



Positioning Paper

Gentrification and displacement: a review of approaches and findings in the literature

authored by
Rowland Atkinson and Maryann Wulff

for the
Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute
Southern and Monash Research Centres

March 2009

AHURI Positioning Paper No. 115

ISSN: 1834-9250
ISBN: 978-1-921610-06-6



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This material was produced with funding from the Australian Government and the Australian States and Territories. AHURI Ltd gratefully acknowledges the financial and other support it has received from the Australian, State and Territory governments, without which this work would not have been possible.

AHURI comprises a network of fourteen universities clustered into seven Research Centres across Australia. Research Centre contributions, both financial and in-kind, have made the completion of this report possible.

DISCLAIMER

AHURI Ltd is an independent, non-political body which has supported this project as part of its programme of research into housing and urban development, which it hopes will be of value to policy-makers, researchers, industry and communities. The opinions in this publication reflect the views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of AHURI Ltd, its Board or its funding organisations. No responsibility is accepted by AHURI Ltd or its Board or its funders for the accuracy or omission of any statement, opinion, advice or information in this publication.

AHURI POSITIONING PAPER SERIES

AHURI Positioning Papers is a refereed series presenting the preliminary findings of original research to a diverse readership of policy makers, researchers and practitioners.

PEER REVIEW STATEMENT

An objective assessment of all reports published in the AHURI Final Report Series by carefully selected experts in the field ensures that material of the highest quality is published. The AHURI Final Report Series employs a double-blind peer review of the full Final Report – where anonymity is strictly observed between authors and referees.

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	1
LIST OF TABLES	2
ACRONYMS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1 INTRODUCTION	6
1.1 Gentrification and policy-maker interest.....	7
1.2 Conclusion	9
2 MEASURING GENTRIFICATION AND DISPLACEMENT	10
2.1 Measuring gentrification activity	11
2.2 Research on displacement	13
2.3 Recent displacement studies	15
2.4 Displacement in Australian cities	18
2.5 How does displacement occur?	18
2.6 Incumbent upgrading or gentrification.....	18
2.7 The social and economic cost of displacement	18
2.8 Conclusion	19
3 PROPOSED MODEL FOR ESTIMATING GENTRIFICATION-RELATED DISPLACEMENT	21
3.1 Conclusion	22
REFERENCES	24

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: : Losses across gentrified areas in London, 1981–1991	14
Table 2: Headline results from key displacement studies.....	15
Table 3: Recent key displacement studies	17
Table 4: Summary of neighbourhood impacts of gentrification.....	19

ACRONYMS

HUD	The Department of Housing and Urban Development
AHURI	Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute Ltd

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Gentrification refers to the in-migration of affluent households to poorer and lower value areas of the city. In Australian cities like Melbourne and Sydney this process has become notable in a significant number of suburbs. While gentrification has appeared to increase investment in the housing stock of these areas, there have been persistent risks that such sudden flows of money and people may displace lower-income and vulnerable residents, particularly where their tenure is insecure in private rental accommodation. This positioning paper considers the international literature on gentrification-related household displacement. The paper then considers available data sources and a model appropriate to estimating areas of intensive gentrification activity, and subsequently to accurately measure flows of displacement from these areas. These measures will form the basis of the empirical research that will follow this review.

Gentrification has become a persistent feature of larger metropolitan and rural housing markets. This has had important consequences for community harmony, local services and infrastructure, the quality of local built environments and for the affordability of housing that has previously served low-income populations, often in central city districts. The costs of these processes therefore lies in their social and economic impacts as communities are priced-out of locations, journey to work times are increased and insecure renters face eviction or market dislocation. Research also suggests serious psychological impacts on households who cannot afford to stay in areas where social networks of support co-exist. Concern has therefore been expressed about the effects of gentrification on community cohesion and resilience and on the further loss of stocks of affordable accommodation.

The issue of household displacement is closely associated with gentrification and yet estimates of the scale of displacement are not in evidence for Australian cities. Proxy measures have been used through the loss of boarding house accommodation, for example, yet we lack strong empirical measurements and at the scale of the greater metropolitan area. In countries like the US and the UK it is possible to identify techniques for the measurement of displacement in quantitative terms, and for contact with displacees to understand more about the socio-economic consequences of gentrification activity. These are used here to inform our proposed approach.

The fact that displacement has been inferred more often than directly measured is directly linked to the difficulties of developing methodologies capable of tracking those who are displaced. However, on the whole the general concurrence of researchers on who is involved and the social costs imposed suggests that this area of research is robust in its conclusions and, further, that persistent or newly engendered gentrification will have similar effects.

The paper identifies a preferred model for the identification of hotspots of gentrification activity in the Melbourne and Sydney greater metropolitan areas. Subsequent research effort will be used to estimate the extent of gentrification, the scale of any related displacement pressures in local submarkets and to account for the psychological, social and economic costs for displacees. The estimation of gentrification will proceed by analysing 2001 and 2006 census data for statistical local areas in Melbourne and Sydney in order to identify suburbs that have gentrified during this period (through increases in owner occupation; increases in higher income households, professional households, and rising house prices combined).

Displacement activity will be identified through losses in key categories as measures for displacement, for example above-baseline level losses in the number of private

renter households. We will use ABS 2001 and 2006 census data at the statistical local area (SLA) level to broadly identify gentrifying sections of each city. A migration matrix will then be defined at a much more spatially disaggregated level (collector's districts or collections of adjacent collectors' districts) to establish the flow of gentrifiers and displacees in relation to these neighbourhoods.

The results of this project will be used to consider appropriate Commonwealth, State and Local Government approaches and interventions into local housing markets and metropolitan systems.

1 INTRODUCTION

The definition of gentrification used for this work was: the migration of higher income and status groups to lower social status/income neighbourhoods and derelict housing and the consequent transformation of such areas to higher status neighbourhoods. The term 'gentrification' was first coined by the urban geographer Ruth Glass in the 1960s (Glass, 1964). Since then there has been protracted debate on its causes, consequences and whether it constitutes a dominant or residual urban form. The term was applied to the then newly observed habit of upper middle class households purchasing properties in the traditionally deprived East End of London. It was this apparent contrast with previous waves of middle class migration and residential choice that marked it out as a new phenomenon but also one with potentially profound impacts for the deprived and lower paid households in such areas. In Australia, gentrification has now been noted by a number of researchers (Shaw, 2005; Bounds, 2002) but it is in the context of the most recent economic and housing booms that we now ask:

How has the gentrification of metropolitan suburbs affected the availability of affordable housing and what are the impacts of these shifts on low-income households?

