring their complaints are quickly addressed. Poor groups tend to rely on less powerful informal channels. This inequality reinforces marginalization. Thus, gentrification needs to be seen as a change in the structure of class relations that transforms the city from a shared living space into a tiered consumption space.

Relocation to the periphery is often presented as a solution, but displacement carries heavy social consequences (Leeuwen, 2020). A new house in a different location does not automatically replace lost social networks. Distance from the workplace can trigger a decrease in income, and distance from services can increase costs. Additionally, relocation can cause a sense of loss of identity because residents lose the place-based stories that shaped them. Fundamentally, every development policy must remain mindful of social welfare as its primary foundation (Rizky & Udjari, 2021). Within a normative framework, relocation that does not maintain life viability and the continuity of social networks is an unjust displacement, even if conducted through formal procedures. The success of housing policy should be judged by the residents' ability to maintain a stable life, not merely by the availability of housing units. If relocation leaves residents living in uncertainty and alienation, then relocation increases vulnerability. Gentrification that drives such displacement strengthens urban inequality because the poor are moved far from centers of opportunity. Thus, urban renewal that results in displacement needs to be understood as a social change that shifts the burden to the weakest groups, thereby becoming a fundamental issue of justice.

In a normative sense, the right to the city includes the right to stay, the right to participate, and the right to be recognized as a legitimate part of urban life (Marcuse, 2015). Gentrification tests this right because it changes the conditions of presence through price and norms. If the right to the city is filtered by purchasing power, then the city becomes a space of economic selection. If the right to the city is filtered by lifestyle norms, then the city becomes a space of cultural selection. Both selections push the urban poor out of the spaces they have built. The life values taught within the family since childhood will become an important guide for children in facing challenges in the big city (Safira et al., 2022). Therefore, gentrification demands an assessment of the legitimacy of change. The legitimacy of change cannot be supported by physical benefits alone if those benefits are paid for with the loss of the social lives of long-time residents. In this framework, just urban renewal requires principles of fair benefit-sharing and burden-sharing, as well as recognition of the knowledge and needs of long-time residents. This discussion shows that marginalization is not a side effect, but an inherent

risk in the logic of renewal based on spatial value. Thus, gentrification must be understood as a social process that can gradually strip away the right to the city through mechanisms that appear normal in the language of the market and administration.

Gentrification marginalizes poor urban communities through changes in spatial value that drive cost increases, through changes in regional usage norms that filter social practices, and through shifts in social recognition that alter the moral position of long-time residents (Chaskin & Joseph, 2013). These three mechanisms work together and produce gradual marginalization, including psychological displacement, the weakening of social networks, and increasing life insecurity. Urban renewal that invites investment and consumption can turn homes into assets and turn public spaces into narrower arenas for community practices. Furthermore, institutional changes and rule enforcement can add administrative pressure for residents with limited resources. In essence, we must all strive so that every change that occurs still provides a sense of justice for low-income communities (Rizky & Udjari, 2021; Suwito et al., 2021). Thus, gentrification is not merely a movement of population, but a change in the regional social system that regulates who can survive. Normatively, this discussion places urban justice as a moral measure namely, whether spatial change maintains dignity, affordability, and recognition for long-time residents. If not, urban renewal risks becoming a social selection mechanism that deepens inequality and shifts the burden to the most vulnerable groups.

Conclusion

Gentrification is an urban renewal process that can marginalize poor urban communities through changes in spatial value, shifts in regional norms, and the erosion of social recognition for long-time residents. The increase in spatial value drives cost pressures that alter the ability to survive, especially for low-income tenants and homeowners who face an accumulation of living expenses. Changes in regional norms reorganize the use of public space and daily economic activities, meaning community practices once considered normal may be judged as inappropriate. The shift in social recognition emerges through changes in regional identity that diminish the legitimacy of long-time residents' voices and reinforce a

hierarchy of who is deemed fit to determine the rules of communal living. The triggers can include symbolic and institutional changes that appear neutral but are selective in their consequences because the social conditions of residents are unequal. Marginalization can also occur gradually, including psychological displacement and the weakening of social networks that previously served as informal protection systems. Normatively, gentrification positions the right to the city as a primary question concerning liveability, participation, and dignity.

Implications and suggestions emphasize the need to evaluate urban renewal through measures of urban justice that examine affordability, the sustainability of social networks, and equality of recognition. Spatial change needs to be understood as a change in life systems; therefore, policy design must avoid imposing costs and uncertainty on low-income groups. Regional decision-making processes need to position the participation of long-time residents as a substantive element of legitimacy, rather than a mere formal procedure. The arrangement of public spaces needs to respect the diversity of social practices and preserve space for the small-scale economies that sustain poor families. Conceptual suggestions for further research include clarifying categories of gradual marginalization, psychological displacement, and changes in recognition, so that the debate does not stop at physical indicators. Practical suggestions point toward strengthening tenant protections, ensuring security of tenure, and establishing accountability mechanisms that assess whether the benefits of renewal are shared collectively without excluding long-time residents from the spaces they have built.

