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Abstract

Despite extensive literature on the nature and impact of gentrification, there has been little consideration of the effects of gentrification on ethnic neighbourhoods. This study evaluates the negative and positive effects of gentrification on the Portuguese in west central Toronto. Details concerning the settlement patterns of the Portuguese, the characteristics of Portuguese residents and patterns of gentrification in inner-city Toronto were obtained from census data. Evaluations of neighbourhood change and attitudes of the residents towards gentrification were obtained from key informant and focus group interviews. The results suggest considerable ambivalence among the respondents, but most agreed that the long-term viability of Little Portugal as an immigrant reception area with a good supply of low-cost housing is in doubt.

1. Introduction

Since Ruth Glass (1964) introduced the term in the 1960s, gentrification has become an integral part of the urban studies literature and there have been numerous studies on the origin and explanations of gentrification, the nature of the process and its impacts, both negative and positive, on local neighbourhoods. Debates have emerged concerning the meaning of gentrification, but most researchers agree that gentrification is the production of space for—and consumption by—a more affluent and very different incoming population (Slater et al., 2004, p. 1145).

In spite of the extensive amount of research concerning gentrification, there has been little consideration of the intersection between ethnic groups and gentrification. As Lees (2000, p. 400) noted at the turn of the present...
century, emphasis in gentrification research has been placed much more directly on class and gender than on ethnicity or race. Seven years later, Lees (2007, p. 230) reported relatively little progress in this area of research, except for Black gentrification in US cities (for example, Boyd, 2005; Freeman, 2006; Moore, 2009) and a few case studies of the impact of gentrification on minority groups, especially in Chicago (for example, Betancur, 2002; Boyd, 2005; Nyden et al., 2006).

Research has also focused more on gentrifiers and the process of gentrification than on the experiences of non-gentrifiers living in gentrifying neighbourhoods, many of whom are likely to be displaced as a result of gentrification (Rose, 2004, p. 302; Slater, 2006, p. 743). Displacement of low-income residents is usually identified in the literature as the major negative consequence of gentrification. However, the implications of gentrification for non-gentrifiers and the neighbourhoods in which they live are both negative and positive. Some researchers point to negative outcomes such as residential and commercial displacement, loss of affordable housing and the lessening of social diversity, while others emphasise positive effects such as the stabilisation of declining areas, reduced vacancy rates and increased social mix (Atkinson, 2004, p.112; Lees et al., 2007, pp. 195–236; Nyden et al., 2006, pp. 18–19).

Canadian research on gentrification has focused on the extent and timing of the process in the country’s three largest cities, Montréal, Toronto and Vancouver, and the factors responsible for gentrification, concentrating particularly on the consumption side. Ley’s (1996) work on the quickening pace of social status change as a marker of gentrification in inner-city neighbourhoods is especially relevant, as is Walks and Maaranen’s (2008a) more recent work on the timing, patterning and forms of gentrification. Using changes in social status, artists, income and rental tenure as indicators, Walks and Maaranen conclude that by 2001 more than one-third of pre-World-War-II inner-city census tracts in Canada’s three major cities had experienced complete or incomplete gentrification, with Toronto being most impacted.

There is general consensus among Canadian researchers that, while artists are important catalysts in the early stages of gentrification, managers and professionals ultimately replace them as house prices increase. Both Caulfield (1994) and Ley (1996) argue that gentrifiers are part of a post-industrial middle class who reject suburban conformity and favour inner-city diversity. Ley also argues that gentrifiers are attracted to areas of older Victorian houses, urban amenities, central-city employment opportunities and proximity to existing high-status enclaves. Rose (1984, 1996) has expanded this view to include ‘marginal gentrifiers’, especially female single parents who appreciate the greater level of support services available in inner-city neighbourhoods.

Although concern has been expressed in the Canadian literature about the link between gentrification and the displacement of low-income households from inner-city neighbourhoods, precise evidence concerning the extent of displacement is not available. More generally, however, the divergent impacts of gentrification on both gentrifiers and existing residents in Toronto have been considered by Filion (1991) and Slater (2004). As Filion (1991) notes, gentrifiers benefit in terms of enhanced home equity and neighbourhood amenities, but existing residents—especially those who are displaced to less desirable neighbourhoods—are negatively impacted. Based on a case study of South Parkdale in west central Toronto, Slater (2004) argues that middle-class gentrification in this area, encouraged by neo-liberal government policies aimed at improving the physical quality of South Parkdale, has not been beneficial to the deinstitutionalised psychiatric patients and recent immigrants who live in the area.
Despite Toronto’s characterisation as ‘the world in a city’ (Anisef and Lanphier, 2005) and the fact that 46 per cent of Toronto’s 2006 population was foreign-born, there has been no specific study of the impact of gentrification on the city’s inner-city ethnic neighbourhoods. Although Toronto has experienced a substantial suburbanisation of its immigrant population, west central Toronto, an older ethnically diverse residential area located immediately west of downtown Toronto, still contains a large number of European migrants, especially Portuguese who immigrated in the 1960s and 1970s and a diverse group of more recently arrived immigrants. In 2006, about 45 per cent of west central Toronto’s population was foreign-born and 9 per cent had immigrated in the previous five years. During the past two decades, however, west central Toronto has become increasingly gentrified with important implications for the existing immigrant population (Walks and Maaranen, 2008a).

In this research, we seek to understand the impact of gentrification on Portuguese residents living in west central Toronto, including Little Portugal, the historical core of Toronto’s Portuguese community (Figures 1 and 2). Although many Portuguese have moved to other areas in the Toronto Census Metropolitan Area (CMA), Little Portugal contains most of the city’s Portuguese institutions and Portuguese-oriented retailing, and Portuguese are still the largest ethnic group in west central Toronto. The rest of the paper is divided into seven major sections and a conclusion. The first three sections summarise the contextual background of the study focusing on: recent literature concerning the impact of gentrification on ethnic neighbourhoods; Portuguese settlement trends in the Toronto area; and, the emerging pattern of gentrification in Toronto’s inner city. This is followed by an overview of the methodology used in the remainder of the paper. Subsequent sections provide: a census-based analysis of the demographic, socioeconomic and housing characteristics of three major groups in west central Toronto—persons of Portuguese ethnic origin, Recent Immigrants and persons of British ethnic origin; and, an evaluation of the negative and positive impacts of gentrification on the Portuguese population in this area using key informant and focus group interviews and Atkinson’s (2004) framework for evaluating the impact of gentrification on existing residents. Atkinson (2004) identifies three major negatives of gentrification: (1) speculative property price increases, loss of affordable housing and displacement, (2) commercial/industrial displacement, and, (3) community resentment and conflict. He also identifies three contrasting positives: (1) increased property values, (2) stabilisation of declining areas and encouragement of further development, and (3) increased social mix. In conclusion, we consider the future of the Portuguese and immigrant newcomers in west central Toronto in the context of increased gentrification in the area and provide some general comments about the ways in which ethnic enclaves are impacted by gentrification and the extent to which the findings from this study can be generalised to other cities.