In cities like Melbourne and Sydney gentrification has become a significant concern to particular local communities and to housing and planning policy-makers, particularly with regard to its contribution to a loss of affordable housing. This positioning paper considers the existing evidence on gentrification and displacement, in relation to Australian cities where such evidence is available. It is important to note that, compared with the US and the UK, Australia has not appeared to witness the same level of research activity in relation to these issues but it is not clear whether this should be taken as evidence of a different magnitude of gentrification activity and community impacts. This latter point essentially forms the basis of this project which aims to provide new evidence on the degree to which neighbourhood change (through high-income household mobility and investment in low cost areas) has:

- exacerbated housing stress for lower-income households in areas undergoing marked increases in the cost of homes and rents;
- displaced households by making tenure impossible through sudden rent increases;
- reduced social diversity through lack of affordability by closing-off housing options for lower-income households traditionally looking to these areas for accommodation (e.g. the elderly, lone parents, the low-waged, benefit-dependent).

This paper thus also reviews the key methodological literature relating to the measurement of gentrification-related displacement. The scope of the review was international, reflecting the fact that most of the advances in this field have come in particular from the US and the UK. Nevertheless, we have also been able to pick up on some published and 'grey' (unpublished) literature from the Australian context. The purpose of the review was to inform the development and refinement of instruments for measuring gentrification and displacement in suburbs across Melbourne and Sydney.

Displacement is notoriously difficult to measure. As we highlight in this paper there has generally been little research internationally and in Australia; researchers have often remarked on the difficulties of such measurement. We therefore tread our way cautiously toward the identification of what we believe to be a robust means of

estimation of the scale of displacement activity in Melbourne and Sydney and the measurement of gentrification activity itself as a precursor to these pressures. Within all of this it is important to remember that gentrification activity as a localised in-migration of higher-income households, is one pressure among a range of other systemic pressures that have placed increasing stress on low- to middle-income households. Broader research on housing affordability highlights a range of such systemic, local, economic and social factors and these include:

- land supply and supply of dwellings;
- levels of construction activity compared with levels of household formation and dissolution;
- changes in the labour market and occupational structure of households such that there are increasing numbers of high income and professional households;
- a decrease in the number of lower paid manual occupations in urban areas;
- losses of public rental accommodation and in low-rent private stock.

In short, a range of national, metropolitan and local neighbourhood dynamics are behind the supply of gentrifiers and in setting the conditions through which social and economic inequalities create the possibility for gentrification activity and displacement. To date the housing affordability debate has not tended to be couched in terms of gentrification activity, but it has become clear that in some locations, such as Port Phillip and Fitzroy in Melbourne or Surry Hills and the Glebe in Sydney, that increases in professional households have increased property prices and rents in the private sector. In other locations, public housing areas have been sold or remodelled in ways that have ultimately led to the introduction of larger numbers of high-income residents.

This initial report comes at a time of pronounced change in the global and national economies. It seems highly likely that the geographies of gentrification in Australian metropolitan areas will be affected by these processes as access to mortgages and credit is stifled, yet it also seems likely that pressures on such funding will mean that medium- to high-income buyers may more emphatically seek out cheaper locations and rents and that this may actually act as a spur to gentrification activity (Atkinson, 2008). Under the previous conditions of the long housing market boom, similar processes could also be noted, for different reasons, as higher-income households outbid on rental accommodation for low-income households, by trading down to save money for deposits for homeownership.

1.1 Gentrification and policy-maker interest

Gentrification has regularly divided the opinions of policy-makers, researchers and commentators. Where some see a boon to the public purse and the revitalisation of the built environment, others see huge social costs and the continued moving of the poor with little if no net gain to cities and the wider society. Clearly what makes the gentrification debate so difficult and so interesting is the interaction between our own political standpoint and the phenomenon – where neoliberalism sees the market salvation of the inner-city – others, generally of the political left, point to the damaging entrenchment of social relations and displacement.

Dating back to the 1970s, several authors have acknowledged that displacement from gentrification has been both prevalent and socially harmful (notably, Sumka, 1979, Hartman, 1979, Le Gates and Hartman, 1986, Marcuse, 1986, Atkinson, 2000, Slater, 2008), yet little research has been conducted in Australia to measure its extent. This despite the fact that extensive gentrification has occurred over the past thirty years or so in areas of Sydney and Melbourne. Perhaps the most obvious reason for this

research gap is that it is very difficult to track displacees once they have moved away from their neighbourhood. It is much easier to research the more tangible outcome of gentrification itself, given that it is an observable change that is predicated on the removal or voluntary migration of previous residents. For policy-makers, this absence of evidence makes coordinated or effective action more difficult; indeed it is not clear whether public intervention in these issues is warranted or could ultimately be effective.

The lack of data on gentrification and displacement provides the basis for this paper. Of course, gentrification may not necessarily displace anyone at all; people may migrate by choice rather than by force or economic necessity. Yet even the apparently benign upgrading of previously vacant property may bring a 'price shadowing' of nearby rents and property prices, creating pressures on those with fewer resources (Hall and Ogden, 1992). It has also become clear that many Australian cities now compete for human talent and to provide the kind of milieu that would be supportive of processes of gentrification (Atkinson and Easthope, 2009). Moreover, a number of creative arts and major physical infrastructure projects have been instigated by the private sector and State and Federal Governments that seek to attract high income and talented households and individuals.

It seems plausible to suggest then that policy in some Australian metropolises may actively seek to promote processes that, in other wings, it strives to counter by providing affordable housing and access to key resources for lower-income households. Whether gentrification is a problem is a question that will see different responses by particular government departments, and at different tiers of government. For local governments seeking viable property tax incomes or particular social milieus, gentrification may seem an unproblematic bonus; while for State public housing managers these processes may increase need and resource allocations.

Gentrification can be attached to the great Australian dream of homeownership and the deeper status of property relations in political rhetoric and public culture. Many households seek not only a foothold in the market but also to trade up a property 'ladder', a process that may be accelerated by choosing the 'right' neighbourhood; places that are 'up and coming' investment hotspots. This geography of opportunity for erstwhile homeowners may present problems for lower-income residents in these locations, if their rents rise as a result or indeed if they cease to feel that the neighbourhood supports their social needs. Where household incomes are lower it is more likely that the neighbourhood and its social resources play a more significant role for these residents. In addition, it is also more likely that work and economic opportunities need to be found locally.

