

COPYRIGHT NOTICE:

Rick Grannis: From the Ground Up

is published by Princeton University Press and copyrighted, © 2009, by Princeton University Press. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from the publisher, except for reading and browsing via the World Wide Web. Users are not permitted to mount this file on any network servers.

Follow links for Class Use and other Permissions. For more information send email to: permissions@press.princeton.edu

Neighborhoods and Neighboring

GEOGRAPHY AND COMMUNITY

Human behavior necessarily occurs within (or must transcend) physical space. Nowhere is this truer than in residential life. As real-estate agents and homeowners (especially those with children) often declare, where one makes one's home matters almost as much as what one does inside it. In the rapidly shrinking world of the twenty-first century, psychologists, economists, political scientists, and sociologists still acknowledge the importance of the neighborhood context.

Not all neighborhoods are alike, however. Some neighborhoods are characterized by high levels of effective community. They offer social capital to their residents, a social organization that facilitates and coordinates cooperative action for mutual benefit, which allows them to deal with daily life, seize opportunities, reduce uncertainties, and achieve ends that would not otherwise be possible.¹ This social organization is a resource that is not individually attainable because social capital is not a characteristic of individuals; it is a supraindividual property of social structure, and it seems to be particularly well grounded in neighborhood communities.² Sources of social capital tied to the neighborhood community are analytically distinct from, and are as consequential as, the more proximate family processes and relationships occurring in the home. Some neighborhoods develop a further layer of mutual trust and shared norms, values, and expectations,³ beyond the resource potential of neighbor networks, which allows them to use these networks to achieve desired outcomes. Collective efficacy occurs when members of a collectivity, with social capital resources, believe they are mutually able and willing to use them to achieve an intended outcome.⁴ The distinction is a subtle, but important, one. A neighborhood may have social capital resources available for its constituent residents to use, but they may not trust the willingness or ability

of their fellow residents to use these resource networks for the collective good, or they may not even be certain that they agree on what the collective good is.

From a less positive perspective, neighborhoods show remarkable continuities in patterns of criminal activity. For decades, criminological research in the ecological tradition has confirmed the concentration of interpersonal violence in certain neighborhoods, especially those characterized by poverty, the racial segregation of minority groups, and the concentration of single-parent families. Even in neighborhoods with less socioeconomic or racial isolation, crime rates persist despite the demographic replacement of neighborhood populations.⁵ In addition, neighborhoods not only determine one's exposure to crime and violence,⁶ but also a host of less tangible deleterious factors⁷ that contribute to the development of an urban underclass, signs of social disorder that lead residents to perceive their neighbors as threats rather than as sources of support or assistance.⁸

Researchers have taken a growing interest in the role of neighborhoods in shaping outcomes for children, families, and neighborhood residents in general.⁹ These "effects" have included phenomena ranging from child and adolescent development¹⁰ (e.g., abuse and maltreatment, school completion¹¹ and achievement,¹² drug use,¹³ deviant peer affiliation, delinquency¹⁴ and gangs,¹⁵ adolescent sexual activity¹⁶ and pregnancy,¹⁷ childbearing¹⁸ and parenting behaviors,¹⁹ etc.) to concentrated disadvantage and its many corollaries (restricted economic attainment²⁰ and labor market failure, crime²¹ and violence,²² physical disorder,²³ the perpetuation of racism,²⁴ to name just a few). The conclusion reached by all of these studies is that neighborhoods influence our behavior, attitudes, and values.²⁵ They shape the types of people we will become and expose us to or shield us from early hazards that might restrict the opportunities available to us later in life. After our homes, and in conjunction with them, neighborhoods are where we first learn whether the world is safe and cooperative or inchoate and menacing. The neighborhood one lives in matters.

