

The Systematic Review on Quality of Life in Urban Neighborhoods

Hamed Najafpour*¹, Vahid Bigdeli Rad², Hasanuddin Bin Lamit³, Muhamad Solehin Fitry Bin Rosley⁴

Centre for Study of Built Environment in the Malay World (KALAM), UTM

¹Najafpour.Hamed@gmail.com, ²Vahid.bigdeli@gmail.com, ³INADEAN@gmail.com, ⁴solzfity@gmail.com

Abstract: Previous researches on quality of life have highlighted the factors associating with quality of life for residents of urban neighborhoods. This research aims on providing a holistic overview on literatures regarding the importance of quality of life and its associated factors. To do so, 17 research articles relating to quality of life's research area are undertaken and reviewed. Despite of inconstancy of the results, the significance of neighborhood's quality of life and factors associating to it is revealed. Most of the researches in diverse contexts undertaking statistical designs, validated and reliable quality of life, standardized and investigation on possible moderating of effects are absolutely considered and warranted.

[Najafpour H, Bigdeli Rad V, Lamit H, Fitry S. M. **The Systematic Review on Quality of Life in urban Neighborhoods.** *Life Sci J* 2014;11(7):355-364]. (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 41

Keywords: Quality of life, neighborhood, life satisfaction, neighborhood satisfaction urban neighborhoods.

1. Introduction

Kevin A. Lynch (1960) specified the concept of image of city by highlighting three components named as feelings (subjective) associated with the locales' physical distinctiveness, structures such as mental representation (particularly outlined) and identity like the place's quality that empower residents to distinguish it among other places and place's distinctiveness. In terms of cities' representation, there are several studies highlighting the importance of the structural factors affecting representation of cities (Aragones and Arredondo (1985), Marchand (2003), Milgram and Jodelet (1976) and Nenci, De Rosa, Testa and Carrus (2003)). Furthermore, the researches on sense of place identified the factors associating with the meaning (Hay (1998), Jorgensen and Stedman (2001) and Tuan (1980)), characteristics of place (Breakwell (1999), Feldman (1990 and 1996), Fried (2000), Gustafson (2001), Korpela (1989), Proshansky (1978), Proshansky, Fabian and Kaminoff (1983), Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996) and Uzzell, Pol and Badenas (2002)) and place attachment (Brown, Perkins and Brown (2003), Giuliani, Ferrara and Barabotti (2003), Hidalgo and Hernandez (2001)). Perceiving the distinctiveness of the neighborhoods compared to other places and its role for residents' memory considered as significant aspects of place's characteristics. Moreover, each city and neighborhood is identified by its unique anthropological and psychological characteristic associating with its residences. As discussed by Bonnes, Mannetti, Secchiaroli and Tanucci (1990), neighborhoods are considered as sub-places of the city when applying the same consideration to each part of cities and neighborhoods. Therefore, attachment and characteristic are revealed as larger

construct and sub-dimensions of sense of place (Jorgensen & Stedman, 2001). The characteristics of society is associated with several place's dimensions named as physical environment, cultural heritage, relation bonds and symbolic connections. Finally, sense of community (comparing to place attachment) identifies as strong linkage among urban environment and residents who live there. Sense of community is defined by Sarason (1974) as individual's feeling to be a part of available, supportive and mutual relationship and appropriate factors for this construct that implicates the social intervention and planning evaluation. He also highlighted that diverse quality of life's variables named as social and physical participation (Chavis and Wandersman (1990), Davidson and Cotter (1989) and Florin and Wandersman (1984)), individual ability to use problem-focused coping strategies (Bachrach and Zautra (1985)), life satisfaction (Prezza and Costantini (1999)) and sense of security are directly associated with sense of community.

Previous researches defined neighborhoods by their patterns of activity, social contacts and symbolic elements (Park (1925), Keller (1968), Suttles (1972), Buttimer and McDonald (1974) and Hourihan (1979)). Meanwhile, neighborhoods present the significance structural characteristics of the settlements (Lynch (1960), Coleman (1987), Craik (1979), Downs and Stea (1973), Ladd (1970) and Tuan (1974)) and they play a significant role in terms of determining the decisions of residential mobility and housing satisfaction (Kasl and Harburg (1972), Cadwallader (1979), Newman and Duncan (1979), Adams and Gilder (1976) and Speare (1974)). Moreover, neighborhoods represent essential domains of life effecting overall well-being (Abrams (1973) and Campbell et al (1976)). According to

Sundquist (1974), the residential preference statements is identified as the best index due illustrating the quality of residential environments and such results have significant remit according to empirical behavioral and theoretical researches during 1970s (Wolpert (1966), Dillman and Dobash (1972) and Tremblay et al (1980)).

Although, understanding people satisfaction about the levels of local environments is significant, evaluating the quality of neighborhoods by their residents is important and required by urban policies and such evaluation are still presenting for diverse components nation's settlement systems. According to the neighborhood national commission that was held in last decades, there is rare national perspective as whole on quality of life at neither level of neighborhood nor assessment of quality of neighborhoods.