When gentrification dislocates households, social support mechanisms and needs may also be disrupted (Marcuse, 1986; Atkinson, 2000). Indeed, for employers seeking lower paid and skilled workers, these issues may also become important. Policy-makers have often been confused by complaints of community friction and the loss of affordable housing, on the one hand, and the benefits of physical revitalisation and bolstered tax bases on the other. Where displacement and replacement take place it can seem as though neighbourhoods 'improve', when the reality may be that poorer groups are thinned out or re-sorted through the housing system – often into private rental and public housing elsewhere. Social problems are evacuated through the 'improvement' of neighbourhoods and are thereby often seen as evidence that gentrification has positive impacts on social problems.

From a public policy perspective, the challenge remains to capture the social and physical investment from these kinds of changes while preventing the hardship imposed by displacement and market dislocation. This requires some sophistication in

recognising that displacement is not simply eviction or market dislocation of the marginal, it also encompasses a sense of neighbourhood change and shifting social networks that 'unhome' less well-off residents in locations touched by more aggressive gentrification patterns.

1.2 Conclusion

Gentrification is a process of socio-economically selective migration that sees higher income and higher consuming households moving into devalorised urban areas where their investment sees more significant returns than when moving to locations that are more consonant with their market power. In other words, gentrification encompasses a form of household migration that takes them to poorer areas because, when these choices pay off, they yield greater investment growth over time. Under pressured housing market conditions and shifts in the occupational structure of Australian cities, however, it is also more likely that gentrification pressures are built into these systems – there is a greater incentive to move to cheaper locations as prices rise and, perhaps crudely, there are simply more members of a 'gentry' to accommodate. We thus need to assess gentrification within these shifting benchmarks and also incorporate a sense of the temporal churn of neighbourhoods; displacement is about more than the replacement of households who move voluntarily. We now move to review the existing literature on gentrification and displacement before concluding this paper with a proposed model for the empirical phase of this research; a model of gentrification and a methodology capable of detecting household displacement within Australian metropolitan areas.

2 MEASURING GENTRIFICATION AND DISPLACEMENT

In this section of the paper we discuss the measurement of displacement from gentrification activity as charted in the international research literature. The bulk of such research efforts have come from the US where gentrification itself has perhaps been a more marked aspect of the housing landscape and where protection from rental increases, accommodation in public and social housing and welfare protection are much less in evidence. This has made gentrification a bigger player and greater threat for low-income households where being unhoused may have more deleterious consequences. In our review of the existing research literature we identified key studies in this area, studies that had robust methodologies, which adequately captured the extent and measurement of displacement activity. Searches were made of the main social science databases, in tandem with requests to leading researchers in the field to ensure that we did not miss any more recent grey literature.

The migration of low-income households to the margins of Australia's large metropolises has become a feature of neighbourhoods in the larger Australian cities (Burke and Hayward 2001; Randolph and Holloway 2007). It is less clear how, and how many, households are displaced as a result of being out-bid in the rental and purchase markets in formerly low-cost areas. Households may be displaced either as they look for new accommodation and find that the market now exceeds their incomes, or because they are 'tipped-out' of the area as a result of rental increases in their current properties. Gentrification thus not only reduces the supply of affordable accommodation, but also threatens the sustainability for those with existing tenure in neighbourhoods. These processes involve a number of factors:

- declining housing affordability/growing income polarisation. These are now significant issues, particularly in state capitals like Melbourne and Sydney, where demand for affordable housing by high-income groups has moved into low-cost neighbourhoods traditionally associated with lower-income areas of renting and owning. High housing costs for an increasing range of income groups has made higher-income households more price-sensitive and to search out low-cost areas putting pressure on low-income households;
- loss of social diversity, services and infrastructure. Opportunities for lower-income households, such as elderly private renters or single parents, may be diminished by changes in the character of services in the locality.

Gentrification pressures have been attributed to the loss of housing affordability in neighbourhoods traditionally identified as lower cost and containing working class, elderly, public and low-cost rental accommodation. This housing stock has helped maintain diversity and footholds for low-income households in the inner suburbs of Australian cities. Research (Atkinson, 2000) on displacement suggests a range of outcomes from gentrification-related displacement including:

- a loss of housing options for growing sections of the community and a loss of the demographic and social mix that comes with housing tenure diversity and cost variability;
- fewer housing options for the more vulnerable members of the community;
- effects on the psychological health and support networks of displacees resulting from making involuntary housing choices in pressured housing markets;
- spatial mismatches as work opportunities are located further away from residential options and potential brakes on economic growth as businesses

seeking low-waged and low-skilled workers find it more difficult to locate in high housing cost enclaves.

Under current planning provisions and social/affordable housing investment, the prospects for low- to moderate-income households appear bleak. With supply scarcities, the effects of gentrification pressures are more pronounced as high-income households are attracted to look at cheaper housing cost areas. We know that traditional new owners are spending longer in the private rental sector, because of the growing costs of entry to ownership (Wulff and Maher 1998) and this adds further pressure as these high-income tenants seek low-cost accommodation so they can save for a large enough deposit (Yates, Wulff & Reynolds 2004).

While some policy-makers applaud the physical changes and upgrading from gentrification, the reality is also a series of costs to private households, communities and, ultimately, to governments and economies. In the past, research indicated that displaced were dislocated to areas nearby their previous locations (Le Gates and Hartman, 1986). Displacement is now likely to push such households to the peripheries of cities (Atkinson, 2000). Consequently, not only is low-cost wage labour in these cities more difficult to find but these households suffer significant stress in relocating some distance away from the supporting networks of local family and friends. This can also impact on psycho-social health, educational outcomes, household dissolution and homelessness.

Our review of these issues in this section takes note of two broad approaches to gentrification: qualitative approaches that seek to understand the social and economic impact of gentrification, and quantitative approaches whose approach is to assess the overall extent and geography of gentrification and displacement. Clearly, there is much to commend both types of research endeavour. In seeking to understand whether policy-makers should act and in determining how they should act, both such approaches are essential. Nevertheless, while the absolute bulk of research has focused on case study approaches to the specific question of gentrification-related displacement, these studies have been:

- a) very few in number, and
- b) largely concerned with the scale of the phenomenon.

In assessing this literature with the objective in mind of producing an appropriate model of gentrification and measurement of displacement, we have been guided by this research but, as seen in the next chapter, have had to:

- a) work with different data sources, and
- b) devise strategies for examining qualitative displacement impacts.

2.1 Measuring gentrification activity

It should be understood that there is a close relationship between theoretical statements about the nature and underlying mechanisms of gentrification. The theory-dependency of observation suggests that how we theorise and define such processes is deeply implicated in the indicators we select as evidence of its manifestation. Since gentrification is most commonly defined as a process that involves a status-class-income transformation in the households living in particular neighbourhoods, and a significant transition upwards in this respect, this has led researchers to focus on empirical proxy indicators that are seen as marking the presence of these shifts. As we will later see, some studies of gentrification and displacement have not always made such connections, with the resulting problem that empirical measurement becomes disconnected from our understanding and explanation of phenomena.