2. Impact of Gentrification on Ethnic Neighbourhoods

Relatively few studies have specifically considered the impact of gentrification on ethnic neighbourhoods. This impact is important, however, because, in addition to residential and commercial displacement, ethnic enclaves have a particular significance for immigrant groups. As Krase states:

Not only are local residents and businesses displaced but the symbolic representations of people and their activities are as well (Krase, 2005, p. 207).

In a study of four neighbourhoods undergoing gentrification in Chicago, Nyden et al. (2006)
note how gentrification impacts on the loss of community and ethnic/racial identity including the disruption of neighbourhood social networks, ethnic retailing, religious institutions and community organisations. In a highly racialised city such as Chicago gentrification also highlights differences between White gentrifiers and the minority groups being displaced, with some minority respondents characterising gentrification as a racist process. Interestingly, Latinos, whose neighbourhoods act as a buffer between Blacks and Whites, seem to be more directly impacted by the gentrification process than Blacks. The result in Chicago is an uneasy relationship between White gentrifiers and the incumbent Latinos. In particular, Whites are often uncomfortable with Latino neighbourhood celebrations and ethnic festivals, while Latinos view the White gentrifiers as unfriendly and intolerant.

Gentrification can also occur in neighbourhoods where higher-income members of a group replace lower-income members of the same group. For example, intraracial gentrification has occurred in Harlem and Clinton Hill in New York City and in the Douglas/Grand Boulevard neighbourhood of Chicago where middle-class Blacks are moving into areas occupied by lower-class Blacks, perhaps paving the way for middle- and upper-class Whites to follow (Boyd, 2005; Freeman, 2006; Lees et al., 2007, pp. 110–111). Evaluations of intraracial gentrification are mixed. Freeman (2006), for example, argues that displacement in Harlem has been minimal, partially because of rent-control legislation and because existing residents appreciate the improvements in amenities, services and the physical landscape. He concedes, however, that gentrification has done little to improve employment prospects in the area. In contrast, Boyd (2005) points out that those who have encouraged Black gentrification in Chicago as a form of ‘racial uplift’ mask
the negative implications for the neighbourhood’s low-income Blacks.

The few studies that have examined the impacts of gentrification on ethnic neighbourhoods have been restricted primarily to minority neighbourhoods in New York City and Chicago. None has been undertaken in Canadian cities. The impacts range from positive to negative, depending on who is impacted. As Nyden et al. (2006, pp. 27–28) note in their Chicago study, participants who expressed ambivalence about gentrification often asked, “Who benefits?” or “Who is hurt?”. These questions are at the core of this study on the impacts of gentrification on Portuguese residents in west central Toronto.

3. Portuguese Settlement Trends in the Toronto Area

Portuguese immigration to Toronto began in the early 1950s and peaked in the 1970s. By 2006, 410,850 people of Portuguese ethnic background lived in Canada, almost half of whom resided in the Toronto Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) (Census of Canada, 2006, total ethnic origin). The majority of this group lived in the City of

![Figure 2. Percentage of Portuguese ethnic origin, by census tracts, west central Toronto, 2006.](image)
Toronto, particularly Little Portugal, adjacent areas of west central Toronto and an expanded corridor of Portuguese settlement to the north-west (Figures 1 and 2).

Since first settling in west central Toronto, many Portuguese have left the central city and moved in a north-westerly direction, where they are replacing the Italians, or to Toronto’s western suburbs, particularly Mississauga and Brampton (Figure 1). In 1971, people of Portuguese background (Portuguese mother tongue) accounted for about 28 per cent of the population in Little Portugal and 15 per cent in west central Toronto (Table 1). Since 1971, people of Portuguese background (Portuguese mother tongue) accounted for about 28 per cent of the population in Little Portugal and 15 per cent in west central Toronto (Table 1).4 West central Toronto was home to almost half of Toronto’s Portuguese population at that time. By 1981, Portuguese represented over half the population in Little Portugal and about one-third in west central Toronto. However, the Portuguese in west central Toronto only accounted for about one-quarter of Toronto’s Portuguese population, primarily due to the dramatic increase in Portuguese immigration in the 1970s and the (re)location of Portuguese to other areas of the Toronto CMA.

Beginning in the 1980s, Portuguese immigration to Canada declined. However, Portuguese population (total ethnic origin) in the Toronto CMA rose to 188 000 in 2006 due to an increase in the second and subsequent generations. In contrast, the Portuguese population in west central Toronto, including Little Portugal, declined following 1981, both numerically and as a percentage of total population. Although Little Portugal and the surrounding area of west central Toronto are no longer the only important Portuguese residential areas in Toronto, they still contain a large number of people of Portuguese ethnic origin—more than 16 000 (total ethnic origin) in west central Toronto, of whom almost 60 per cent live in Little Portugal. Evidence from interview studies also suggests that many Portuguese who live in other parts of the city do so because of family ties or social networks.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>44 590</td>
<td>35 140</td>
<td>33 050</td>
<td>30 940</td>
<td>28 085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>12 285</td>
<td>19 655</td>
<td>15 945</td>
<td>12 075</td>
<td>9 040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Portuguese</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West central Toronto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>124 355</td>
<td>103 110</td>
<td>106 276</td>
<td>108 190</td>
<td>102 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>18 235</td>
<td>31 645</td>
<td>27 125</td>
<td>21 450</td>
<td>16 060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Portuguese</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto CMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>2 628 125</td>
<td>2 998 947</td>
<td>3 893 046</td>
<td>4 647 955</td>
<td>5 113 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>39 550</td>
<td>127 635</td>
<td>124 330</td>
<td>171 545</td>
<td>188 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Portuguese</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Little Portugal: census tracts 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45 and 46; City of Toronto neighbourhoods of Little Portugal and Trinity Bellwoods.
* West central Toronto census tracts 4, 5, 7.01, 7.02, 8, 10, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47.01, 47.02, 48, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57 and 58; City of Toronto neighbourhoods of South Parkdale, Liberty Exhibition, Niagara, Trinity Bellwoods, Little Portugal, Roncesvalles, Dufferin Grove and Palmerston–Little Italy.

return to Little Portugal to visit friends, take part in religious services and cultural festivals, and shop in local Portuguese stores (Teixeira, 2007a). Therefore, Little Portugal remains an important magnet in the life of Toronto’s Portuguese community.