Since 1937, due providing more information about the condition of general situation of housing and American nation housing, the Department of Urban Development and Housing of America has supported the annual large-scale national survey about seventy thousand respondents. The surveys are about rating the neighborhoods as place to live by residents. In addition, the residents' reaction associated with questions about their aspects of neighborhoods' environments are investigated. In this regard, residents' perception about current particular phenomena of their neighborhoods and evaluation of reported situations that perceived by residents (nuisance level) as two dimensions of subjective response associating with local conditions are investigated. The results revealed that mentioned dimensions were treated separately (Craik (1979)) and were illustrated producing diverse rating of conditions (Marans (1976)) in accordance with conceptual independency of them.

With the increase in the number of studies considering the factors influencing quality of life in last previous decades and outspread results an updated review of evidence would be timely. This research review aims on providing a holistic overview of researches that examining the factors influence quality of life in the neighborhoods.

2. Methods

In terms of the aim of this research, searching the relative literatures is started in accordance to the most extensive investigation on research articles that was associated with quality of life and its related factors.

2.1 The strategy of research

Four electronic databases involving Web of science, Sage publication, Iranian urban management publisher and Google scholar were undertaken as

electronic search approach of this study. In addition, the scope of research was designed based on English research articles published during June 1985 to May 2012. After reviewing the abstract and conclusion of extracted research articles, those with most appropriateness and association with neighborhoods' quality of life and the principles of this research were gathered. Performing the hand search by considering first authors of eligible articles comparing to other published eligible papers consisting of their names was investigated. Finally, chosen articles were evaluated by the experts in quality of life's research area to catch the accuracy and robustness of study.

2.2 Selection of criteria

This research only focused on the articles was conducted on urban neighborhoods. Meanwhile, those articles that fulfilled the quality of life criteria and its related factors were investigated. The researches that exclusively investigated with neighborhood satisfaction, neighborhood disorders, and neighborhood characteristics, perception of the neighborhoods, quality of life conceptualization, quality of life measurement, neighborhood social condition and social geographical aspects of the neighborhoods were excluded. Moreover, interventional and qualitative studies, proceedings of conferences and the opinions of experts were undertaken.

3. Research results

3.1 The characteristics of research

The characteristics of 17 reviewed papers are illustrated in Table 1. All considered researches were investigated on quality of life in urban neighborhoods instead of Gideon E. D. Omuta (1988) that focused on urban and rural neighborhoods. In addition, researches were conducted in different study areas such as: seven in America, tow in Europe, five in Asia, and one in Africa and one in Australia. The range of sample sizes was from 98 to more than 1000 participants. Two researches were used theoretical analysis instead of demographical analysis (R. L. Schalock (2004) and A. F. Mollaei, A. Azimi and K. Ziari (2010)). Furthermore, most of the researches were focused on males and females in their sample size instead of M. Greenberg, and K. Crossney (2007). Due providing the holistic and detailing overview of the results extracted of the literatures the results is presented for each article separately. In addition, the extracted factors influencing quality of life in urban neighborhoods are illustrated in Table 2.

3.2 Assessment of factors affecting quality of life in urban neighborhoods

In his research, Donald C. Dahmann (1985) focused on evaluating the neighborhood condition by asking respondents to rank their satisfaction of their

neighborhood and its components (street lighting, security etc). Afterward he evaluated the size of settlements and centrality within the settlements by identifying the dimensions of centrality and size in settlements. In addition, he conducted a model which considered the conditions or elements existing in a neighborhood. As result, built environment (rundown housing, abandoned structures, commercial activities), street conditions (heavy traffic, streets need repair, roads impassable, poorly lighted streets), pollution (trash, noisy streets, air) and public security (street security) were revealed as effective factors associating with the quality of life in the neighborhoods. Gideon E. D. Omuta (1988) considered the six environmental problems for the residents of Benin City, capital of Bendel State of Nigeria as significant factors affecting quality of life. As result, employment environment (employment within neighborhood, employment in/outside contiguous neighborhood), housing environment (average age of buildings, rental payment as percentage of income, overcrowding), amenity environment (weekly power seizure, running taps in

days/week, health facilities (hospital beds) within/outside neighborhood), educational environment (primary schools (within/In contiguous) neighborhood, secondary schools (within/In contiguous) neighborhood), nuisance environment (noise generators within neighborhood/In contiguous neighborhood), socio-economic environment (income, education, auto ownership) were highlighted as most significant factors associating with physical environment of urban neighborhood which resulting in the amount of quality of life. M. Joseph Sirgy and Terri Cornwell (2002) highlighted the association of neighborhood features with quality of life by conducting three conceptual models for the residents of southwest Virginia. Failure in two first models and succeed in third model revealed that life satisfaction, home satisfaction, community satisfaction, housing satisfaction, neighborhood satisfaction, satisfaction with neighborhood social features, satisfaction with neighborhood economic features and satisfaction with neighborhood physical features as factors influencing quality of life in neighborhoods.