Neighborhoods matter, but different neighborhoods matter in different ways. Different neighborhoods have different effects, of different magnitudes. Some neighborhoods have almost no effect. For the researcher, neighborhoods cluster outcomes that cannot be accounted for

in terms of the characteristics of the individuals or households currently residing in them. It is as if neighborhoods have personalities, enduring characteristics that survive the replacement of their constituent residents.²⁶ These neighborhood effects, however, necessarily involve a geographic context. Thus, to analyze and understand them, neighborhoods necessarily require a geographic equivalent.

Researchers have used a wide variety of such equivalents. In fact, “urban social scientists have treated ‘neighborhood’ in much the same way as courts of law have treated pornography: a term that is hard to define precisely, but everyone knows it when they see it.”²⁷

Apparently, however, researchers often don’t know it when they see it. Miller’s (1999) survey suggests that the modifiable areal unit problem (MAUP)²⁸ exists primarily because analysts decide beforehand on the spatial units they will use when they study a phenomenon.²⁹ Having done so, they reach conclusions about the phenomenon that are hopelessly prejudiced by their choice of spatial unit.

While many statistical techniques and error-modeling approaches have been used to counteract, reduce, or remove the effects of MAUP, Miller argues that the ultimate solution has to involve a behaviorally oriented definition of neighborhood for use in the practical measurement of neighborhood factors. One needs better intuitions about the general nature of neighborhoods, not better statistical methods. The very existence of the modifiable areal unit problem evidences that theory has taken a back seat. Those researchers³⁰ who have developed methods for creating optimal analytic units with respect to predefined objective functions note correctly that MAUP would be irrelevant if neighborhood equivalents were chosen for theoretical reasons rather than administrative convenience.³¹

Despite this need for a conception of neighborhoods that is tied to the behaviors and interactions of residents that produce these effects, however, when a geographic definition of neighborhood is required for the purpose of quantitative analysis, “most social scientists and virtually all studies of neighborhoods . . . rely on geographic boundaries defined by the Census Bureau or other administrative agencies . . . [that] offer imperfect operational definitions of neighborhoods for research and policy.”³² Administratively defined units such as census tracts and block groups do not directly measure, nor were they designed to measure,

the potential for interaction among residents, the primary process hypothesized to produce neighborhood communities and their effects. In most cases, the sheer ubiquity of data gathered by the Census Bureau or other administrative agencies (e.g., school districts, police districts) proves an overwhelming temptation for researchers. Theory succumbs to the preponderance of data.

As a result, sociologists often treat neighborhoods as if they were only colored boxes on a map or sets of geo-referenced variables for use in a geographic information system (GIS).³³ This approach often proves productive, but, like all plans, it emphasizes some aspects of what we are studying and de-emphasizes others. A focus on maps, especially maps based on census or administrative geography, emphasizes those aspects of neighborhoods and their residents that can be effectively displayed or associated with administratively defined polygons and ignores those that cannot. To understand the social-interactional aspect of neighborhoods, we may not have to think outside the box, but we do have to think about what's inside it.

In this book, I explore neighborhood communities and attempt to develop a more theoretically grounded neighborhood equivalent. Undoubtedly, neighborhood effects involve a geographic context. Neighborhood effects, however, are not produced by neighborhood geography. Nor are they—at least most of them—merely spatial effects, a by-product or spurious confound of the geographic location of residents with particular demographic characteristics or psychological profiles. I argue that cataloguing neighborhood effects, by definition, hypothesizes that there exists a thing, a social entity, a neighborhood community, that has effects. Neighborhood effects are the product of these neighborhood communities. I argue that neighborhood communities and their effects emerge from neighboring interactions among their constituent residents.

IT'S THE KIDS, STUPID!

Neighborhood communities and their effects involve children (e.g., child development and abuse, school achievement, delinquency, the development of racist attitudes) or adolescents (e.g., gangs, sexual activity

and pregnancy, drug use) either exclusively or primarily. For example, collective efficacy and segregation most powerfully affect children and adolescents. Furthermore, most discussion of neighborhood effects is developmental in nature, focusing on how neighborhoods, in addition to households, may manifest to us a world that is predictable and helpful or one that is capricious and dangerous. In doing so, they help mold the character of the adults we become.