Currently, west central Toronto is in transition, partly as a result of the outward movement of Portuguese, but also due to an in-movement of: immigrants and refugees, primarily from eastern and southern Asia, Latin America and Africa; and, an increasing number of middle-class professionals who see an opportunity to obtain relatively low-cost housing with renovation potential in close proximity to the city’s downtown core (Teixeira, 2007b). A comparatively small number of immigrants and refugees have also arrived from the Portuguese diaspora (Brazil and Portugal’s former African colonies). In this multi-ethnic context, west central Toronto offers an opportunity for a rich and complex analysis of gentrification occurring in an area that is also experiencing replacement of its older European immigrant groups by more recently arrived visible minority groups.

4. Emerging Patterns of Gentrification in Inner-city Toronto

Gentrification in inner-city Toronto dates from the late 1960s and early 1970s and now includes much of the city’s central area (for example, Caulfield, 1994; Sabourin, 1994; Ley, 1996; Meligrana and Skaburskis, 2005; Walks and Maaranen, 2008a). Walks and Maaranen (2008a), in the most recent and comprehensive of these studies, trace the patterns of gentrification by census tract for each decade from 1961 to 2001, using a combination of variables representing changes in income, education, occupational status, housing tenure, rent and dwelling value. They further identify areas of complete gentrification (personal income above average in 2000 from a previously below-average status in 1960) and incomplete gentrification (personal income still below average in 2000).

Figure 3 indicates the degree to which areas of complete or incomplete gentrification were prevalent throughout inner-city Toronto in 2000. Of the 23 census tracts in west central Toronto, one was completely gentrified by 2000, 12 showed incomplete gentrification and another four were characterised as having potential for future gentrification. Evidence from Walks and Maaranen (2008a) indicates that gentrification has spread in a contagion fashion from the downtown area west through the eastern half of west central Toronto and from High Park at the western edge of west central Toronto in an easterly direction. Census tracts between these two areas exhibit either potential for gentrification or no gentrification, but if this pattern continues it is likely that much of west central Toronto will experience some form of gentrification in the future, although this point must be nuanced, at least for the western half of Little Portugal where the majority of houses have less architectural appeal for gentrifiers.

A comparison with Figure 2 shows that Portuguese neighbourhoods in the eastern half of west central Toronto have been most affected by gentrification. The eastern half is closer to downtown and has more Victorian houses that are attractive to gentrifiers. Italian and Portuguese homeowners often ‘mediterraneanise’ these houses with angel-brick facades or brightly painted brick, but it is relatively easy for gentrifiers to restore the houses to their original brick façade, an aesthetic they prefer. In contrast, houses in census tracts to the west are more modest, without the same architectural appeal as houses to the east. They are also closer to rail lines and industry in areas where until recently deindustrialisation has been relatively slow (Walks and August, 2008). Of the eight census tracts with 20 per cent or more residents of Portuguese ethnic origin in 2006, four exhibit
incomplete gentrification and another two have the potential for future gentrification.

Discussion of Portuguese settlement patterns in west central Toronto and emerging patterns of gentrification leads to a consideration of the impact of gentrification on Portuguese suburbanisation. Portuguese suburbanisation began in the 1970s and accelerated in the 1980s. Gentrification also began in the 1980s, but remained incomplete in most parts of west central Toronto (Walks and Maaranen, 2008a, p. 29). On one level, it can be argued that the Portuguese simply followed the pattern established earlier by Jewish and Italian immigrants who also settled initially in west central Toronto and subsequently moved to the suburbs. Unlike the Portuguese, however, these groups moved before the onset of gentrification. More likely, gentrification has accelerated Portuguese relocation to the suburbs and continues to have substantial impacts on the large number of Portuguese who still live in west central Toronto.5

5. Methodology

The empirical research in the following sections is based on both quantitative and qualitative analyses. The quantitative census-based analysis includes socio-demographic characteristics for three major ethno-racial groups living in west central Toronto: Portuguese and two groups of non-Portuguese—Recent Immigrants and British. This section provides a context for the qualitative analysis. Specific definitions of the three groups are provided.
in Table 2. As noted in Table 2, these are derived variables obtained through custom tabulations of the 2001 Canadian census. The variables are designed to capture the increased complexity of the ethnic origin variable, whereby respondents often report more than one origin, especially Canadian. For Portuguese and British, the data are based on ethnic origin. Portuguese include both Portuguese immigrants and Canadian-born of Portuguese descent. Similarly, British include British immigrants and Canadian-born of British background. The data for Recent Immigrants are based on a combination of visible minority status and ethnic origin. The latter include a wide variety of groups who immigrated to Canada relatively recently, primarily from eastern and southern Asia, Latin America and Africa. Thus, we use the term ‘Recent Immigrants’ as a descriptor of this group. The three groups are differentiated by their immigration status and history as well as a variety of socioeconomic and housing characteristics.

The available census data do not permit a breakdown between Portuguese immigrants and Portuguese non-immigrants, nor is it possible to determine the characteristics of the gentrifiers. Nevertheless, as indicated in Table 2 and evaluated more fully later, the demographics of the British ethnic origin group display the classic characteristics of gentrifiers in ways that the other two groups do not. This is not to imply that the gentrifiers are only of British or British-Canadian background. Indeed, it is possible that a sizeable number of second- and third-generation immigrants from various ethnic backgrounds who are also part of the professional class have been drawn from the suburban environment of their parents to an inner-city lifestyle.

Almost 19 per cent of west central Toronto’s population in 2001 indicated that they were of Portuguese ethnic origin. The Portuguese are an established immigrant population. Although 70 per cent of the group were born outside Canada, less than 10 per cent immigrated between 1991 and 2001. ‘Recent Immigrants’ include persons from a wide variety of ethnic origins who have immigrated to Canada and settled in west central Toronto much more recently than the Portuguese. About 27 per cent of west central Toronto’s population indicated that they belonged to one of the ethnic origin groups listed as Recent Immigrants in Table 2. Almost 80 per cent were born outside Canada, but more importantly almost 45 per cent immigrated in the 1991–2001 period. About 11 per cent of west central Toronto’s population regarded themselves as British or British and Canadian. In contrast to the Portuguese and Recent Immigrants, fewer than 20 per cent of the British origin group were born outside Canada and only about 2 per cent came between 1991 and 2001. The ethnic groups not included in this analysis comprise persons of Polish, Ukrainian, Greek, Italian and Caribbean ethnic origin, groups that entered Canada primarily in the 1960s and 1970s, about the same time as the Portuguese. The census data include variables related to immigration status, residential mobility, age and household/family structure, economic status (education, occupation, income) and housing (tenure, period of construction, dwelling type and physical quality of the dwelling).