Table 1: The Characteristic of Research based on 17 reviewed articles

References	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	Total
Sample size																		
n ≤ 150															X			1
150 (n ≤ 500)			X		X													2
500 (n ≤ 1000)									X			X						2
n ≥ 1000	X	X		X			X			X							X	6
Country																		
America	X		X				X			X		X			X		X	7
Europe					X								X					2
Australia				X														1
Asia							X	X		X				X		X		5
Africa		X																1
Setting																		
Urban	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	15
Urban + rural		X																1
Gender																		
Female + male	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	15
Female							X											1
Male																		0

References: 1: Donald C. Dahmann (1985), 2: Gideon E. D. Omuta (1988), 3: M. Joseph Sirgy and Terri Cornwell (2002), 4: Micheal Pacione (2003), 5: Marino Bonaiuto, Ferdinando Fornara, and Mirilia Bonnes (2003), 6: R. L. Schalock (2004), 7: Michael Greenberg and Kristen Crossney (2007), 8: Mohammadreza Pourjaafar (2008), 9: Kazem Jajromi, (2009), 10: Patricia A. Collins, Michael V. Hayes and Lisa N. Oliver (2009), 11: Amin F. Mollaei, Azadeh Azimi and Keramatllah Ziari (2010), 12: Misun Hur and Jack L. Nasar, (2010), 13: Antonio Aiello, Rita Grazia Ardone, and Massimiliano Scopelliti (2010), 14: Mohammadreza Rezvani (2011), 15: Jeanette Eby, Peter Kitchen and Allison Williams (2012), 16: Derya Oktay, and Sanaz Saeidi (2012), 17: Andrea Dassopoulos, Christie D. Batson and Robert Futrell (2012).

Table 2.1: Factors Affecting the Quality of Life in Neighborhood

NO	Author(s)	Factors of the Quality of Life in Neighborhood
1	Donald C. Dahmann (1985)	1- Built environment (Rundown housing, Abandoned structures, Commercial activities) 2- Street Conditions (Heavy traffic, Streets need repair, Roads impassable, Poorly lighted streets) 3- Pollution (Trash, Noisy streets, Air) 4- Public Security (Street security)*
2	Gideon E. D. Omuta (1988)	1- Employment environment (Employment within neighborhood, Employment in/outside contiguous neighborhood) 2- Housing environment (Average age of buildings, Rental payment as percentage of income, Overcrowding) 3- Amenity environment (Weekly power seizure, Running taps in days/week, Health facilities (hospital beds) within/outside neighborhood) 4- Educational environment (Primary schools (Within/In Contiguous) neighborhood, Secondary schools (Within/In Contiguous) neighborhood) 5- Nuisance environment (Noise generators within neighborhood/In contiguous neighborhood) 6- Socio-economic environment (Income, Education, Auto ownership)
3	M. Joseph Sirgy and Terri Cornwell (2002)	1- Life satisfaction 2- Home satisfaction 3- Community satisfaction 4- Housing satisfaction 5- Neighborhood satisfaction 6- Satisfaction w/neighborhood social features 7- Satisfaction w/neighborhood economic features 8- Satisfaction w/neighborhood physical features
4	Micheal Pacione (2003)	1- Multiple derivation (Male unemployment, Council housing, Single parents, Travel to work by bus, ...) 2- Neighborhood problems (Unemployment, Poor schooling, Bad housing, sense of security, Lack of leisure facilities, Lack of play spaces, ...)* 3- Risk from criminal activities (Assault, Sexual Assault, Burglary, Car theft, ...) 4- Dangerous spaces by gender (Parks, Bridges, Playing Fields, Schools, Peripheral roads, Town centre, ...)
5	Marino Bonaiuto, Ferdinando Fornara, and Mirilia Bonnes (2003)	1- Architectural and town-planning space (total items = 22) 2- Organization of accessibility and roads (total items = 14) 3- Green areas (total items = 10) 4- People and social relations (total items = 24) 5- Welfare services (total items = 12) 6- Recreational services (total items = 16) 7- Commercial services (total items = 8) 8- Transport services (total items = 8) 9- Pace of life (total items = 16) 10- Environmental health (total items = 8) 11- Upkeep and care (total items = 1) 12- Neighborhood attachment (total items = 8)
6	R. L. Schalock (2004)	1- Emotional well-being (Contentment, Self-concept, Lack of stress) 2- Interpersonal relations (Interactions, Relationships, Supports) 3- Material well-being (Financial status, Employment, Housing) 4- Personal Development (Education, Personal competence, Performance) 5- Physical well-being (Health, Activities of daily living, Leisure) 6- Self-determination (Personal control, Goals and personal values, Choices) 7- Social inclusion (Community integration and participation, Community roles, Social support) 8- Rights (Human, Legal)
7	Michael Greenberg and Kristen Crossney (2007)	1- Perceived neighborhood attributes (sense of security *, blight, odors, recreation, heavy traffic, parks, schools) 2- Perceived home attributes (Size, rooms, plumbing, electrical) 3- Perceived jurisdictional attributes (Elected officials, schools, other services, feelings about control)