Most studies of gentrification have sought to measure localised increases in professional-managerial households, a measure of the occupational shifts in particular neighbourhoods with other aspects of gentrification inferred from these changes → including household displacement that precedes these increases, the physical upgrading of the housing stock and significant increases in household incomes. The most effective studies are clearly those then that are capable of measuring the migration of higher income/class/education/occupational/tenure groups to small neighbourhood areas and which thereby avoid the possibility that the residents of such areas have moved into these positions in situ – what is known as incumbent upgrading. Yet many studies have also inferred gentrification by repeating cross-sectional measures of the composition of neighbourhoods, such as using multiple census points and taking measures of occupation or tenurial change as an indicator of gentrification activity.

In all of these types of study the aim remains the same, to chart what are pronounced changes in the social composition of areas that are suggestive of a deeper class or resource-based shift within the housing stock such that older, less popular, declining or disinvested locations become popular with higher income, class and taste groups. Clearly the precise configuration of such groups is varied and strong qualitative work on gentrification in London, for example Butler with Robson (2002), highlight that there are subtle but significant differences in the educational, social and income capital of gentrifiers in different locations.

Approaches using census data to measure and map gentrification have been adopted in the past (Hamnett and Williams, 1979; Galster and Peacock, 1986) using proxy measures of gentrification based on spatially bounded increases of professionals and managers. Dangschat (1991) found that, even in existing areas which have been gentrified, the continuation of the process may displace even higher income groups.

Socio-economic groups (referred to as 'SEG's' in UK research) used to construct a 'gentrifying class', as used by Lyons (1996), were adopted as a measurement which minimised the possibility of measurement error and comparability problems between each census. Earlier work (e.g. Hamnett and Williams, 1979) used increases in head of households in this category. This is a notoriously male view of labour and one ignorant of the, now acknowledged, female contribution to gentrification (Warde, 1991) and to the professional class in general (Davies, 1996). Atkinson (2000); for example, measured increases in the proportion of the higher Socio-Economic Groups (SEG's) (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3, 4, 5.1 and 13) in electoral wards to indicate the presence of gentrification over a ten-year period.¹ Of course, lower SEG's may have similar abilities to displace those with lower resources than themselves and, in this sense, there is a degree of relativity to the process of displacement. This point has already been noted by Lyons (1996) where junior non-manual workers were also held to be potential displacers of lower groups.

In Atkinson's (2000) research gentrification was deemed present where a rate of occupational change in any single ward exceeded the mean rate of increase for London as a whole. This led to the exclusion of all wards with a growth rate of less than 5 percentage points; the city-wide mean for the ward growth of professionals and managers. While professionals and managers were fewer in some wards they also formed a relatively larger group due to greater losses of other occupational groupings.

¹ Employers in large establishments, managers in large establishments, employers in small establishments, managers in small establishments, professional workers – self-employed, professional workers – employees, ancillary workers and artists and employer/manager farmers.

These were eliminated leaving 133 wards (out of a total of 755 wards in the Greater London area, excluding the City of London) where the increases in the number of higher SEG households ranged from 5 to 22 percentage points.

2.2 Research on displacement

Perhaps the main question hanging over the issue of displacement is how many people it affects. This has important ramifications for policy responses, given that the belief that displacement is a small problem has underpinned the idea that Government responses should be muted. Displacement has been located most strongly in metropolitan areas where the economy has been at full tilt (e.g. Seattle, Washington, London, San Francisco). Estimates in the US in the late 1970s and early 1980s ranged from a few hundred households in the major cities (Grier and Grier, 1980) to 2.5 million people per year (Le Gates and Hartman, 1986).

A robust literature on gentrification-induced displacement exists in North America where quantification has been more successful. This provides us with a template to explore the manifestation of these processes in London. Displacement is a problematic subject, given inevitable political wrangling over the adequacy of data and debates about what constitutes displacement itself (Barrett and Hodge, 1986). Here we define the presence of displacement as occurring in circumstances where 'any household is forced to move from its residence by conditions which affect the dwelling or its immediate surroundings' (US Department of Housing and Urban Development in Le Gates and Hartman, 1981:214).

Work on displacement indicates that its scale can be extensive. For example, studying London between 1981 and 1991, Atkinson (2000) showed that 38 per cent of working class households moved away from gentrified areas in this period. More recent AHURI research (Randolph and Holloway 2007) has noted the increasing shift of private rental tenants to the edges of Sydney's metropolitan area.

Levels of displacement have been a contentious issue. In the US, Sumka estimated that 500,000 households, roughly 2 million people, were annually displaced (Sumka, 1979). Le Gates and Hartman (1981 and 1986) viewed this as a purposeful undercount by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Work by McCarthy in London (1974) found that household movement prior to state-funded renovation activity was significant and that 'the improvement of living conditions did not benefit the original residents.' (1974:3). In total, 68 per cent of renovation applications sampled had been preceded by the outward movement of at least one household, and in total almost three quarters of all households had moved away. Of those leaving, 80 per cent were tenants, as might be expected. By far the most common reason for moves was landlord harassment (43 per cent), an issue that remains significantly under-examined in the Australian context.

Work by Lyons (1996) used the UK longitudinal study (hereafter LS) at a borough level to examine the effect of increasing polarisation and professionalisation on potential displacee groups in London over the census period 1971–81, looking at the socio-economic, geographic and migratory aspects of the process. She found that local migration was associated with low-status households, while longer range migration may be associated with those of a higher status, indicating a relationship to constraint and choice respectively. This appears to contrast with Australian research that indicates the reverse patterns of migration. For Lyons, displacement was linked to gentrification and consumer choice for the gentrifiers.

In Atkinson's work, standard cross-sectional 1981 and 1991 census data (in order to get a picture of social change across London at electoral ward level, as has been mentioned) was then used to 'build' four new borough-sized areas from those wards which had experienced above-average levels of professionalisation that ranged from low to high levels of gentrification. These new areas (labelled 'G' areas) were used as the likely locus for exploring changes based on migration. After establishing that migration was significantly greater than internal status changes over the period, analysis shifted to the significance of exit flows from the four new 'G' areas. Finally comparisons were made with the rest of London to see if the moves in the 'G' areas were more pronounced, as one would expect, than that of London as a whole. The results are summarised in Table 1 below.