The qualitative information was used to evaluate perceptions of neighbourhood change and the attitudes of Portuguese-speaking residents towards gentrification. Information was obtained in summer 2006 from informal interviews with 20 Portuguese key informants and five focus groups. A total of 42 people participated in the focus groups, 13 Portuguese with roots in Portugal, 14 from the Portuguese colonies and 15 people from other ethnic origins. Three focus groups only included Portuguese-speakers, either from Portugal or the former Portuguese
Table 2. Selected characteristics of the Portuguese and non-Portuguese population: west central Toronto, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Portuguese ethnic origin</th>
<th>Recent immigrants</th>
<th>British ethnic origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigrant population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born outside Canada (percentage)</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated 1991–2001 (percentage)</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved, previous 5 years (percentage)</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 Years (percentage)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–24 years (percentage)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–44 years (percentage)</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–64 years (percentage)</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over (percentage)</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-family household (percentage)</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily household (percentage)</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-family household (percentage)</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational achievement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than grade 9 (percentage)</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 9–13 (percentage)</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college/university (percentage)</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree (percentage)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High skill (percentage)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium skill (percentage)</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low skill (percentage)</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average individual income (Can$)</td>
<td>23110</td>
<td>20925</td>
<td>37075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household income (Can$)</td>
<td>59995</td>
<td>41450</td>
<td>59514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned (percentage)</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household income (Can$)</td>
<td>68687</td>
<td>75487</td>
<td>89292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average value dwelling (Can$)</td>
<td>254007</td>
<td>265732</td>
<td>279402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household’s spending ≥ 30 per cent (percentage)</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented (percentage)</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household income (Can$)</td>
<td>42817</td>
<td>39140</td>
<td>45311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average monthly rent (Can$)</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household’s spending ≥30 per cent (percentage)</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period of Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1946 (percentage)</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946–60 (percentage)</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961–80 (percentage)</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981–2001 (percentage)</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
colonies, and two included Portuguese- and non-Portuguese-speakers. Key informants and focus group participants were recruited through reputational (snowball) sampling relying initially on: extensive contacts that have been developed with local Portuguese residents over several years of research in the area; and ethnocultural organisations (for example, ABRIGO, BIA–Dundas St West); and, St Christopher House, a local community agency. Appeals for participants were also made through the Portuguese media. There is no evidence that the mixed nature of the groups had an influence on the conversation. Participants talked openly about the advantages and disadvantages of gentrification.

The key informants come from different professions (for example, social workers, journalists, real estate brokers, politicians, entrepreneurs, teachers, factory workers, a priest, a construction contractor, a bank manager and a health nutritionist). Preference was given to residents of Little Portugal and to people living elsewhere but working in the area. Former residents of the neighbourhood who moved out of the area in the past decade were also interviewed in order to reach a better understanding of who has left the area and why. The key informant interviews and focus group discussions were taped, transcribed and summarised by theme. It is important to note that the snowball sampling procedure and the relatively small number of key informants and focus group participants limit the results of the study and do not allow conclusions based on statistical representativeness. In that respect, this is an exploratory study and the results must be interpreted cautiously. Nonetheless, it is the first substantive attempt in the Canadian literature to evaluate the impact of gentrification on a particular immigrant group.

Table 2. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Portuguese ethnic origin$^a$</th>
<th>Recent immigrants$^b$</th>
<th>British ethnic origin$^c$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Type</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single detached (percentage)</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached and row housing (percentage)</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Quality of the Dwelling</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Portuguese ethnic origin: Portuguese single ethnic origin with/without Canadian ethnic origin.
$^b$ Recent immigrants: Chinese, south Asian (Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, Bangladeshi), African (Black visible minority respondents who indicated African ethnic origin), south-east Asian, Filipino, Latin American, and Arab/west Asian visible minority status.
$^c$ British ethnic origin: British Isles responses with/without Canadian ethnic origin.
$^d$ High skill (level A): occupations usually require university education (for example, managerial, professional).
$^e$ Medium skill (levels B and C): occupations usually require high school, college or apprenticeship training (for example, supervisors, skilled crafts and trades, technicians, senior clerical, sales and service).
$^f$ Low skill (level D): on-the-job training is usually provided for these occupations (for example, sales, service, other manual workers).

Note: for definition of west central Toronto, see footnote to Table 1.
Source: Adapted from Statistics Canada Custom Product EO1025, 2001 Census.

6.1 Persons of Portuguese Ethnic Origin

The Portuguese exhibit the expected characteristics of an ageing immigrant population. They are stayers—only about 20 per cent moved in the previous five years. They are also considerably older than the other two groups. About 17 per cent of the Portuguese are 65 years of age and older and 27 per cent are between 45 and 64 years of age. Almost three-quarters of the Portuguese households are one-family and a further 10 per cent are multifamily. The latter reflect the custom among some Portuguese to live as extended families. Compared with the other two groups, the Portuguese have a relatively low level of educational achievement and occupational status. Almost half of Portuguese adults have no high school education and fewer than 5 per cent possess a university degree. Only about 10 per cent are engaged in high-skilled managerial or professional occupations. While average individual income for the Portuguese is relatively low, average household income is comparatively high, partially as a result of multiple earners within many Portuguese families. With regard to housing status, two-thirds of Portuguese households own their homes, more than twice the incidence of homeownership for the Recent Immigrants and the British, and higher than the city average. They are also more likely to occupy semi-detached and row housing than the other two groups. This is often the Victorian-style housing that is attractive to gentrifiers. Even though 70 per cent of the Portuguese indicate that their dwelling only needs regular maintenance, the housing is old and regular maintenance may be more of a financial burden than for a newer house.

6.2 Recent Immigrants

The Recent Immigrants are considerably younger than the Portuguese. Twenty per cent are under 15 years of age and almost 60 per cent are between 15 and 44 years old. About two-thirds are one-family households and one-third are non-family households, either living alone or with non-related persons. The Recent Immigrants are much more highly educated than the Portuguese. Almost 30 per cent possess a university degree and a further 30 per cent have some college or university education. Although a larger proportion than the Portuguese are in highly skilled jobs, their occupational status does not match their high level of educational achievement—an issue that affects many new immigrants. Also, individual and household incomes are both relatively low. Concerning housing status, almost 80 per cent of these households are renters and more than 70 per cent live in apartments. Almost half live in high-rise apartments and half in housing constructed between 1946 and 1980, the period during which most of Toronto's high-rise towers were constructed. Much of this housing is showing its age and not surprisingly 40 per cent of Recent Immigrant households considered their housing in need of minor or major repair. Most of this group lives in housing that is not attractive to gentrifiers.