References

- Aidan Bin Abdullah, M. H. 2021. Street Children and the Layered Failure of Protection Systems: An Analysis of Driving Factors and the Cycle of Vulnerability Reproduction. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*. 1(1), 93-112.
- Amri, M. W., & Khayru, R. K. 2022. Keeping Tradition in the Midst of Modernity: The Social Life of Indigenous Communities in Urban Areas. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 135-138.
- Arifin, S., & Darmawan, D. 2022. Adaptive Approach in Crisis Management for Economic Uncertainty in Organization. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 271-276.
- Bailey, K. 2008. *Methods of Social Research*. Simon and Schuster, New York.

- Bereitschaft, B. 2020. Gentrification central: A change-based typology of the American urban core, 2000–2015. *Applied Geography*, 118, 102206.
- Chaskin, R. J., & Joseph, M. L. 2013. 'Positive' gentrification, social control and the 'right to the city' in mixed-income communities: uses and expectations of space and place. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(2), 480-502.
- Chum, A. 2015. The impact of gentrification on residential evictions. *Urban Geography*, 36(7), 1083–1098.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2015.1049480>
- Darmawan, D et al. 2021. *Tanaman Perkebunan Prospektif Indonesia*, Penerbit Qiara Media, Pasuruan.
- Darmawan, D. et al. 2021. *Psychological Perspective in Society 5.0*, Zahir Publishing, Jogjakarta
- Darmawan, D. 2021. Social Interaction in Digital Society: Changes in Online Communication Patterns and Dynamics of Virtual Communities, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 325-350.
- Dastrup, S., & Ellen, I. G. 2016. Linking residents to opportunity: Gentrification and public housing. *Cityscape*, 18(3), 87-108.
- Davidson, M. 2008. Displacement, Space and Dwelling: Placing Gentrification Debate. *Ethics, Place & Environment*, 11(3), 251–270.
- Eddine, B. A. S. & D. Darmawan. 2022. Social Construction of Work Life Balance in Cultural and Organizational Norms, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(1), 213-234.
- Ernst, O., & Doucet, B. 2014. A window on the (changing) neighbourhood: The role of pubs in the contested spaces of gentrification. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, 105(2), 189-205.
- Fajar, A. S. M., Darmawan, D., & El-Yunusi, M. Y. M. 2021. The Principle of the Child's Best Interests in Custody and Post-Divorce Care. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 113-128.
- Fauzi, A. 2021. Spatial Patterns of Poverty and Social Segregation in Metropolitan Areas, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 147-160.
- Formoso, D., Weber, R., & Atkins, M. S. 2010. Gentrification and urban children's well-being: tipping the scales from problems to promise. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 46(3), 395–412. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10464-010-9348-3>
- Fowler Jr, F. J. 2013. *Survey Research Methods*. Sage Publications, New York.
- Fraser, N. 2008. Social justice in the age of identity politics: Redistribution, recognition, and participation. In *Geographic thought* (pp. 72-89). Routledge.
- Freeman, L. 2012. *Gentrification and Well-Being*. 280–286.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-047163-1.00006-0>
- Gałkowski, M., & Antosz, P. 2022. The hidden boundaries of public space: Awareness of civil rights restrictions in privatized urban squares in Poland. *Cities*, 127, 103722.