8	Mohammadreza Pourjaafar (2008)	1- Social (Security*, Leisure space, Public space, ...) 2- Economic (Employment, Low income households, ...) 3- Transportation (Public parking, Public transportation, Traffic volume, ...) 4- Building (Life building, Material, Resistance to earthquake, ...)
9	Kazem Jajromi, (2009)	1- Urban facilities (Public space, Sport places, Cultural places, ...) 2- Urban problems and risks (Accident, Water pollution, Air pollution, ...) 3- Access to housing facilities (Drinking water piping, Gas piping, Kitchen Service, ...)
10	Patricia A. Collins, Michael V. Hayes and Lisa N. Oliver (2009)	1- Self-assessed health status (Self-reported health, Activity limitations, Chronic conditions) 2- Neighborhood satisfaction 3- Identity & pride dimension (Belong in neighborhood, Proud of neighborhood, Outsiders want to live here, Visitors like appearance) 4- Social dynamics dimension (Close knit neighborhood, People get along, People can be trusted, Adults know children, Quiet neighborhood) 5- Security dimension (Adults watch kids are secure, secure to walk alone in dark, secure for kids to play, Theft not a problem, secure playgrounds)*
11	Amin F. Mollaei, Azadeh Azimi and Keramatollah Ziari (2010)	1- Facilities 2- Landscape 3- Housing 4- Neighborhood relationship 5- Hygiene 6- Security*
12	Misun Hur and Jack L. Nasar, (2010)	1- Vegetation rate (presence of trees in the neighborhood) 2- Building density (open space, parks, or bike paths in the neighborhood, density of housing in the neighborhood) 3- Naturalness (vegetation and water) 4- Openness (open views and open space)
13	Antonio Aiello Rita Grazia Ardone, and Massimiliano Scopelliti (2010)	1- Building aesthetics and spaciousness among buildings 2- Building size 3- Connection to the rest of the city 4- Presence and care of green areas 5- Insecurity* 6- Sociality and affability 7- Educational services 8- Health/social services 9- Sports services 10- Leisure and cultural services 11- Commercial services 12- Public transportation 13- Monotonous lifestyle 14- Pollution 15- Care and upkeep 16- Chaotic lifestyle
14	Mohammadreza Rezvani (2011)	1- Physical environment (Housing, Green space, Public transportation, ...) 2- Mental environment (Quietness, Traffic, ...) 3- Economical environment (Job opportunities, Transportation cost, Unemployment rate, ...) 4- Social environment (Security*, Gratification, Neighborly relations, ...)
15	Jeanette Eby, Peter Kitchen and Allison Williams (2012)	1- Housing quality and affordability 2- Diversity and cultural integration 3- Crime and sense of security * 4- Community engagement and recreation 5- Green space and the physical environment 6- Transportation

16	Derya Oktay, and Sanaz Saeidi (2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Diversity of forms 1- Topography and greenery (Water front, Natural parks, Green open space, ...) 2- Urban blocks (Form of development, Density, Availability of legible centre, ...) 3- Street network (Vehicular circulation, Bicycle paths, Public facilities for pedestrians, ...) 4- Buildings (Architectural identity, Period of developments, ...) B. Diversity of uses 1- Residential (Detached single family house, Row house or townhouse, Apartment flat (5 or more units, 3 stories or less), ...) 2- Commercial/Recreational (Grocery stores and other retail area, Restaurant, Hotel, Theatre, Cinema, ...) 3- Public facilities (Schools, Hospital, Library, ...) 4- Public open spaces (Urban square, Pedestrian, Urban park, ...) C. Diversity of users 1- Diversity in gender 2- Diversity in marital status 3- Diversity in age 4- Diversity in educational attainment 5- Diversity in income level 6- Diversity in employment status 7- Family type
17	Andrea Dassopoulos, Christie D. Batson and Robert Futrell (2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Dependent variables 1- Neighborhood satisfaction 2- Great quality of life B. Independent variables 1- Neighborliness 2- Neighborhood social disorder 3- Security* 4- Neighborhood type (Urban core, Suburban, Urban fringe) C. Control variables Diversity in gender 1- Marital status (Other status, Married or living with partner) 2- Gender (Male, Female) 3- Race (White; non-Hispanic, Minority; non-Hispanic, Hispanic) 4- Age 5- Education (High school diploma or less, Some college, Bachelor's degree, Graduate or professional degree) 6- Total household income in year (\$20,000 or less, \$20,001-\$40,000, \$40,001-\$80,000, \$80,001 or more) 7- Years lived at current residence 8- Housing type (Own, Rent)

Considering the social-geographical concept of neighborhoods associating with quality of life, Micheal Pacione (2003) conducted five dimensional models due assessing quality of life. Multiple derivation (e.g. male unemployment, council housing, single parents, travel to work by bus etc), Neighborhood problems (e.g. unemployment, poor schooling, bad housing, sense of security, lack of leisure facilities, lack of play spaces etc), risk from criminal activities (assault, sexual assault, burglary, car theft etc) and dangerous spaces by gender (parks, bridges, playing fields, schools, peripheral roads, town centre etc) are highlighted as important factors affecting quality of life in Glasgow neighborhoods. Moreover, Marino Bonaiuto, Ferdinando Fornara and Mirilia Bonnes (2003) conducted two instruments consisting of 11 scales to measure the quality of residents' association with their urban neighborhood,

quality of urban neighborhoods' environment and neighborhoods' attachment. They revealed that architectural and town-planning space, organization of accessibility and roads, green areas, people and social relations, welfare services, recreational services, commercial services, transport services, pace of life, environmental health, upkeep and care and neighborhood attachment as significant factors associating with quality of life in neighborhoods. In the theoretical research, R. L. Schalock (2004) investigated on figuring their understanding, being understood and lack information about quality of life criteria. As result, they highlighted that emotional well-being (contentment, self-concept, lack of stress), interpersonal relations (interactions, relationships, supports), material well-being (financial status, employment, housing), personal development (education, personal competence, performance),