Table 1: : Losses across gentrified areas in London, 1981–1991

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Net change for all 'G' Areas</i>	<i>Percentage gain/loss</i>
Professionals	+18,800	+20%
Inactive	-38,500	-46%
Working class	-19,300	-38%
Elderly	-23,200	-18%
Unskilled	between -200 and -1,800	Between -9 and -78%
Unemployment	between -1600 and +100	between -4% and -59%
Lone parents	+600	+ 4.5%

Source: Atkinson, 2000

The study of gentrification, often described at a neighbourhood level, lends itself to an analysis pegged at the smallest level of census analysis, the enumeration district in the UK and the collector's district in Australia (EDs and CDs have an approximate mean value of 200 households or roughly 500 persons). Moves made over short distances may not be picked up by analysis using larger spatial units. However, in the UK, analysis at ED level is not possible because boundary changes can lead to total mismatches between 1981 and 1991. In addition, the use of data on socio-economic groups uses 10 per cent counts which means that sampling errors may be pronounced at the ED level. Table 2 below takes the highlight results of other quantitative research examining displacement. This highlights the role of contexts, points within economic cycles and within particular national and city-regional contexts. It is clearly not possible to read across from these data to the Australian context, except perhaps to comment that where gentrification activity has been extensive, it has touched the lives of many displaced households.

In line with previous statements on these issues (Atkinson, 2004) we argue that gentrification may be used effectively as a broad conceptual container for a range of related neighbourhood changes wherein higher-income households enter, in relatively significant numbers, lower-income neighbourhoods, and that displacement will varyingly accompany such changes. A particular argument within the literature has nevertheless focused on whether new-build areas of housing investment for high-income groups should be classified as gentrification – these purpose-built high-amenity areas are marketed to high-income households and although they technically do not 'displace' lower-income groups, they are specifically designed to exclude them.

In a review of the research on displacement Atkinson (2004) found that the research approach used was mainly based on census data but that only 9 out of 17 studies

used multiple censuses to infer displacement from the data, and usually in the form of correlations rather than household displacement estimates. The use of surveys, administrative and other data sources was also popular (a third of the studies). Only two studies used longitudinal data sources, both in the UK, (Atkinson, 2000, Lyons, 1996) and two others used Polk annual survey data to examine change and infer displacement (Henig, 1981; Schill and Nathan, 1983). Sixteen studies utilised qualitative research techniques to look at the problems facing displacees (e.g. Bondi, 1999). However, further studies have been carried out since this research and we report on these in more detail shortly.

Table 2: Headline results from key displacement studies

<i>Author</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Method</i>	<i>Results</i>
Cousar/ Sumka	1978 /1979	US	Annual Housing Survey	More than a half million households per year (1974–76)
Grier and Grier	1980	US	Review of data and literature	No more than 100–200 households annually per city
Le Gates and Hartman	1981	US	Systematic review of evidence	Portland – 2000 per year Denver – 2000 households Seattle – 14,000 households between 73 and 78
Schill and Nathan	1983	1 neighbourhood in each of 5 cities in US	Postal questionnaire to moving renters	23% of movers were displacees (range: 8% in Richmond to 40% in Denver)
Le Gates and Hartman	1986	US	Data review	2.5 million people displaced annually (conservative)
Marcuse	1986	New York City	J51/SRO closure data City rent data	Between 10,000 and 40,000 households per year

Note: numbers must be seen in light of time period and city or local area size.

2.3 Recent displacement studies

In recent years, new insights on the outcomes of gentrification and displacement have emerged from two quantitative studies that have used the New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey (Freeman and Braconi, 2004; Newman and Wyly, 2006). The NYCHVS is a longitudinal data set that tracks approximately 18,000 New York City dwelling units every three years. While an equivalent data source is not available in Australia, the studies provide important information on methodology. Given the studies are based on New York City, the analysis only considers renter households. Both studies also employ multivariate logit models to determine the importance of selected characteristics on the likelihood of moving or not moving from a gentrifying neighbourhood.

Freeman and Braconi (2004) found, somewhat counter-intuitively, that when all significant factors were controlled, low-income households were 19 per cent less likely to move than low-income households in other neighbourhoods. The authors posited that perhaps gentrifying neighbourhoods still contain a segment of lower-cost housing stock or perhaps lower-income households go to great lengths to remain in their neighbourhood given the improvement in services and facilities that accompany gentrification.

Newman and Wyly (2006) set out to question Freeman and Braconi's assertion (2004) that gentrification does not play a large role in displacing low-income households. They employed both qualitative and quantitative methodologies to yield a rich analysis of both the numerical level of displacement and the impacts on displacees. Employing a logit analysis, the authors found that between 6.2 and 9.9 per cent of all local moves among renter households in New York City were due to displacement and that most displacees were driven to move by the increases in rents. The authors concluded that: 'Cost drives the overall trend, with fluctuations in unemployment, income and rental inflation combining to force households into various relocation or adjustment strategies' (Newman and Wyly, 2006, p. 30). Of relevance to the Australian situation, an important statistical outcome was that households living in low rent units were more likely to have been displaced compared with those in higher rent dwellings.

Still more recent work nationally in the US has suggested similar results to those of Freeman. This work on gentrification-related displacement by McKinnish, Walsh and White (2008) used only an income-based measure and only for neighbours at the bottom of the income scale at the beginning of the census decade, thus appearing to create serious problems of definition. This most recent set of studies highlights the political environment within which studies of gentrification are now received. The work of Freeman and McKinnish has been well received by some media segments and politicians seeing justification for past programs or for the direct promotion of gentrification.

Table 3: Recent key displacement studies

<i>Study</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Data source</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Issues</i>
Atkinson	2000	London	Longitudinally linked census data	Between 1981 and 1991 in gentrified areas losses of : -46% inactive -38% working class -18% elderly -78% unskilled	
Freeman	2005	New York	New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey Data 9 borough areas decided were gentrifying 67% of households move over past ten-year period	Gentrified areas experienced less 'displacement' than non-gentrifying areas Highlights need for public housing to anchor poverty to 'positive' changes	Selection of 'gentrified' areas vs non-gentrified areas was based on personal assessment of demographic changes Measures were deployed at the tail end of a long boom and what other analysts see as successive waves of gentrification and displacement
Freeman and Braconi	2004	New York	New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey Data	Poor groups less likely to leave G areas	Very popular with those looking to evidence the goodness of gentrification
Newman and Wyly	2006	New York	New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey Data	Displacement ranged from small to massive within particular neighbourhoods and using a more refined and informed analysis of G areas	
McKinnish, Walsh and White	2008	USA	Small area census data Growth in average household income of bottom quartile of neighbourhoods by \$10,000	Entrants to G areas were college graduates and black graduates Poor less likely to exit 'gentrified' areas	Uses only an income-based measure of gentrification and applies this only to poorest neighbourhoods

2.4 Displacement in Australian cities

A study conducted 30 years ago on gentrification in inner Melbourne neighbourhoods (CURA 1977) found that 45 per cent of private renters indicated they had been displaced (i.e. forced to move because of the cost or state of repair of dwelling). Even 20 per cent of home purchasers and 22 per cent of public tenants said they had been displaced. Given the unprecedented market changes impacting on house prices and rents that Australian cities have experienced in recent years, it is timely to reassess the scale of displacement. More recent work by Engels (1999) in Sydney's Glebe areas showed that displacement was difficult to measure and potentially encompassed a broad grouping, including middle class private renters. Here Engels noted the interaction between market conditions and household composition in the area.