6.3 Persons of British Ethnic Origin

Based on the data in Table 2, the British group exhibits many of the demographic characteristics that are associated with gentrifiers. Although specific evidence concerning previous residential location is not available, this group's high level of residential mobility implies that many are relative newcomers to west central Toronto. More than half of this group are between 25 and 44 years of age, with very few under 15 years of age or over 65. More than half are non-family households, either living alone or with non-related persons. Compared with the other two groups,
they are highly educated. Eighty per cent of adults have a university degree or at least some college or university education. This high level of educational attainment is reflected in their occupational status. Half are employed in high-skilled occupations. Average individual income is considerably higher than the other two groups. Concerning housing, about one-third are homeowners. Almost 60 per cent occupy housing built before 1946 and almost 40 per cent live in low-rise apartments. Although their level of homeownership is only about half that of the Portuguese group, members of the British group who do not own their residence are likely to have sufficient current or potential economic resources to purchase and ultimately to renovate a house in west central Toronto.

7. Negative and Positive Impacts of Gentrification as Identified by the Portuguese Respondents

7.1 Speculative Property Price Increases, Loss of Affordable Housing and Displacement vs Increased Property Values

Loss of affordable housing, arising primarily from speculative property price increases in gentrifying areas, usually results in the displacement of existing residents, especially renters. Loss of affordable housing and displacement have been identified in numerous studies as the most negative effects of gentrification. Although measurement of displacement is difficult (Atkinson, 2000; Newman and Wyly, 2006a, 2006b) and most studies are based on incomplete evidence, there is general agreement that displacement has serious consequences, especially for low-income displacees. Not only are displacees forced to find alternative housing, but they also face the emotional impact of removal from social networks and familiar community structures. Gentrification also affects low-income residents, especially recent immigrants, who might have otherwise found affordable housing in gentrifying neighbourhoods but are forced to look elsewhere, a phenomenon that Marcuse (1986, p. 156) refers to as exclusionary displacement.

Loss of affordable housing was identified by three-quarters of the Portuguese respondents as the most important negative impact of gentrification. This is not surprising, given the rapidly escalating house prices in the area. As illustrated in the following quotations many respondents blamed gentrifiers and the increased demand for housing for the escalating real estate values.

Houses in my area are listed for one price and sold later on for more than 25–30 per cent above the asking price. The urban professionals are largely responsible for that ... they can afford.

There has been a frightening change in the last seven years. Seven years ago, when I rented an apartment in the Portuguese area, the first one was $550 a month for rent. Then, I moved to a much larger apartment, two bedrooms, kitchen, bathroom quite large, for $750. Now I pay $875 for something that is half of where I used to live. It keeps going up because it’s like this: there is more demand. I say this because my landlord talks about it. Demand is much greater now and they have to increase ... but it has gone up a lot.

Low-income people, including Recent Immigrants, are most severely affected by the escalating house prices and face increased barriers finding affordable housing in the area. Indeed, there are already signs that some renters who have lived in the area for a long time are being forced to leave their apartments because they cannot afford the rents. One respondent even questioned the future of Little Portugal as an immigrant reception area

I have also seen the arrival of other ethnic groups—the Asiatics, the Chinese ... but if Little Portugal is going through gentrification this area will stop being a reception area for
new immigrants ... they cannot afford the rents ... like Chinatown and Queen Street West which are in transition, Little Portugal too will follow ... it’s a question of location.

Most respondents felt that smaller apartments will gradually be eliminated and, with them, the ability of low-income working-class people to rent in the area. In part, this is because increased property values encourage the conversion of rental units to homeownership, thereby reducing the number of rental units in the area. Increased property values in gentrifying areas enhance the growing wealth gap between homeowners and renters (for example, Hulchanski, 2004) and make it increasingly difficult, if not impossible, for renters to enter the homeownership market in these areas of the city.

In contrast, increased property values resulting from gentrification are advantageous to homeowners who wish to capitalise on the increased equity in their house. When they sell their houses, Portuguese and other homeowners stand to benefit from increased house prices, especially if they are able to or want to move to lower-cost housing in the suburbs. The increased value of housing in Little Portugal may also help the children of first-generation Portuguese to achieve inter-generational class mobility.

Arrival of gentrifiers is good for Portuguese because they can sell their houses for very good prices ... they will cash in their real estate investment ... the ones who benefit the most are the sons/daughters with the sale because some of those Portuguese parents decide to live with their children. Thus, they are in a position to help financially their children.

Some, however, do not want to leave Little Portugal and selling their house is not an option. Regarding this dilemma, one respondent noted

Houses are selling for a very good price ... but what is the point ... most of the first-generation Portuguese don’t want to move ... they want to die where they spent most of their lives ... here in ‘Little Portugal’. What’s the point to sell for good bucks, cash some money and go to the suburbs ... far away from the Portuguese community? That’s not what they want. So ... what’s the point of having this huge housing prices here ... who benefits? Not the Portuguese seniors because they still need a roof to live.

Those homeowners who remain in Little Portugal face another dilemma. A little more than half of the respondents expressed concern about the potential displacement of existing residents due to a steady increase in property taxes and maintenance costs. Seniors on fixed incomes are the most vulnerable because many lack the necessary financial resources to maintain their houses and afford the increased property taxes. One respondent pointed to these issues, but also lamented the lack of sufficient seniors’ housing to accommodate a growing elderly population.

People who are older can’t maintain a three-storey Victorian house. Because of the very nature of their health and/or age they are not ... able to do the repairs needed in their homes ... and the high property taxes ... have gone through the roof ... Portuguese like Italians ... like to hold their houses for as long as they can ... usually the move is due to health reasons. ... Unfortunately, we don’t have enough seniors’ housing in our community to accommodate these people in need of a place to stay ... in a secure and comfortable place in an atmosphere where they would feel comfortable.

Seniors who decide to stay in Little Portugal often rent part of their house, usually to Portuguese-speaking immigrants, as a means of coping with escalating homeownership costs. As one respondent noted.

Yes ... my property taxes increased by $300 alone in one year [in 2005—paying $3000 and in 2006, $3300]. I am retired ... I don’t know how I will be able to survive with these increases ... What saves me now is that I have part of my house rented [rooms and
Otherwise I would be in a very difficult situation. Other retired Portuguese have to do the same ... it’s a necessity ... with high taxes and high costs of maintenance of the house.

This approach is a modern extension of a traditional Portuguese housing strategy whereby homeowners paid off their mortgages by renting out parts of their houses, often to recently arrived Portuguese immigrants. Not all seniors are comfortable renting part of their house, however, especially to non-Portuguese-speaking tenants.

A major issue is that since 1988 property taxes in Toronto have been based on current value assessment. With the inflow of urban professionals willing to pay high prices for a location near the downtown core, house prices have increased considerably during the past decade and property taxes have increased accordingly. Despite the fact that most first-generation Portuguese are homeowners and mortgage-free they are ‘land rich and cash poor’. Although the city offers some financial relief from property tax increases for seniors and low-income homeowners, it is not sufficient to compensate fully for high taxes and increased expenditures on maintenance and utilities. In this way, the city may be inadvertently encouraging gentrification.