physical well-being (health, activities of daily living, leisure), self-determination (personal control, goals and personal values, choices), social inclusion (community integration and participation, community roles, social support) and rights (Human, Legal) are the factors associating with quality of life in urban areas. Other studies also revealed the association among financial status with quality of people life (Mohsen Ghods and Hamed Najafpour et al (2014) and Mohsen Ghods, Hamed Najafpour and Naghmeh Abdolahi et al (2014)). Michael Greenberg and Kristen Crossney (2007) considering 48,000 samples undertook by American Housing Survey in 2002 revealed strong association among perceived neighborhood attributes (sense of security, blight, odors, recreation, heavy traffic, parks, schools), perceived home attributes (size, rooms, plumbing, electrical) and perceived jurisdictional attributes (elected officials, schools, other services, feelings about control) with quality of life in urban neighborhoods. Furthermore, Mohammadreza P. J. (2008) argued that social factors (security, leisure space, public space etc), economical factors (employment, low income households etc), transportation (public parking, public transportation, traffic volume etc) and buildings condition (life building, material, resistance to earthquake etc) have strong relationship with quality of life in neighborhoods. In this regard, Kazem, J (2009) also reported urban facilities (e.g. public space, sport places, cultural places etc), urban problems and risks (e.g. accident, water pollution, air pollution etc) and access to housing facilities (e.g. drinking water piping, gas piping, kitchen Service etc) as significant factors affecting quality of life. Patricia A. Collins, Michael V. Hayes and Lisa N. Oliver (2009) focused on association among quality of neighborhoods and residents' self-related health in eight suburban neighborhoods of Vancouver in accordance to their income status. They resulted that self-assessed health status (self-reported health, activity limitations, chronic conditions), neighborhood satisfaction, identity and pride dimension (belong in neighborhood, proud of neighborhood, outsiders want to live here, visitors like appearance), social dynamics dimension (close knit neighborhood, people get along, people can be trusted, adults know children, quiet neighborhood) and security dimension (adults watch kids are secure, secure to walk alone in dark, secure for kids to play, theft not a problem, secure playgrounds) were the most significant factors associating to perceived neighborhoods' quality and therefore quality of life. Meanwhile, Amin F. Mollaei, Azadeh Azimi and Keramatollah Ziari (2010) highlighted facilities, landscape, housing, neighborhood relationship, hygiene and security as

indicators indexing quality of life in neighborhoods. Misun Hur and Jack L. Nasar (2010) considered the neighborhood satisfaction associating with openness and naturalness undertaking Geographic Information System (GIS) due measuring environmental attributes. Moreover, the overall residents' satisfaction of their neighborhood was considered. The results revealed that the vegetation rate (presence of trees in the neighborhood), building density (open space, parks, or bike paths in the neighborhood, density of housing in the neighborhood), naturalness (vegetation and water) and openness (open views and open space) have strong association with neighborhood's attributes improvement and thus the quality of resident's life in neighborhoods. On the other hand, Antonio Aiello, Rita Grazia Ardone and Massimiliano Scopelliti (2010) investigated on psychological association among residents and their neighborhood environment in two neighborhoods of Rome due highlighting the factors affecting neighborhood improvement that results on people satisfaction and the attachment of the neighborhoods. They resulted building aesthetics and spaciousness among buildings, building size, connection to the rest of the city, presence and care of green areas, insecurity, sociality and affordability, educational services, health/social services, sports services, leisure and cultural services, commercial services, public transportation, monotonous lifestyle, pollution, care and upkeep and chaotic lifestyle are the positive and negative factors affecting undertaken neighborhoods in Rome and therefore the quality of life there. In his research Mohammadreza Rezvani (2011) highlighted that physical environment (e.g. housing, green space, public transportation etc), mental environment (quietness, traffic etc), economical environment (job opportunities, transportation cost, unemployment rate etc) and social environment (security, gratification, neighborly relations etc) of the neighborhoods play a critical role in promoting quality of life there. In this regard, Hamed Najafpour (2013) highlighted the legibility of urban neighborhoods as important factor due promoting neighborhoods' environments. Jeanette Eby, Peter Kitchen and Allison Williams (2012) investigated on examining the quality of life's perception in Hamilton, Ontario located at Canada. The result revealed that housing quality and affordability, diversity and cultural integration, crime and sense of security, community engagement and recreation, green space and the physical environment and transportation were the most significant quality of life issues for undertaken neighborhoods of this research. Derya Oktay and Sanaz Saeidi (2012) examined the diversity within environments of neighborhoods due achieving successful neighborhoods of Famagusta located at Turkey. They