2.5 How does displacement occur?

Displacement has been achieved through landlord eviction and harassment (also described as 'flipping' (US) and 'winkling' (UK) and price increases (also referred to as exclusionary displacement). More subtly, the qualitative studies have shown that displacement also occurs when people decide to move because friends and family have been moved on, thus leaving gaps in the mutual support structures around them.

2.6 Incumbent upgrading or gentrification

Separating gentrification and displacement out from wider processes of social change, incumbent upgrading, voluntary migration and welfare and labour market changes provide complex problems for measuring such processes. Further, it is often exceedingly hard to distinguish between gentrification as a form of neighbourhood replacement or displacement, the litmus test usually resting on a distinction between prevailing rates of household mobility across a particular city and the rates of out-migration by vulnerable lower-income households in a particular neighbourhood. However, attaching causal primacy to gentrification may still remain contentious. As we have already suggested, it may be possible for households to be displaced as rental rates increase through lack of new supply as well as gentrification.

Research by Atkinson (2000) 'built' four new borough-sized areas from smaller wards that had been gentrified by professionals and managers and checks were made to ensure that:

- a) what appeared to be gentrification was based on migration or incumbent upgrading, and
- b) to see if an associated out-migration by those groups seen as possible displacees was greater than migration rates in the capital as a whole.

This was done to demonstrate whether or not the 'G' areas had been actively gentrified or whether social changes in these areas accounted for an image of gentrification mistakenly derived from the cross-sectional census data. This then allowed a more robust interpretation of the resulting outflows to be seen as being causally linked to gentrification rather than prevailing market conditions, though this is clearly likely to have been implicated.

2.7 The social and economic cost of displacement

Henig (1984) has indicated the costs to the elderly are profound in gentrified areas and it would seem that, from the above results, gentrification over the decade occurred in areas with a high proportion of elderly people and appeared to displace or replace a massive migratory flow of such people away from such areas.

Gentrification-related displacement (in the UK and USA) has been shown to affect poor white and non-white households (to a lesser extent), the elderly, female-headed households and blue collar/working class occupational groupings. This has often led to displacement into adjacent areas and into housing which is more expensive and therefore often rated more highly by the displacees.

Table 4: Summary of neighbourhood impacts of gentrification

<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>
	Displacement through rent/price increases
	Secondary psychological costs of displacement
Stabilisation of declining areas	Community resentment and conflict
Increased property values	Loss of affordable housing, Unsustainable speculative property price increases, Homelessness
Reduced vacancy rates	
Increased local fiscal revenues	Greater take of local spending through lobbying/articulacy
Encouragement and increased viability of further development	Commercial/industrial displacement
Reduction of suburban sprawl	Increased cost and changes to local services
	Displacement and housing demand pressures on surrounding poor areas
Increased social mix	Loss of social diversity (from socially disparate to rich ghettos)
Decreased crime	Increased crime
Rehabilitation of property both with and without state sponsorship	Under-occupancy and population loss to gentrified areas
Even if gentrification is a problem it is small compared to the issue of:	Gentrification has been a destructive and divisive process that has been aided by capital disinvestment to the detriment of poorer groups in cities
→ urban decline	
→ abandonment of inner cities	

Source: Atkinson 2004

The role of individual neighbourhood contexts is also clearly important in determining the prevalence of displacement. For example, areas with high levels of social housing will be less prone to gentrification, but will also form protective areas for residents who might otherwise be moved on if market rents were applied. In other cases such relationships have not always been so clear. For example, Melbourne's inner suburbs all had high levels of public housing and yet still appear to have begun gentrifying in the 1970s. Research in Hamburg (Dangschat, 1991) and London (Lyons, 1996) shows that ever higher social groups may successfully gentrify and be displaced from these areas. In general once a neighbourhood has achieved a relatively complete level of transformation the social costs diminish as nobody remains to be displaced (Robinson, 1995).

2.8 Conclusion

The most effective measures of gentrification and displacement have been anchored in a strong conceptualisation of a socio-economic shift in the population of local neighbourhood populations – this has tended to mean mapping measures onto available data sources, generally using occupational measures, such as professional

and managerial groupings. Gentrification is seen as a process of neighbourhood change that implies a shift in the usage of an area that stems from its changing residential class-income profile. The most effective measures of both processes require data that tracks migrants so that any confusion arising from changes in personal or household status are accounted for. Incumbent changes for existing residents have sometimes obscured the true extent of gentrification for example.

There is a need to consider and measure the likely out-migrants from gentrification, while bearing in mind that processes of voluntary migration continue to mark many households decisions. Perhaps the clearest line of weakness lies along tenurial lines so that private renters are often implicated in patterns of displacement. Tracking the household composition of these groups appears to be important for this reason, yet prevailing levels of mobility may also be high, making estimates of displacement more difficult. The suggestion that elderly households are likely to be displaced and more easily harassed from their homes can be found in several studies and is perhaps one of the most significant areas of concern about protection and social harm in relation to gentrification – whether such processes are mediated through the market or by landlords.

Some studies of displacement have yielded significant estimates. In the case of the Newman and Wyly (2006) study within New York City they found that between 25,023 and 46,606 renter households moved each year as a result of dislocation pressures from gentrification, the vast majority for cost considerations. While Australian cities, neighbourhoods and the broader social housing and welfare systems are somewhat different from such case examples, it remains to be seen what the scale of displacement activity has been in cities like Melbourne and Sydney.