The relationship between neighborhood communities and children is a problematic topic, however, because social researchers are adults and, despite their attempts at objectivity, view neighborhoods first through their own adult eyes. Another obstacle is that protocols for treatment of human subjects typically prevent researchers from interacting with non-adults. Thus, the scholarly view of neighborhoods often reflects adults theorizing about neighborhoods, adults observing neighborhoods, and adults talking to other adults. Children, however, do not relate to neighborhoods in the same ways that adults do.

Neighborhood communities are more relevant for households with children for at least three important reasons. First, households with children constitute about half of the population of American neighborhoods. According to the 2004 American Community Survey, conducted by the Census Bureau, slightly over half of all persons reside in households with children under 18 living in them.³⁴ Of these households with children, almost half³⁵ have very small children under six living in them. Thus, a majority of Americans live in households with minor children in them, and about a quarter of all Americans live in households with preschool children in them. Furthermore, researchers³⁶ have consistently found that the number of neighbors known is higher for households with children. Thus, these households with children are involved in a much larger majority of neighborly interaction.

Second, neighborhoods are especially important for households with children because children are less mobile, and thus more geographically dependent, than adults. Children and their playful interactions depend upon proximity much more than do adults and their interactions. Since children cannot drive and have little, if any, voice in decisions on where to live, they are forced to share lives with neighboring children even more than are their parents. For children, the street in front of their home is “the mediator between the wider community and the private

world of the family.”³⁷ This is where children first learn about the world. They often play games in the middle of these streets³⁸ and use them to walk pets and to ride bicycles, and the majority of their recreational activity occurs there.³⁹ Sidewalks provide access between residence and schools and parks. As a result, the relationships children form primarily depend upon the opportunities to interact provided by walking arenas immediately surrounding them.⁴⁰ Especially for young children, neighboring children are the most likely to become their playmates.⁴¹ Children are even affected by the extremely subtle geography of rain gutters and hedges.⁴² Thus, the networks of relationships they form will be much more dependent upon passive contacts occurring along them.⁴³ Unlike children, adults have many venues for social relationships beyond their neighborhood, including work and voluntary activities. School-age children may have some of these opportunities, to the extent their parents allow. Preschool children, however, have few, if any, of these alternative social venues. Their lives are tightly bound by geography.⁴⁴

Households with children are far more influenced by the norms and values of surrounding households with children than households in general are influenced by the norms and values of their surrounding neighbors. Your neighbors’ children are predisposed to become your children’s playmates and friends,⁴⁵ your neighbors may become some of the role models they emulate,⁴⁶ and thus the character of those living in neighboring households is a potentially powerful influence on your children.

Neighboring parents may become intimately involved in the socialization of your children. Neighbors rear children side by side⁴⁷ and together have the potential to co-create a safe and value-laden environment. Parents monitor their own children as well as those of their neighbors.⁴⁸ Some neighborhoods expect residents to share values and to be willing and able to intervene on behalf of children. In these neighborhoods, residents expect each other to actively cooperate in the support and social control of children.⁴⁹ Parents get to know the parents and families of their children’s friends, they observe children’s actions, both their own and their neighbors, in a variety of circumstances, they talk with other parents about their children, and they establish norms.⁵⁰ Such structural and normative adult-child closure gives children social

support, provides parents with information, and facilitates control.⁵¹ The choice to live in a neighborhood is to some extent a choice to rear children together with one's neighbors.⁵²

Ultimately, a community of parents may develop around the community of children, mirroring it. People whose children play together form friendship relations based in part on that fact.⁵³ While it is the children who are immobile, confined to neighborhoods, and most immediately affected by them, children's geographic dependence encumbers their parents as well.

