<Re‐positioning Second Homes within Housing Studies: Household Investment, Gentrification, Multiple Residence, Mobility and Hyper‐consumption>

in metropolitan area

e.g. a concentration of second homes in London

-used mainly during the working week

-for leisure use in cities

<A comparison of the approaches for gentrification identification>

1.ambiguuity of the definition

2.lack of consensus on indicators and methods of measurement

-synergy between conceptualization and operationalization is barely examined systematically

Conceptualization of gentrification

rural gentrification

super gentrification

new-build gentrification

studentification

tourism gentrification

state-sponseored gentrification jiaoyufication

^critical

Rose (1984) and Beauregard (1986) criticize that gentrification is a nebulous and chaotic concept, as it combines necessary tendencies with contingent conditions (such as particular gentrifiers at a particular time), and obscures the multiplicity of the process.

gentrification should be treated as simply a topic of research, rather than any type of explanatory theory (Smart & Smart, 2017). Some even argue that gentrification is doomed (Bourne, 1993).

quantitative measures:

improvement of the built environment (reinvestment of capital): housing price, property tax

social upgrading of neighbourhoods (socio-demographic change):neighborhood change, dispacement

combination of both

others:field survey data, number of coffe shops, newspaper coverage, big data, streestscape

\* using a single variable to identify the multidimensionality of gentrification is almost certain to fail.

@method

different identification methods

1. threshold-based methods

To avert multiple thresholds, a composite index is compiled via linear combination of socio-economic variables or principal component analysis (PCA)

2.K-means clustering