More generally, many respondents viewed gentrification as a broader societal problem with implications for the well-being of the city for the country itself, for the society at large, the fact that you have all those small apartments that gradually are being wiped out, that takes away the ability of the single person, the single mother, to be able to live in the centre of the city is bad. So it’s good for the homeowner who owns right now to sell for a fortune ... but as a city I am afraid that it makes the centre of the city completely out of reach for the working class. I don’t see this area any more being an immigrant reception area as it was in the past ... gone forever!

The respondents also noted that the loss of affordable housing, while of concern, is likely to be a much more serious problem in the future. Currently, the majority of urban professionals in west central Toronto live on the periphery of Little Portugal. However, more intense gentrification in Little Portugal is just a question of time since the process is well established east and west of Little Portugal—Little Portugal, sandwiched between the two areas, will be next. Even if some of the houses are not attractive architecturally, they can be torn down and replaced with more modern structures.

7.2 Commercial and Industrial Displacement vs Stabilisation of Declining Areas and Encouragement of Further Development

In addition to residential displacement, gentrification can result in the displacement of commercial and industrial activities and the loss of working-class shopping and job opportunities. Gentrifiers, who have different tastes than the working-class population and more money to spend, demand more upscale goods and services, resulting in what Lees et al. (2007, p. 131) call “retail gentrification” or “boutiqueification”. As Ley (1996) notes, the nature of retailing in gentrifying neighbourhoods also changes as these areas shift from the pioneer stage of gentrification to more advanced stages and the original ‘hippy’ retailing is replaced by stores offering more luxurious goods and services.

At the same time, industrial uses either close down completely or move elsewhere, primarily because of increased land costs, obsolete factory space and the obtrusive nature of many industrial activities that can lead to conflict and tension with middle-class professionals resulting in a lack of political support for industrial uses. As well, many industrial buildings are ideal candidates for residential loft conversion, a housing form that is particularly attractive to gentrifiers. Industrial displacement results in the loss of
good central-city manufacturing jobs that are often replaced by low-paid jobs in the informal sector (Curran, 2004). Ironically, these are often labourers who find employment in the renovation industry in gentrifying areas of the city.

In contrast to negatives associated with the displacement of commercial and industrial activities, the most positive result of gentrification is often claimed to be the stabilisation of declining areas and the encouragement of further development, sometimes with public subsidy and support. Most obviously, gentrifying homeowners and retailers renovate their properties and thereby enhance the image of the neighbourhood, leading to further investment as confidence builds about positive outcomes in the area. Gentrifiers are also effective lobbyists and have the ability to direct public funds to physical and social improvements in their neighbourhoods. Business owners can also be important catalysts for enhanced residential gentrification. For example, Hackworth and Rekers (2005) describe how the packaging of mostly upscale ethnic retailing by business owners in four Toronto neighbourhoods is being used to enhance the value of surrounding residential properties. From a negative perspective, however, as gentrification accelerates, more low-income residents and marginal businesses upon which local residents depend are displaced from the neighbourhood.

Almost 40 per cent of the Portuguese respondents expressed concern about the future of Little Portugal’s ethnic economy. Some strongly believe that the arrival of commercial gentrification and increased property taxes have the potential to displace Portuguese entrepreneurs. Portuguese businesses in Little Portugal are still doing well economically, in part because the majority of entrepreneurs own the buildings they occupy. Respondents agreed, however, that the number of Portuguese businesses in the area has decreased slightly in the past decade.

Portuguese businesses are still doing well. However, the number of Portuguese-owned businesses decreased a little bit ... not too much but some are moving more northward or retiring and selling the businesses. ... A few years ago on Dundas St West [from Bathurst Street to Dufferin/Landsdowne] ... most of the businesses were owned by Portuguese immigrants ... I would say approximately 90 per cent. Today maybe only 70 per cent. Businesses on Dundas have been bought more and more by Vietnamese, Brazilians and other Canadians.

The reasons are varied. Some Portuguese businesses decided to follow the Portuguese who moved to the suburbs, while an increasing number of Portuguese entrepreneurs are retiring and their children show no interest in continuing the business. Other respondents said that retail gentrification is pushing out some Portuguese entrepreneurs, particularly those who rent the buildings in which their businesses are located.

Several respondents took a more positive view and argued that gentrification could promote the “stabilisation of declining areas” and encourage further residential and commercial development of Little Portugal. Despite the extraordinary work by Portuguese homeowners in renovating their houses and ultimately improving the quality of life in Little Portugal, respondents recognised that some retail facilities, especially west of Dufferin St, need rehabilitation and investment. In that regard, it was suggested that Portuguese entrepreneurs could cater more directly to the gentrifiers by diversifying their businesses and giving a ‘facelift’ to the façades of their stores.

The Portuguese businesses here cannot serve exclusively the Portuguese living in the area nor be ‘weekend’ businesses for those coming from the suburbs who like to shop in Little Portugal. We have to diversify our businesses and open ourselves to other groups including these people with money [gentrifiers] which are discovering Little Portugal.
Most respondents admitted, however, that gentrifiers, who have the capital, the aesthetic taste and the political acumen to demand high-quality municipal services could best achieve neighbourhood rehabilitation. As one respondent, when describing the gentrifiers in positive terms, noted

I have a problem with a sort of boxing people as gentrifiers because—I mean—I think that people have a need for beauty and shouldn’t be bad thing because I like to see actually Little Portugal looking a little bit more beautiful. ... so for me, I’m feeling that there’s a bad connotation to the word gentrification and I think there’s also something that I appreciated about, you know, well educated people who want to live in a beautiful neighbourhood.

Another respondent noted the ability of gentrifiers to get the attention of city officials, but was a little less positive about the outcome

Urban professionals arrive in the area and they demand changes. Some would say positive one ... They know how to get around ... how to get the urban planning department to do it ... how to get to the city councilors to do. They have the power, they know how to do it plus they have the time and the knowledge. Because of their complaining, for example ‘one-hour parking signs’ in Little Portugal streets ... It limits the noise, the traffic ... but you can get easily a ticket when visiting the family ... now you think twice before you come to the Portuguese feasts/festivals ... they are good in lobbying.

Overall, this group of respondents sees gentrification as an important driving-force for further development, both in Little Portugal and in neighbouring areas of west central Toronto.