A third reason neighborhoods are important for households with children is that most school-age children attend schools in their neighborhood. This pattern affects households because school quality plays an important role in the decision on where to live, both for families who currently have children and for those who think they might some day. Spatially defined neighborhoods typically determine the quality of the public schools one's children have access to.⁵⁴ For households with children, the quality of its school district may be one of the most important aspects of a residence under consideration.⁵⁵ Parents often choose their neighborhood (and even pay more in housing and taxes)⁵⁶ to gain access to particular school districts.⁵⁷ Furthermore, school catchment areas may complement any effect of walking arenas, onto which they may be intentionally mapped, since children often walk to school.

In review, when one considers neighborhood communities, most of the effects researchers concern themselves with involve children or adolescents. This results in large part because households with children constitute the majority of American households; because children are much less mobile than adults and this affects both them directly, their parents, and their families; and because most school-age children attend schools in their neighborhood. Children and their families are the quintessence of neighborhood life.

During Bill Clinton's 1992 presidential campaign, Democratic Party strategist James Carville hung a sign with three bullet points on it in Clinton's Little Rock campaign office to keep everybody "on message." The most famous, reminiscent of the KISS⁵⁸ principle, was "It's the economy, stupid!" When we study neighborhood communities and

their effects, it is worth hanging an imaginary sign in front of us to keep us on track.

“It’s the kids, stupid!”

OVERVIEW OF THE BOOK

The neighborhood one lives in matters. Neighborhoods influence behaviors, attitudes, and values; they shape outcomes for families, and they provide (or fail to provide) resources for residents to achieve or avoid outcomes collectively. While it is the community aspect of neighborhoods that influences norms and values and that generates social capital and collective efficacy, to analyze and understand neighborhoods requires a geographic equivalent for them. Many current neighborhood equivalents, however, imperfectly map onto the interactional processes generating the geographic outcomes being measured. In this book, I attempt to develop a more theoretically grounded neighborhood equivalent, mapping the neighboring interactions that produce neighborhood communities.

I argue that neighborhood communities are geographically constrained because the interactions that produce them are geographically constrained. In fact, because children are much more geographically constrained than adults, children and their families are the quintessence of neighboring and neighborhood communities. More importantly, I argue that neighborhood communities are both geographically identifiable and have effects that persist through the replacement of their constituent residents because the networks of interactions that produce them, that translate neighbor-level interactions into neighborhood communities, are constrained by predictable urban geographic substrates. Finally, I show that commonly used administrative units are not those substrates.

In chapter 2, I focus on the neighboring relation that forms the basis of neighborhood communities. I argue that the neighboring relationship develops in stages, each stage superimposed on the previous one. In the definitions used in this book, a stage 1 neighboring relation exists between two individuals if they are geographically available to each other. A stage 2 neighboring relation exists between two residents when

their lifestyles cause them to casually and unintentionally encounter each other and thus to have the opportunity to learn about each other through observation and to acknowledge each other's presence or choose not to. A stage 3 neighboring relation exists between two residents if they have intentionally initiated contact. A stage 4 neighboring relation exists when two residents engage in a substantial activity that indicates mutual trust or a realization of shared norms and values, when they share a belief in each other's willingness and ability to act together to achieve a common goal, when they influence each other, either actively or passively. Neither stage 3 nor stage 4 implies that the involved parties understand their relationship to be intimate or strong in the sense of having a friendship or an affective bond.

These stages of neighboring develop in a logical order, with lower stages necessarily preceding higher stages. Two people cannot be neighbors in any sense if they are not geographically available to each other. While two people can be geographically available to each other and have no passive contacts, they cannot have such unintentional encounters unless they are geographically available to each other. Similarly, while two people can have passive contacts and choose to ignore each other or to actively avoid such contacts, they cannot interact without having encountered each other. Finally, while two people can interact at a superficial level only, they cannot develop mutual trust without some interaction.

