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Summary of results

Gentrification, broadly defined as the influx of middle or upper-class households into poorer inner city neighbourhoods, has been a highly contested notion since it was first noticed in the 1960s. Beyond New York or London, it has since then become a process leaving no city in the global urban hierarchy untouched. While it may therefore seem like a simple outcome of a general tendency of a new post-industrial and global capitalism, it turns out to be a rather complex matter on local grounds. It is this complexity, so much neglected in current theory and practice, that we intend to accommodate in our new approach to the subject. As a result, our aim was to uncover the specific potentials and capacities inhering in the investigated neighbourhoods.

To this end, field work started by investigating the general, seemingly clear and distinct indicators and measurements of the institutional ecology surrounding the neighbourhood. Subsequently, the researchers have established what kind of interpretations and motivations inform that institutional science and technology. To widen our scope, the researchers have contrasted these with other interpretations of what was happening, coming from actors whose views are not easily translated into academic and policy documents (e.g. local entrepreneurs, marginalized residents). In the final step, the researchers have probed the practices that generated these interpretations and stories (e.g. playgrounds, cafes, community centres).

Moreover, they have found innovative practices, that is: seeds and capacities for positive change, that were overlooked by current perspectives on the neighbourhood. For the Demographic theme the results of this three-step approach can be summarized as follows: the researchers have come across many different metrics that promise to measure the ‘population’ of the neighbourhood, such as ethnic background. However, these metrics were not always consistent with daily practices and existing sentiments in the neighbourhood (in the literature sometimes referred to as social tectonics). Also, figures were selective: class information, for instance, has not been recorded. Finally, the researchers found several encounters and events (e.g. Ballroom, Night of Fashion) that entailed a temporary, yet defining (in terms of shared history) break – or perhaps better: eruption - from daily practices and sentiments.
Overall, the researchers found strong differences in manifestations and roles of ‘quantifying’ (metrics) and ‘qualifying’ (interpretative) practices, which are meeting, but also suppressing alternative and emergent aspirations and practices.

In Klarendal (Arnhem) the researchers observed the strong role of ‘experts’ and metrics, balanced by creative ‘city-makers’. In contrary, Cihangir (Instanbul) was characterized by political capture and resistance and a strong intrusion of what the actors involved conceive of as ‘capitalist’ practices and devices. In Rudolfsheim-Fünfhaus (Vienna), finally, the researchers observed how politics was mainly performed through community actors, with a strong role for intermediaries in developing local practices.
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