7.3 Community Resentment and Conflict vs Increased Social Mix

In the early stages of gentrification there is likely to be resentment by existing residents, especially renters who are impacted by increased housing costs. Existing residents may also resent more general aspects of neighbourhood change, including the increased cost of upscale goods and services and an escalating loss of control over changes in their neighbourhood. At the same time, there may be a lack of tolerance by gentrifiers for existing working-class residents, often ethnic minorities, who do not share the same values and customs as themselves. On the other hand, some commentators point to the advantages of increased social mix in areas impacted by gentrification, although others are sceptical. The advantages of greater social interaction and cultural diversity are often expressed by governments as a way of reducing social segregation and the assumed negative consequences of spatially embedded disadvantage. As noted by Lees et al. (2007, pp. 198–207) governments in the UK, the Netherlands and the US have all used this argument as a means of promoting ‘positive gentrification’.

Empirical evidence, however, suggests that gentrification does not necessarily result in increased social diversity or that social mix is a cure-all for the negative effects of gentrification (Lees, 2008). In considering whether gentrification leads to greater social mix and ethnic diversity, Walks and Maaranen (2008b), using census-tract data for Montréal, Toronto and Vancouver, demonstrate that gentrification tends to reduce levels of income and ethnic mix in gentrified neighbourhoods. Attitudes of gentrifiers towards the incumbent population are also mixed. Relying on interviews with a sample of residents in new non-luxury infill condominiums in Montréal’s inner city, Rose (2004) found that attitudes towards social diversity and social housing run the gamut from ‘egalitarian’ to ‘tolerant’ to ‘NIMBY’. Concerning issues of spatial proximity and social distance, Rose (2004, p. 294) notes that in Montréal’s Saint-Louis neighbourhood gentrifiers appreciate the fact that their working-class Portuguese neighbours maintain their property even though there is little communication between
them, what Germain and Rose (2000, p. 245) in the context of multi-ethnic sociability in Montréal’s public places refer to as a "peaceful but fairly distant co-existence".

Almost 40 per cent of the Portuguese respondents noted ‘community resentment and conflict’ as a negative aspect of gentrification in Little Portugal. Some respondents argued that the newly arrived gentrifiers are an élitist alien group who form their own ‘world’ (a white-collar one) while the Portuguese form another ‘world’ (a working-class or blue-collar one). As some respondents put it, the gentrifiers come to Little Portugal in search of cultural diversity, but they end up recreating their own cultural territory, ultimately leading to social distance and in some cases tension between the Portuguese and the gentrifiers.

Yes—exclusion ... they [urban professionals] have different uses, customs, life styles ... also their status is different from us Portuguese. They normally spend little time at home ... they are professionals and they travel a lot. Very distinctive, even by the cars they drive you can tell them, these are people with a lot of money. They have no time and don’t share interests with Portuguese immigrants ... This is another form of ‘ghettoisation’ and the Portuguese already feel insecure.

Tension between the two groups is often expressed in lifestyle or cultural differences, as indicated by the following encounter in a local park.

They [gentrifiers] are picky. In June at the Portuguese Parade, I was at the Trinity Bellwoods Park where we had the bands playing and a lot of other activities and a gentrifier complained because we were making too much noise. We have Portuguese here for 50 years and this type of party for decades ... so where is the problem? I can understand their point of view ... OK ... If I was a gentrifier and I paid a million bucks for the home and I am trying to surf the net and there is this noise in the Park ... it’s terrible ... this is the conflict we have now ... we are very happy when we sell our houses for $750 000 but we get upset when these guys come with ‘decibel meters’ measuring the noise ... two worlds it seems.

On the other hand, several Portuguese respondents argued that the arrival of gentrifiers has been beneficial to the Portuguese community in general, and particularly to those who have a good knowledge of English, by helping them mix and thus integrate more broadly into Canadian society. They further argue that gentrifiers bring more cultural diversity to Little Portugal, thereby helping the Portuguese break down the closed ethnic enclave that has characterised the community since the 1960s when the Portuguese first arrived in Toronto.

It’s positive the arrival of gentrifiers into Little Portugal ... it destroys the ‘ghetto’ that we had for decades. We are here highly concentrated and Portuguese didn’t need to learn English because their lives were done in Portuguese within the Portuguese community ... now our ‘ghetto’ is diluting/disintegrating and we are integrating ourselves more into the Canadian society. There is no conflict with them ... and all of us get very happy when we sell our houses for very good money.

The gentrifiers have also been participating more in the life of Little Portugal by shopping in Portuguese businesses and taking part in Portuguese cultural events. Some respondents suggested that there are already signs of a shift in thinking among first-generation Portuguese immigrants, who are opening themselves more to people of different ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds and gradually embracing the idea of greater cultural diversity in the neighbourhood. For the majority of Portuguese, gentrifiers are also good neighbours, people who really care about their houses and the neighbourhood.

As indicated by the quotations, there is ambivalence about the arrival of gentrifiers in Little Portugal. There is general acceptance...
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of the gentrifiers by the Portuguese, but at the same time there is a degree of social isolation between the two groups and where cultures clash, as in the use of a park, tensions come to the surface. And, as expressed in the following comment by a Portuguese journalist, the gentrifiers are well received by homeowners who sold their property for a relatively high price

I would say that they [urban professionals] were well received by those Portuguese who sold the real estate ... but by the people who stayed behind I am not sure ... I have a feeling that it is not always a rosy picture ... it’s not always a neighbourly situation ... the other side of the coin is that the Portuguese are seen still as a peaceful people, a very accommodating people ... very generous people but there is an underbelly that I think needs to be explored. With regard to social exclusion ... . I think we are two ‘worlds’ apart ... the Portuguese one versus the urban professionals ... we continue to have that ... it’s not the homogeneous picture we would like to think we have ... this harmony among neighbourhoods is not quite what we say it is.

8. Conclusion

In the absence of new waves of Portuguese immigration and the further suburbanisation of current Portuguese residents, west central Toronto, and Little Portugal more specifically, have continued to lose Portuguese residents. Some respondents noted that every time a Portuguese sells a house in the area, the same house is bought by gentrifiers, speculators and/or by members of other immigrant groups. Thus, the number of Portuguese homeowners will decrease with time and with it some of the existing rental units as well as the informal renting that characterises Portuguese homeowners in the area. Consequently, Little Portugal is likely to decrease in importance as an institutionally complete Portuguese enclave. Indeed, this decline would be even more marked were it not for the unexpected arrival of Portuguese-speaking immigrants from former Portuguese colonies such as Brazil, Angola and Mozambique.

A key unknown is the future of those areas in Figure 3 that have not gentrified and are not categorised as having potential for gentrification. As noted earlier, these are areas that generally lack the spacious and architecturally appealing Victorian housing demanded by gentrifiers and suffer from environmental negatives such as proximity to rail lines and industry. On the other hand, industry is rapidly abandoning the area and there is a possibility that some of these older industrial buildings will be converted to upscale residential lofts. Alternatively, houses that are not architecturally appealing to gentrifiers may be torn down and replaced by others that are.