In chapter 3, I revisit stage 1 neighboring in more detail. This initial stage occurs when we are geographically available to each other. While this availability is often conceptualized in terms of neighborhood-sized distances and the absence of neighborhood-sized boundaries, I conceptualize stage 1 neighboring in terms of neighbor-sized distances and the absence of neighbor-sized boundaries. Neighboring is primarily dependent upon extremely short distances, walking arenas such as tertiary face blocks and tertiary intersections,⁵⁹ because stage 2 neighboring, that is, passive or unintentional contact, relies upon pedestrian encounters.

In chapter 4, I turn to the networks formed by the concatenation of these neighboring relations. Some (perhaps all, perhaps none) of stage 3 neighbor networks translate into stage 4 neighbor networks. Some (perhaps all, perhaps none) of stage 2 neighbor networks translate into

stage 3 neighbor networks. Some (perhaps all, perhaps none) of stage 1 neighbor networks translate into stage 2 neighbor networks. No neighbor networks, however, develop where there are not already stage 1 networks in place. This is why an accurate definition of stage 1 neighbor relations is so important. Most sociological studies of neighborhoods use administrative geography that implicitly defines two households to be stage 1 neighbors if they live in the same administratively defined area. It is not clear, however, whether residents of these spatially defined analytic units are geographically available to each other. In place of administratively defined areas, I define two new neighborhood equivalents, in terms of the concatenated network of walking arenas as represented by tertiary face blocks. These neighborhood equivalents differ only by the intersections they allow to connect face blocks with each other. The first, *t*-communities, uses only tertiary intersections, while the second, *islands*, uses all intersections.⁶⁰ While I expect *t*-communities to have more pronounced effects, I include *islands* to measure the potency of nontertiary intersections. Both these new neighborhood equivalents focus on the potential for passive contacts, or unintentional encounters, and thus the interactional aspect of neighborhoods.

In chapter 5, I conceptualize the foundations of neighborhood communities in terms of two forces: selection and influence. Households relocate, at least in part, to choose the type of households they want to have as stage 1 neighbors, relocating in favor of homophilous immediate neighbors, not homophilous neighborhoods. Since neighbors respond to household changes along their tertiary streets, the concatenation of these relocation events is necessarily delimited by the tertiary street network, and thus segregation patterns reflect it. Homophilous locational choice, however, cannot account for the entirety of neighborhood communities and their effects. A second community-generating force within neighborhoods consists of the flow and exchange of norms, values, beliefs, and influences among neighbors along their stage 4 networks. Neighborhood communities result from both the concatenation of homophilous locational choices and the exchange of norms, values, and beliefs among neighbors. Their correspondence is not additive, but rather sequential. Relocation, which is responsible for residential demographic differentiation, determines stage 1 neighbors and thus, of necessity, the higher stages of neighboring among which norms, values,

and beliefs flow. Locational-based neighborhood community effects such as segregation correspond to influence-based neighborhood community effects such as social capital and collective efficacy because, while each emerges from different stages of neighboring, the same concatenated, multistage processes guide both.

In chapter 6, I review the data used in this book, most of which are original. The data were collected in several distinct settings, an ethnographic study of a gang barrio, and four large collections of structured interviews in 68 Los Angeles neighborhoods and a college town (a total of 70 neighborhoods). The 68 Los Angeles neighborhoods, 20 of which were revisited several years later, added statistical robustness to my study and used an adaptive link-tracing methodology to generate an interview chain that would spread out spatially great distances in order to determine what constrained neighboring relations. A region in the college town was the site of an exhaustive census that fully mapped the geographically embedded neighbor networks. This same region was revisited three years later to discover how these same neighbor networks had evolved. In chapter 6, I discuss these studies in detail, reviewing both the interviews and how neighborhoods and respondents were sampled. Finally, I discuss the administrative data I used to explore the same 70 neighborhoods in which I collected interviews and conducted ethnography.