- Gani, A. 2022. The Colonialism-Vulnerability Nexus: A Political Ecology Study of Structural Inequality in Climate Change. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(1), 85-108.
- Glass, R. L. 1960. *London: aspects of change* (No. 3). MacGibbon & Kee.
- Issalillah, F., & Mardikaningsih, R. 2022. Environmental Justice and Health Burdens in Marginalized Communities Near Waste Sites. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(1), 145-168.
- Janoschka, M., & Sequera, J. 2016. Gentrification in Latin America: addressing the politics and geographies of displacement. *Urban Geography*, 37(8), 1175-1194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2015.1103995>
- Kalof, L., & A. Dan. 2008. *Essentials of Social Research*. McGraw Hill Education UK, Maidenhead.
- Khairi, M. 2021. Career Women, Double Burden, and Gendered Structures in Feminist Sociological Perspective. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 173-186.
- Kohn, M. 2013. What is wrong with gentrification. *Urban Research & Practice*, 6(3), 297-310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2013.846006>
- Lees, L. 2008. Gentrification and Social Mixing: Towards an Inclusive Urban Renaissance? *Urban Studies*, 45(12), 2449-2470.
- Leeuwen, B. van. 2020. What is the point of urban justice? Access to human space. *Acta Politica*, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1057/S41269-020-00178-0>
- Marcuse, P. 1985. Gentrification, Abandonment, and Displacement: Connections, Causes, and Policy Responses in New York City. *Washington University Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law*, 28, 195-240.
- Marcuse, P. 2015. Gentrification, Social Justice and Personal Ethics. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39(6), 1263-1269. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12319>
- 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.
- Mazer, K. M., & Rankin, K. N. 2011. The social space of gentrification: the politics of neighbourhood accessibility in Toronto's Downtown West. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 29(5), 822-839.
- Mironenko, O., Kalashnik, D., & Milavski, S. 2020. *Gentrification when development of unfavorable urban areas*. 2(2), 37-46. <https://doi.org/10.34031/2687-0878-2020-2-2-37-46>
- 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.
- Paccoud, A. 2017. Buy-to-let gentrification: Extending social change through tenure shifts. *Environment and Planning A*, 49(4), 839-856.
- Paulla, D. S., & Wakhidah, K. 2020. *Gentrification Impact to the Community's Quality of Life in Semarang Old Town*. 202, 02004. <https://doi.org/10.1051/E3SCONF/202020202004>
- Rejeki, S. 2021. Social Network Formation Through Shared Interest Communities in Urban Areas, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 227-250.
- Rizky, M. C., & Udjari, H. 2021. Reflections on Social Welfare Theory in the Juridical Foundation of Sustainable Public Policy. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 185-190.
- Rojak, J. A. 2021. The Effectively Leading Manifestation of Public Service-Oriented Governance. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 89-96.
- Rojak, J. A., & Khayru, R. K. 2022. Disparities in access to education in developing countries: Determinants, impacts, and solution strategies. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 31-38.
- 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.
- Safira, M. E., Aliyah, N. D., Evendi, W., & Yulianis, M. S. F. 2022. Parental Education in Shaping Children's Life Values at Home. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 131-134.
- Safira, M. E., Aliyah, N. D., Rodiyah, S. K., Nuraini, R., & Halizah, S. N. 2022. Fostering Pro-Environmental Learning through Family-Centered Education. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 243-248.
- Sajjapong, T., Darmawan, D., & Marsal, A. P. 2022. The Role of Social Stereotypes in Shaping Opportunities and Inequalities in Society: Their Impact on Education, Employment, and Intergroup Interactions. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 1(1), 44-49.
- Saktiawan, P., Hardyansah, R., Darmawan, D., & Putra, A. R. 2021. Ethical Principles in Indonesian Legal Advocacy: Sustaining Justice in Adversarial Systems Through Professional Integrity. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 239-244.
- 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.
- Schnake-Mahl, A. S., Jahn, J. L., Subramanian, S. V., Waters, M. C., & Arcaya, M. 2020. Gentrification, neighborhood change, and population health: a systematic review. *Journal of urban health*, 97(1), 1-25.

- Shaw, K. 2008. Gentrification: What It Is, Why It Is, and What Can Be Done about It. *Geography Compass*, 2(5), 1697-1728. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1749-8198.2008.00156.X>
- Shaw, K., & Hagemans, I. W. 2015. 'Gentrification Without Displacement' and the Consequent Loss of Place: The Effects of Class Transition on Low-income Residents of Secure Housing in Gentrifying Areas. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39(2), 323-341. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12164>
- Singleton, R., & B. C. Straits. 2018. *Approaches to Social Research*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Smith, N. 2002. New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy. *Antipode*, 34(3), 427-450.
- Suwito, Yulianis, M. S. F., Evendi, W., Zakki, M., & Mujito. 2021. Regulatory Effectiveness in Ensuring Access to Education and Child Health in Low Income Communities through Scholarship Equity. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 181-186.
- Valli, C. 2015. A Sense of Displacement: Long-time Residents' Feelings of Displacement in Gentrifying Bushwick, New York. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39(6), 1191-1208.
- Vigdor, J. L. 2002. *Does Gentrification Harm the Poor*. 2002(1), 133-182. <https://doi.org/10.1353/URB.2002.0012>
- Wahyudi, W., R. N. K. Kabalmay, & M. W. Amri. 2021. Big Data and New Things in Social Life. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 1-12.
- Warin, A. K. 2022. Reconstructing Community Futures Through Non-Formal Education for Participatory and Inclusive Social Advancement. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 183-188.
- Weller, S. A., & Hulten, A. van. 2012. Gentrification and Displacement: The Effects of a Housing Crisis on Melbourne's Low-Income Residents. *Urban Policy and Research*, 30(1), 25-42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08111146.2011.635410>
- Wisnujati, N. S. & R. Mardikaningsih. 2021. Urban Sprawl, Daily Mobility, and Community Cohesion in Suburban Fringe Areas, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 275-300.
- Zuk, M., Bierbaum, A. H., Chapple, K., Gorska, K., & Loukaitou-Sideris, A. 2018. Gentrification, displacement, and the role of public investment. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 33(1), 31-44.
- Zukin, S. 1987. Gentrification: culture and capital in the urban core. *Annual review of sociology*, 13(1), 129-147.
- Zulkarnain, M. A. B., Khayru, R. K., Issalillah, F., & da Cruz, C. 2021. Citizen Engagement in Ecological Issue Management through Participatory Practices and Community-Based Social Supports. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 227-232.