highlighted three groups of diversity and related sub-components affecting neighborhoods environment and therefore quality of life named as: diversity of forms (topography and greenery (e.g. water front, natural parks, green open space etc), urban blocks (e.g. form of development, density, availability of legible centre etc), street network (e.g. vehicular circulation, bicycle paths, public facilities for pedestrians etc) and buildings (e.g. architectural identity, period of developments etc)), diversity of uses (residential (e.g. detached single family house, row house or townhouse, apartment flat (e.g. 5 or more units, 3 stories or less etc), commercial/recreational (e.g. grocery stores and other retail area, restaurant, hotel, theatre, cinema etc), public facilities (e.g. schools, hospital, library etc) and public open spaces (e.g. urban square, pedestrian, urban park etc)) and diversity of users (diversity in gender, diversity in marital status, diversity in age, diversity in educational attainment, diversity in income level, diversity in employment status and family type)). Finally, Andrea Dassopoulos, Christie D. Batson and Robert Futrell (2012) examined the association among neighborhood disorder and social cohesion with residents' satisfaction and quality of life in Las Vegas Metropolitan's neighborhoods. The result were categorized into three groups and their related sub-component named as: dependent variables (neighborhood satisfaction and Great quality of life), independent variables (neighborliness, neighborhood social disorder, security and neighborhood type (urban core, suburban and urban fringe)) and control variables diversity in gender (marital status (e.g. other status, married or living with partner), gender (e.g. male and female), race (e.g. white; non-Hispanic, minority; non-Hispanic and Hispanic), age, education (High school diploma or less, Some college, Bachelor's degree, Graduate or professional degree), total household income in year, years lived at current residence and housing type (Own or Rent)).

4. Conclusion

The residents' quality of life in the neighborhood is a significant factor in providing neighborhood satisfaction and human well-being in the neighborhoods. This research aimed on reviewing research articles associating with neighborhoods' quality of life due providing the holistic and comprehensive overview on neighborhoods' quality of life criteria and its associated factors. To do so, 17 research articles are systematically chosen and reviewed. Factors relating to quality of life are presented. As shown in Table 2, the main items associating to quality of life criteria are highlighted. In addition, results revealed that neighborhoods' security (identified by red stars) is the subscription issue

among most of mentioned literatures (58.82%). Therefore, the results not only illustrated the factors influencing quality of life in neighborhoods, but also the significance of security as critical issue for neighborhoods' quality of life improvement is revealed.

Acknowledgements:

The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support provided by Center of Built Environment in Malay World, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (KALAM) and the cooperation and research support from the Department of Landscape Architecture, Faculty of Built Environment, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.

Corresponding Author:

Hamed Najafpour
Department of Architecture
Faculty of Built Environment
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Skudai, Malaysia
E-mail: Najafpour.hamed@gmail.com

References

1. Aragonés, J., & Arredondo, J. M. (1985). Structure at urban cognitive maps. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 5, 197–212.
2. Adams, J. S. and K. A. GILDER (1976) "Household location and intra-urban migration," pp. 159-192 in D. T. Herbert and R. S. Johnson (eds.) *Social Area in Cities*. Vol. 2. Chichester, England: John Wiley.
3. Abrams, M. (1973) "Subjective Social indicators," pp. 35-50 in United Kingdom Central Statistical Office (eds.) *Social Trends*. Vol. 4. London: Her Majesty's Stationary office.
4. Ali Asgari (2010) "Neighborhood satisfaction in Navab neighborhood," (www.urban.management.ir).
5. Antonio Aiello, Rita Grazia Ardone and Massimiliano Scopelliti (2010) "Neighborhood planning improvement Physical attributes, cognitive and affective evaluation and activities in two neighborhoods in Rome," *Evaluation and Program Planning* 33 (2010) 264–275.
6. Andrea Dassopoulos, Christie D. Batson and Robert Futrell (2012) "Neighborhood connections, physical disorder, and neighborhood satisfaction in Las Vegas" *The Urban Politics Section, American Political Science Association*.
7. Breakwell, G. M. (1999). The identity of places and place identity. In C. Gallo Barbisio (Ed.), *La rappresentazione del paesaggio* [Landscape representation] (pp. 51–61). Torino: Tirrenia.
8. Brown, B. B., Perkins, D. D., & Brown, G. (2003). Place attachment in a revitalizing neighborhood: Individual and block levels of analysis. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 23, 259–271.
9. Bonnes, M., Mannetti, L., Secchiaroli, G., & Tanucci, G. (1990). The city as a multi-place system: An