In chapter 7, I explore stage 1 neighboring relations and show that households in the study did indeed relocate so that their stage 1 tertiary street neighbors would be homophilous. They sometimes decided to move from their previous home if those who shared their tertiary streets were different from themselves; they considered with whom they would share tertiary streets in potential future residences; and, if their attempts at homophily proved unsuccessful, they desired to move once again. More than any other factor, respondents correlated racial similarity with homophily. If residents of different races did settle near each other, however, higher stages of neighbor networks generally developed without further reference to racial disparities. In other words, when residents racially segregated their neighbor networks, they typically did it by restricting their geographic availability, by segregating their stage 1 neighbor networks rather than higher stages of neighboring. However, while racial differences did not impede the translation of stage 1 tertiary

street neighbors into stage 3 actualized neighbors, linguistic differences did. To translate stage 1 neighboring relations into stage 3 neighboring relations, it helps to speak the same first language.

In that same chapter, I use administrative data to examine racial segregation across the 70 neighborhoods I explore in my interviews and ethnography. I show that as residents racially segregate their stage 1 neighbor networks, discontinuities in the distribution of racial demographics map onto discontinuities in the tertiary street system, especially for the racial distribution of households with children. T-communities and islands have clear “borders” where sharp discontinuities occur in the distribution of racial groups. Furthermore, “invisible” discontinuities in the network of tertiary streets are just as disruptive to population distributions as natural barriers are. Finally, while sharing more tertiary streets is related to greater demographic similarity, the most substantial distinction occurs between those who live in the same tertiary street network and those who do not. A single trivial tertiary street connection may profoundly affect the demographic composition of two otherwise disconnected neighborhood communities.

In chapter 8, I proceed to stage 2 neighboring relations and show that passive contacts are sociologically real phenomena, not merely theoretical constructs. Respondents had no difficulty identifying whether or not an activity was an unintentional meeting resulting from the mere fact of being neighbors. The correlation between stage 2 neighboring and children is evidenced by the fact that most passive contacts began when children casually played together; in general, meetings involving children were identified as passive, and meetings not involving them were not. Individual respondents’ stage 2 neighboring relations, as evidenced by their cognitive understandings of their neighborhoods, did not typically reflect formal neighborhood equivalents such as real-estate neighborhoods or school districts but rather the “lived” experience of interconnected tertiary face blocks. Furthermore, residents’ conceptualizations of their neighborhood aggregated to form cognitive neighborhoods that were typically identical to the network of tertiary streets.

No one’s cognitive understanding of their neighborhood escaped tertiary street networks. In chapter 9, I show that the actualized stage 3 neighbor networks, which emerge from stage 2 neighbor networks, did not escape tertiary street networks either. Stage 1 neighboring

relations, when measured in terms of house-steps (the number of houses) along a tertiary street, powerfully related to higher stages of neighboring. The latter did not, however, correlate strongly to raw distance “as the crow flies.” The tertiary street network not only constrained individual residents’ interaction patterns but also the networks of neighbors they concatenated into; however, neighborhoods defined by shared boundaries such as census geography or elementary school catchments did not constrain interactions. Furthermore, the effects of t-communities on neighboring relations are not merely spurious confounds of geographic distance. At any distance, neighboring relations are restricted to the shared tertiary street network, but not to shared administrative geography.

In chapter 10, I show that a neighborhood network is not typically identical to any individual resident’s neighbor network; it is a true social entity, beyond any individual. Each resident’s neighbor network connects with the neighbor networks of other residents, who connect to still other residents, concatenating and aggregating, neighbor to neighbor to neighbor, and especially child to child to child, to form a network that extends farther geographically and socially than any one resident’s neighbor network. Significantly, however, these aggregated neighborhood community networks maintain relatively short internal path lengths among residents.

In chapter 10, I also show that households with children are far more involved in neighborhood life than households without children. They know almost three times as many neighbors and are known by more neighbors than households without children. These differences compound, so that the vast majority (85 percent) of all neighboring relations are between two households with children and only 6 percent of all neighboring relationships involve two households neither of which has children. Furthermore, neighbor-to-neighbor paths among households with children are half as long as those among households without children.