Almost all respondents agreed that gentrifiers are becoming the defining population in the neighbourhood. The Portuguese regard this group with mixed feelings. On the one hand, they are valued for rejuvenating the housing stock in the neighbourhood and patronising local businesses. On the other hand, their desire to live in a multicultural neighbourhood has driven up the cost of housing in Little Portugal and the rest of west central Toronto such that increasingly fewer Portuguese can afford to live there. While Portuguese homeowners often benefit from healthy profits upon the sale of their homes, Portuguese in the neighbourhood are under few illusions about the implications of gentrification for the long-term viability of their community. Some respondents pointed to the fate of nearby Little Italy, where gentrification has contributed to the exodus of many Italians, as the template that Little Portugal will follow in the years to come. A few of the respondents, however, remained optimistic about the future of Little Portugal and suggested that, like the commercial axis of Little Italy (College St), the commercial axis of Little Portugal (Dundas St) will retain much of its Portuguese atmosphere and will continue being a magnet for Portuguese from the Toronto area.
More generally, this paper has attempted to bring together the literature on gentrification and immigrant settlement to consider the impact of gentrification on ethnic enclaves in the inner city. The process is complex and requires further study. In Toronto, recent immigrants from a variety of origins are gradually replacing a well-established Portuguese group. At the same time, gentrification is expanding within this area of the city. We know a considerable amount about the demographic characteristics of the Portuguese and their attitude towards gentrification, but relatively little about the newly arrived immigrant groups and the gentrifiers. The different characteristics of these groups, the interactions between them and how each group is reacting to neighbourhood change are important avenues for further research.

Issues concerning the ways in which ethnic enclaves are impacted by gentrification are also important and vary considerably, both within and between groups. Based on this study, three specific groups can be identified.

First are the residents of well-established immigrant enclaves, such as the Portuguese in west central Toronto, who can afford to relocate elsewhere in the city. Most of this group are homeowners who have equal if not better housing options in other parts of Toronto, especially outer suburban areas already occupied by Portuguese. The suburban relocation of many members of this group may simply be the continuation of a long-established pattern of European immigrant groups moving from inner-city reception areas to more modern and spacious houses in the suburbs.

Second are the residents of well-established inner-city immigrant enclaves who cannot afford to or do not wish to move. Portuguese seniors, for example, may find it emotionally difficult to leave the familiarity of Portuguese stores, restaurants and services, as well as long-time friendships in their inner-city enclave, for a suburban environment where these facilities are not as well developed.

Third are the immigrant newcomers, most of whom are renting and have relatively low incomes. For this group, the option of remaining in the inner city will be seriously compromised as gentrification takes hold and access to affordable housing disappears. In Toronto, many will have little choice but to relocate to the ageing high-rise apartments of Toronto’s inner suburban neighbourhoods, a number of which are areas of extensive poverty in urgent need of enhanced community services including access to efficient public transport. The same applies to future immigrants with modest financial resources who have traditionally looked to inner-city immigrant reception areas as a source of conveniently located low-cost housing. With increased inner-city gentrification, these groups face a form of exclusionary displacement from traditional reception areas. Indeed, almost all of Toronto’s newly arrived immigrants are now settling in the suburbs. The result is a dramatic reversal of earlier settlement patterns. These new immigrants are also extremely diverse in ethnic background and socioeconomic status, giving rise to a highly differentiated suburban ethnic geography (Murdie, 2008).

As noted earlier, there has been limited research at the intersection between ethnic groups and gentrification. The three groups just highlighted are specific to Toronto and the extent to which their experiences can be generalised to other cities that are also undergoing extensive gentrification and have a somewhat comparable immigration history is dependent on the development of similar case studies elsewhere. On one level, each city’s situation is unique. On a more general level, however, gentrification processes and contemporary patterns of immigrant settlement and resettlement are sufficiently similar in many cities that there is considerable potential for comparative study and the ultimate development of a more general understanding of the impact of gentrification on immigrant settlement.
Notes
1. Unless indicated otherwise, population figures are from the Census of Canada, various years.
2. West central Toronto is the focus of a multifaceted case study of a well-established mainly residential area west of downtown Toronto that is experiencing pressures from gentrification and other forces of neighbourhood change. This CURA (Community University Research Alliance) project entitled 'Neighbourhood change and building inclusive communities from within: a study of Toronto's west-central neighbourhoods' is being undertaken by St Christopher House and the Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto. The research reported on here is part of the attempt to understand the forces and outcomes of neighbourhood change in this part of Toronto.
3. Total ethnic origin includes respondents who reported more than one ethnic origin. In 2006, 262,230 Canadians reported their ethnic origin as solely Portuguese, while 148,620 indicated Portuguese and one or more additional origins (Census of Canada, 2006). Until the 1991 census, Canadians were encouraged to report only one ethnic origin on the census questionnaire and refrain from using Canadian. Beginning in 1991, multiple origins (including Canadian) were encouraged. About 30 per cent of Toronto's Portuguese population responded with a multiple origin in 2006, an increase from 25 per cent in 2001. There is considerable spatial variation in this response. In 2001, less than 10 per cent of the Portuguese population in west central Toronto and Little Portugal offered more than one response to the ethnic identity question, suggesting that Portuguese identity is stronger in this part of the city. Except for Canadian, the identities of the other origins are not known. They could be members of the Portuguese diaspora reporting dual origins (for example, Brazilian and Portuguese) or from intermarriage. The breakdown between single and multiple ethnic origins is not available at the census-tract level for 2006.
4. Census-tract data for the Portuguese are not available prior to 1971. In 1971, the only variable available is Portuguese mother tongue (the language first learned and still understood). Given the recency of Portuguese immigration to Canada in 1971, we believe that mother tongue data are an accurate representation of the Portuguese in that year. For subsequent censuses, Portuguese ethnic origin data are available. The latter are used to document settlement patterns in 1981 and 1991 (single ethnic origin) and 2001 and 2006 (total ethnic origin).
5. We are grateful to one of the reviewers for raising this point.
6. When this study was completed, custom tabulations were not available for the 2006 census.

Acknowledgements
This research was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) through a Community-University Research Alliance (CURA) grant. The authors are grateful to ABRIGO, BIA-Dundas St. West and St Christopher House for hosting the focus groups and to the key informants and participants in the focus groups for sharing their insights. Alan Walks and Richard Maaranen kindly allowed the authors to use their research on gentrification in Toronto as the basis for Figure 3 and Richard Maaranen created the maps. The authors also thank Alan Walks and the reviewers for their perceptive and useful comments on an earlier version of the article.

References