- analysis of people-urban environment transactions. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 10, 37–65.
10. Bachrach, K. M., & Zautra, A. J. (1985). Coping with a community stressor: The threat of a hazardous waste facility. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 26, 127–141.
 11. Buttner, A. and S.T. McDONALD (1974) "residential areas: planning, perceptions and preferences." pp. 163-182 in J.Forbes (ed.) *Studies in Social Science and Planning*. New York: John Wiley.
 12. Chavis, D. M., & Wandersman, A. (1990). Sense of community in the urban environment: A catalyst for participation and community development. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 18, 55–81.
 13. Coleman, R. P (1987) *Attitude Towards Neighborhoods: How American Choose to Live*. Working Paper 49. Cambridge, MA: Joint Center for Urban Studies of MIT and Harvard University.
 14. Craik, K. H. (1979) "Environmental Psychology," pp. 1-21 in *New Direction in Psychology 4*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
 15. Cadwallader, M. T. (1979) "Neighborhood evaluation in residential mobility," *Environment and Planning A* 11 (April): 393-401.
 16. Campbell, A., P.E. Converse and W.L. Rodgers: 1976, *The Quality of American Life: Perspectives, Evaluations, and Satisfactions* (Russell Sage Foundation, New York).
 17. Davidson, W. B., & Cotter, P. R. (1989). Sense of community and political participation. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 17, 119–125.
 18. Downs, R. M. and D. STEA [eds.] (1973) *Image and Environment: Cognitive Mapping and Spatial Behavior*, Chicago: Aldine.
 19. Dillman, D. A. and R. P. DOBASH (1972) *Prefrences for Community Living and Their Implications for Population Redistribution: Washington Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 764*. Pullman: Washington State Univ. Press.
 20. Donald C. Dahmann (1985) "Assessments of neighborhood quality in metropolitan America," *Urban Affairs Review* 1985 20: 511.
 21. Derya Oktay and Sanaz Saeidi (2012) "Diversity for better quality of community life: evaluations in Famagusta neighborhoods," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 35, 495 – 504.
 22. Feldman, R. M. (1990). Settlement identity: Psychological bonds with home places in a mobile society. *Environment and Behavior*, 22, 183–229.
 23. Feldman, R. M. (1996). Constancy and change in attachments to types of settlements. *Environment and Behavior*, 28, 419–445.
 24. Fried, M. (2000). Continuities and discontinuities of place. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 20, 193–205.
 25. Florin, P. R., & Wandersman, A. (1984). Cognitive social learning and participation in community development. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 12, 689–708.
 26. Gustafson, P. (2001). Meanings of place: Everyday experiences and theoretical conceptualisations. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 21, 5–16.
 27. Giuliani, M. V., Ferrara, F., & Barabotti, S. (2003). One attachment or more? In G. Moser, E. Pol, Y. Bernard, M. Bonnes, J. Corraliza, & V. Giuliani (Eds.), *People, places, and sustainability: 21st Century Metropolis* (pp. 111–122). Goettingen, Germany: Hogrefe & Huber.
 28. Gideon E. D. Omuta (1988) "The quality of urban life and The perception of livability: A case study of neighborhoods in benin city, Nigeria" *The h Index considers Scopus articles published after 1995*. pp, 418-440.
 29. Hamed Najafpour, Hasanuddin Bin Lamit, Mohsen Roshan, Fahimeh Malekinezhad, Amir Ghahramanpouri, Muhamad Solehin Fitry Bin Rosley (2013). *Finding Ways in an Unfamiliar Tourist Destination: Salient Clues for Visitors to a Malaysian Town*, *Life Science Journal* 2013;10(4), http://scival-expert.utm.my/pubDetail.asp?t=pm&id=84887964951&o_id=57.
 30. Hay, R. (1998). Sense of place in developmental context. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 18, 5–29.
 31. Hidalgo, C., & Hernandez, B. (2001). Place attachment: Conceptual and empirical questions. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 21, 273–281.
 32. Hourihan, K. (1979) "The evaluation of urban neighborhoods 1: perception and 2: preference." *Environment and Planning A* 11 (12):1337-1353, 1355-1366.
 33. Jorgensen, B. S., & Stedman, R. C. (2001). Sense of place as an attitude: Lakeshore owner's attitudes toward their properties. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 21, 233–248.
 34. Jeanette Eby, Peter Kitchen and Allison Williams (2012) "Perceptions of quality life in Hamilton's neighborhood Hubs A qualitative analysis," *Springer Science+Business Media B.V.*
 35. Kazem. Jajromi (2009) "Evaluation of quality of life in Gonbad" (www.urbanmanagement.ir).
 36. Kasl, S.V. and E. Harberg: 1972, 'Perceptions of neighborhood and the desire to move out', *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 33, pp. 318–324.
 37. Korpela, K. M. (1989). Place-identity as a product of environmental self-regulation. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 9, 241–256.
 38. Keller, S. (1968) *The Urban neighborhood: A sociological perspective*. New York: Random House.
 39. Lynch, K. (1960) *Image of the city*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
 40. Ladd, F. C (1970) "Black youths view their environment: neighborhood maps," *Environmental and Behavior* 2 (June): 74-100.
 41. Misun Hur and Jack L. Nasar (2010) "Neighborhood satisfaction, physical and perceived naturalness and openness," *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 30 (2010) 52–59.
 42. Mohsen Ghods, Hamed Najafpour, Hasanuddin Bin Lamit, Naghme Abdolahi and Muhamad Solehin Fitry Bin Rosley. (2014). *Evaluation of the Effective Factors on Online Internet Usage in Organizations*, *Life Science Journal* 2014;11(1), http://scival-expert.utm.my/pubDetail.asp?t=pm&id=84887964951&o_id=57.