Finally, in chapter 10, I show that most residents attributed great value to their neighboring relations. Neighbors performed important services for each other. Not surprisingly, the most important of these services related to children. Furthermore, passively generated contacts proved even more likely than nonpassively generated ones to result in

substantively important neighboring relations. The choice to live in a neighborhood is to some extent a choice about who we would like to be conveniently available to us and to whom we would like to be conveniently available.

Chapter 11 formally revisits the discussion of how efficacious neighborhood communities emerge from the flow and exchange of norms, values, and beliefs among stage 4 neighbors. Social influence network theory mathematically models the process of community norm and value evolution. A simple focus on neighbor network density, treating neighbor networks as if all of the information about them was contained within the relations of individual neighbors, ignores the informational content captured in their larger networks. For influence to occur, residents must be within each other's horizon of observability. The number of distinct paths transmitting norms and values between residents also affects the degree of influence; secondhand knowledge may be less valuable than firsthand knowledge, but what it lacks in immediate value it can make up for in volume.

In chapters 12 and 13, I explore influence networks and the neighborhood-level outcomes they relate to in two distinct insular settings, a college town and a gang barrio. I begin with the college town in chapter 12 and explore one particular neighboring relation, trusting each other to watch over children in spontaneous playgroups, and show that this relation is both dense and short enough to be within the horizon of observability, allowing the behavior of neighborhood children and those who monitor them to be observable to most of the other households with children in the t-community. I provide an example of a particular criminal incident, where the observation of the illicit behavior, the parental response, and the evaluation of these behaviors by the neighborhood community was "observed" through influence networks by the residents throughout the t-community, but nowhere else. Shared tertiary streets, but not shared elementary school catchments, circumscribed neighborhood collective memory and produced collective efficacy for children.

I then use the longitudinal nature of the college town study to show that neighbors influence each other's beliefs both by their actions and by their interactions. One's perceptions of one's neighborhood's

values are both similar to those of one's neighbors and directly related to one's interactions with one's neighbors. The beliefs and values foundational to neighborhood effects, such as the working trust necessary for the development of collective efficacy, emerge from these networked interactions. The structure of influence networks, which is heavily determined by the structure of the tertiary street network, powerfully affected residents' beliefs about their neighbors' values and utility. The norms and values that emerged within one t-community, while internally consistent, differed from those that emerged in neighboring t-communities.

In chapter 13, I explore these neighborhood community processes from a different direction. Instead of identifying a geographic area and asking to what extent it relates to some reasonable facsimile of community, I identify a well-established community that provided identification, social capital, and efficacy for its members and attempt to understand why it was associated with a particular geography. I show that the geography identified by residents of this community perfectly coincided with a tertiary street network but not with school catchment areas or parish boundaries or other potentially competing neighborhood foci. Within this neighborhood community, the neighbor influence network generated an enormous amount of social capital and collective efficacy, including actively preventing the sale of drugs within the neighborhood amid a city rife with the drug trade. More importantly, I show that the neighborhood community took its powerful norms and values from those most intimately involved in the network of trust and loyalty, but that who was most intimately involved in the trust and loyalty network was determined by where they lived in the tertiary street network.

Chapter 14 concludes the book. I review my findings about neighborhood communities emerging from the network of interactions of neighbors, networks that concatenate from neighbor-level availabilities and interactions, not neighborhood-level processes. I argue that to properly investigate emergent neighborhood-level outcomes we must focus on communities that could have been produced by neighbor-level interactions. By precisely identifying latent social ties, tertiary street networks provide us with a lens to focus more closely on agentive

social capital and collective efficacy. Furthermore, studying neighborhoods precisely as networks rather than vaguely as diffuse entities highlights their nonlinear response to apparently similar conditions. Relatively minor modifications in the urban ecological environment that mediates individual-level interactions can result in disproportionate sociological outcomes.