3 PROPOSED MODEL FOR ESTIMATING GENTRIFICATION-RELATED DISPLACEMENT

The empirical component of this research will proceed in two stages, as per the methodology proposed in our research grant application. The first stage sets out to measure the extent of gentrification that has occurred in Melbourne and Sydney between 2001 and 2006 and to identify broadly the spatial locations and socio-economic characteristics of such neighbourhoods. This stage will involve comparing the socio-economic characteristics of statistical local areas (SLAs) in Melbourne and Sydney, 2001 and 2006 respectively. We have determined our main proxy measures of gentrification from the literature review and these include small area/neighbourhood changes in:

- household income
- educational attainment
- tenure
- weekly rent
- occupation status
- labour force status
- age
- household type
- median house sale prices.

The extent of socio-economic, demographic and housing market change across the two census periods will be measured by assessing:

- a) percentage differences in each variable;
- b) ratios (such as share of professionals/less skilled workers), and
- c) standardised (shift share) indices (to determine if certain categories, such as high-income households, are growing at a faster rate than the population as a whole).

As per Atkinson's research (2000), local measures of change will be assessed against metropolitan averages in order to identify areas that 'stand out' in terms of the level of social change and further finer gradations of change within the gentrifying neighbourhoods established.

Using these census points raises some issues in terms of market activity, which may have tailed off quite significantly in some locales in the past year. However, we can be more certain that the use of this particular time period will encompass those neighbourhoods that have been gentrified during perhaps one of the most intense periods of housing market expansion and commodification in Melbourne and Sydney. No doubt the geography of gentrification that this will reveal will be different from one that might include areas that were gentrified earlier; that is, such areas may not show up via our analysis. Nevertheless, the identified approach has the clear benefit that the processes of gentrification being identified relate to a recent time period and will be more reliable and relevant to the policy concerns of the research i.e. the geography of gentrification activity will raise issues right now about potentially ameliorative policy actions.

From this base analysis, three specific gentrifying locations in Melbourne and Sydney each (6 locations in total) will be identified for the purposes of the detailed migration

and mobility analysis. It should be noted that alongside the quantitative data that will inform the selection of gentrifying neighbourhoods, the researchers' 'familiarity' (Freeman and Braconi, 2004) will also play a part. Two of the main researchers on the team (Wulff and Yates) have extensive on-the-ground knowledge of neighbourhood change in Melbourne and Sydney respectively, and also have good professional contacts with Stage government urban planners to request advice.

The second stage of the empirical analysis focuses on identifying the geographic and housing movements of displacees following gentrification. As discussed in the literature review, this is not a simple or straightforward process. As Newman and Wyly (2006, p. 27) point out:

Measuring how gentrification affects low-income residents is methodologically challenging and estimating the scope and scale of displacement and exploring what happens to people who are displaced have proved somewhat elusive. In short, it is difficult to find people who have been displaced, particularly if those people are poor.

Atkinson (2000, p. 163) goes further and states that it is like 'measuring the invisible'.

Our approach to this challenge is to specify two customised migration matrices (one for Sydney and Melbourne each) and to examine and compare the socio-economic characteristics of households moving into, and out of, the selected neighbourhoods during the 2001–2006 period by origin and destination. This will provide a robust quantitative analysis of migration flows by origin and destination and household characteristics.

As recommended in the literature review, our spatial disaggregation will be at a fairly localised level (smaller than SLAs and most likely to be a combination of proximate CDs). To measure the geography of displacement, nearby locations will also be spatially identified. Most overseas displacement studies, as discussed earlier, hypothesise that those displaced 'spill over' into nearby locations that are less costly. On the other hand, some Australian research suggests that the displaced are forced into relatively longer distance moves to outer suburbs. The geographic specifications for the migration matrix will attempt to take both of these possibilities into account.

The customized migration matrix will also include the key socio-economic variables as described in Stage 1. While other research uses reference persons (which count only household moves) (Newman and Wyly, 2006), we will be able to identify both the reference person (for household level analyses) and 'other persons' (for person level analysis). Newman and Wyly (2006) recommend this latter approach in their work as they suggest that many people who appear not to be displaced for gentrifying areas may in fact be 'doubling up' with local families and households in order to save costs and stay in the area.

3.1 Conclusion

The results of this study will be used to identify:

The range of practices, policy instruments and interventions used by governments in Australian cities and internationally. For example, in the US, research has pointed to the role of existing public housing stock in gentrifying neighbourhoods as housing that can provide an anchor for lower-income households wanting to remain in place.

The range of policy options directly generated by the proposed empirical research relating to specific locations, impacts and broader effects of gentrification in state capitals like Sydney and Melbourne.

Newman and Wyly (2006) point out the importance of displacement to public policy in the US – and the same could be said for Australia. 'Displacement is the leading edge

of the central dilemma of American property – the use values of neighbourhood and home, versus the exchange values of real estate as a vehicle for capital accumulation’ (Newman and Wyly, 2006, p. 31). Moreover, based on the results gained in their qualitative work, the specific number attached to displacees ‘does not invalidate the importance of displacement as a social issue in urgent need of attention’.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, R 2000, 'Measuring gentrification and displacement in Greater London', *Urban Studies*, vol. 37, pp. 149–165.
- 2003, 'Introduction: Misunderstood saviour or vengeful wrecker? The many meanings and problems of gentrification', *Urban Studies*, vol. 40, no. 12, pp. 2343–2350.
- 2004 The evidence on the impact of gentrification: New lessons for the urban renaissance? *European Journal of Housing Policy*, 4, 1, pp. 107-131.
- 2008 Gentrification, Segregation and the Vocabulary of Affluent Residential Choice Commentary, *Urban Studies*, 45, 12, pp. 2626–2636.
- Atkinson, R. and Easthope, H. 2009 The Consequences of the Creative Class: The pursuit of creativity strategies in Australia's cities, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*.
- Barret, A. and Hodge, D. 1984 Social differentials in metropolitan residential displacement, in Palen, J. and London, B. eds. *Gentrification, displacement and neighbourhood revitalization*, State University of New York Press, Albany.
- Bondi, L. 1999 Gender, class, and gentrification: enriching the debate, *Environment and planning D*, 17, 3, pp.261-282.
- Bounds, M. and Morris, A. 2006 Second wave gentrification in inner-city Sydney, *Cities*, 23, 2, pp. 99-108.
- Butler, T. with Robson, G. 2003 *London Calling: The Middle Classes and the Remaking of Inner London*, Oxford: Berg.
- Burke, T. and Hayward, D. 2001 Melbourne's housing futures, Melbourne's housing past, *Urban Policy and Research*, 19, 2, pp. 21-39.
- Buzar, S, Ogden, P, Hall, R, Haase, A, Kabisch, S & Steinfuhrer, A 2007, 'Splintering urban populations: Emergent landscapes of reurbanisation in four European cities', *Urban Studies*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 651–677.
- Cameron, S 1992, 'Housing, gentrification and urban regeneration policies ', *Urban Studies*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 3–14.
- Cameron, S & Doling, J 1994, 'Housing neighborhoods and urban regeneration ', *Urban Studies*, vol. 31, no. 7, pp. 1211–1223.
- Cohen, JR 1998, 'Combining historic preservation and income class integration: A case study of the Butchers Hill neighborhood of Baltimore', *Housing Policy Debate*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 663–697.
- Coulson, NE & Leichenko, RM 2004, 'Historic preservation and neighbourhood change', *Urban Studies*, vol. 41, no. 8, pp. 1587–1600.
- Cousar, G. 1978 *Bulletin on HUD estimates of national displacement and pertinent program information*, Washington, D.C.: US Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- CURA (Centre for Urban Research and Action, Fitzroy, Vic.) 1977 *The displaced: a study of housing conflict in Melbourne's inner city*, Melbourne, Centre for Urban Research and Action.