- expert.utm.my/pubDetail.asp?t=pm&id=84892163459&o_id=54.
43. Mohsen Ghods, Hamed Najafpour, Naghmeh Abdolahi, Hasanuddin Bin Lamit, Raheleh Sazvar, Mir Hadi Moazen Jamshidi, Seyedhamed Sadoughvanani and Amir Mehdiabadi (2014). Comparison of the Factors that Affect the Design of Traditional and New Systems Due Improving the Level of Organizations' Performance (A Case Study of Tehran, Iran) *J. Basic. Appl. Sci. Res.*, 4(3)134-142, TextRoad Publication, ISSN 2090-4304, [http://www.textroad.com/pdf/JBASR/J.%20Basic.%20Appl.%20Sci.%20Res.,%204\(3\)134-142,%202014.pdf](http://www.textroad.com/pdf/JBASR/J.%20Basic.%20Appl.%20Sci.%20Res.,%204(3)134-142,%202014.pdf).
 44. Mohammad. Reza. Rezvani (2011) "Assessment of quality of life in Norabad," (www.urbanmanagement.ir).
 45. Michael Greenberg and Kristen Crossney (2007) "Perceived neighbourhood quality in the United States: Measuring outdoor, housing and jurisdictional influences," *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences* 41 (2007) 181-194.
 46. Mohammad.Reza. Pour jaafar (2008) "Criteria for evaluating the quality of life in Iran," (www.urbanmanagement.ir).
 47. Marans, K. (1976) "perceived quality of residential environments," pp. 123-147 in K. H. Craik and E. H. Zube (eds.) *Perceiving Environmental Quality: Research and Applications*. New York: Plenum.
 48. M. Joseph Sirgy and Terri Cornwell (2002) "How neighborhood features affect quality of life," *Social Indicators Research* 59: 79-114.
 49. Micheal Pacione (2003) "Urban environmental quality and human wellbeing," *Landscape and Urban Planning* 65 (2003) 19-30.
 50. Marino Bonaiuto, Ferdinando Fornara and Mirilia Bonnes (2003) "Indexes of perceived residential environment quality and neighborhood attachment in urban environments," *Landscape and Urban Planning* 65. Pp, 41-52.
 51. Marchand, D. (2003). Representation of the city and image of the centre in two different urban structures: A modern and a traditional town. In G. Moser, E. Pol, Y. Bernard, M. Bonnes, J. A. Corraliza, & M. V. Giuliani (Eds.), *People, places and sustainability* (pp. 11-24). Go ttingen, Germany: Hogrefe & Huber.
 52. Milgram, S., & Jodelet, D. (1976). Psychological maps of Paris. In A. Proshansky, W. H. Ittelson, & L. G. Rivlin (Eds.), *Environmental psychology: People and their physical settings*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
 53. Newman, S. J. and G. J. DUNCAN (1979) "Residential Problems, dissatisfaction, and mobility," *J. of the Amer. Planning Assn.* 45 (April): 154-166.
 54. Nenci, A. M., De Rosa, A. S., Testa, G., & Carrus, G. (2003). Social and architectural legibility of the city. In G. Moser, E. Pol, Y. Bernard, M. Bonnes, J. A. Corraliza, & M. V. Giuliani (Eds.), *People, places and sustainability* (pp. 25-37). Go ttingen, Germany: Hogrefe & Huber.
 55. Patricia A. Collins, Michael V. Hayes and Lisa N. Oliver (2009) "Neighborhood quality and self-rated health: A survey of eight suburban neighborhoods in the Vancouver Census Metropolitan Area" *Health & Place* 15 (2009) 156-164.
 56. Prezza, M., Costantini, S., Chiarolanza, V., & Di Marco, S. (1999). La scala italiana del senso di comunita` . [The Italian Sense of Community Scale]. *Psicologia della Salute*, 3-4, 135-158.
 57. Park, Robert E., Ernest W. Burgess, Roderick D. McKenzie and Louis Wirth. 1975. *The City*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
 58. Proshansky, H. M. (1978). The city and self-identity. *Environment and Behavior*, 10, 147-169.
 59. Proshansky, H. M., Fabian, A., & Kaminoff, R. (1983). Place identity: Physical world and socialization of the self. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 3, 57-83.
 60. R. L. Schallock (2004) "The concept of quality of life: What we know and do not know," *Scopuse Journal*.
 61. Speare, A.: 1974, 'Residential satisfaction as an intervening variable in residential mobility', *Demography* 11(May), pp. 1973-1988.
 62. Sundquist, J. L. (1974) *Dispersing Population: What America Can Learn from Europe?* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
 63. Suttles, Gerald D. 1972. *The Social Construction of Communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
 64. Suttles, G.D. (1972) *the social construction of communities*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago press.
 65. Sarason, S. B. (1974). *The psychological sense of community: Prospects for a community psychology*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
 66. Tremblay, K. R., Jr., D. A. DILLMAN, and K. D. VAN LIEVE (1980) "An examination of the relationship between housing preferences and community-size preferences," *Rural Sociology* 45 (Fall): 509-519.
 67. Tuan, Y. F. (1980). Rootedness versus sense of place. *Landscape*, 24, 3-8.
 68. Tuan, Y. F. (1974) *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: prentice-Hall.
 69. Twigger-Ross, C. L., & Uzzell, D. (1996). Place and identity processes. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 16, 205-220.
 70. Uzzell, D., Pol, E., & Badenas, D. (2002). Place identification, social cohesion, and environmental sustainability. *Environment and Behavior*, 34, 26-53.
 71. Wolpert, J. (1966) "Migration as an adjustment to environment stress," *J. of Social Issues* 22 (October): 92-102.