- Curran, W 2007, 'From the frying pan to the oven': Gentrification and the experience of industrial displacement in Williamsburg, Brooklyn', *Urban Studies*, vol. 44, pp. 1427–1440.
- Davies, C. 1996 *The Sociology of Professions and the Profession of Gender*, *Sociology*, 30, 4, pp. 661-678.
- Dulchin, B 2003, 'Organising against gentrification, fighting the free market: The displacement-free zone campaign', *Social Policy*, vol. 34, pp. 29–34.
- Engels, B 1999, 'Property ownership, tenure, and displacement: in search of the process of gentrification', *Environment and Planning A*, vol. 31, pp. 1473–1495.
- Forsyth, A 1997, 'NoHo: Upscaling main street on the metropolitan edge', *Urban Geography*, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 622–652.
- Fraser, JC 2004, 'Beyond gentrification: Mobilizing communities and claiming space', *Urban Geography*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 437–457.
- Freeman, L 2005, 'Displacement or succession? Residential mobility in gentrifying neighborhoods', *Urban Affairs Review*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 463–491.
- 2008, 'Comment on 'The eviction of critical perspectives from gentrification research'', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 186–191.
- Freeman, L & Braconi, F 2004, 'Gentrification and displacement → New York City in the 1990s', *Journal of the American Planning Association*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 39–52.
- Gale, D 1985, 'Demographic research on gentrification and displacement', *Journal of Planning Literature*, vol. 1, p. 14.
- Ghose, R 2004, 'Big sky or big sprawl? Rural gentrification and the changing cultural landscape of Missoula, Montana', *Urban Geography*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 528–549.
- Grier, G. and Grier, E. 1980 *Urban Displacement: A Reconnaissance*, chapter in; S. Laska and Spain, D. eds. *Back to the City: Issues in Neighbourhood Renovation*, Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 252-268.
- Ha, SK 2007, 'Housing regeneration and building sustainable low-income communities in Korea', *Habitat International*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 116–129.
- Hagerman, C 2007, 'Shaping neighborhoods and nature: Urban political ecologies of urban waterfront transformations in Portland, Oregon', *Cities*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 285–297.
- Hamnett, C 2003, 'Gentrification and the middle-class remaking of inner London, 1961–2001', *Urban Studies*, vol. 40, no. 12, pp. 2401–2426.
- Harding, S 2001, 'Urban redevelopment, housing loss and class segregation: A case study of gentrification in Seattle', *Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences*, vol. 61, no. 11.
- Hartman, C 1979, 'Displacement: A not so new problem', *Social Policy*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 22–27.
- He, SJ 2007, 'State-sponsored gentrification under market transition – The case of Shanghai', *Urban Affairs Review*, vol. 43, pp. 171–198.

- He, SJ & Wu, FL 2007, 'Socio-spatial impacts of property led redevelopment on China's urban neighbourhoods', *Cities*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 194–208.
- Heidkamp, CP & Lucas, S 2006, 'Finding the gentrification frontier using census data: The case of Portland, Maine', *Urban Geography*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 101–125.
- Henig, JR 1980, 'Gentrification and displacement within cities : A comparative analysis ', *Social Science Quarterly*, vol. 61, nos 3–4, pp. 638–652.
- 1981, 'Gentrification and displacement of the elderly: An empirical analysis', *Gerontologist*, vol. 21, no. 1, p. 67.
- Henig, J 1984 Gentrification and displacement of the elderly: An empirical analysis, in Palen, J. and London, B. eds. *Gentrification, displacement and neighbourhood revitalization*, State University of New York Press, Albany.
- Herrera, LMG, Smith, N & Vera, MAM 2007, 'Gentrification, displacement, and tourism in Santa Cruz de Tenerife', *Urban Geography*, vol. 28, pp. 276–298.
- Hetzler, O, Medina, VE & Overfelt, D 2006, 'Gentrification, displacement and new urbanism: The next racial project', *Sociation Today*, vol. 4, no. 2.
- Hulchanski, JD 2006, 'Global trends, neoliberal social and housing policies and neighbourhoods: Gentrification, displacement and the concentration of poverty in Toronto, Canada', *International Sociological Association*, Durban, South Africa, 2006,
- Immergluck, D 2007, 'There goes the 'hood: Views of gentrification from the ground up', *Urban Affairs Review*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 285–287.
- Le Gates, RT 1982, 'Gentrification-caused displacement', *Urban Lawyer*, vol. 14, pp. 31–55.
- Le Gates, R & Hartman, C 1981, 'Displacement', *The Clearinghouse Review*, July, pp. 207–249.
- Le Gates, R & Hartman, C 1986, 'The anatomy of displacement in the United States', in Smith, N. & Williams, P. (eds), *Gentrification of the City*, London: Unwin Hyman.
- Ley, D 1994, 'Gentrification and the politics of the new middle class', *Environment and Planning D*, vol. 12, pp. 53–74.
- London, B & Palen, J 1984, *Gentrification, Displacement and Neighbourhood Revitalization*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Levy, D., Comey, J. & Padilla, S. 2006 *Case Studies of Local Efforts to Mitigate Displacement*, Washington: Urban Institute.
- Listokin, D, Listokin, B & Lahr, M 1998, 'The contributions of historic preservation to housing and economic development', *Housing Policy Debate*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 431–478.
- Lyons, M 1996, 'Gentrification, socioeconomic change, and the geography of displacement', *Journal of Urban Affairs*, vol. 18, pp. 39–62.
- McCarthy, J 1974, 'Some social implications of improvement policy in London', internal paper, Social research division, Directorate of Development, Department of the Environment.
- McKinnish, T., Walsh, R. & White, T. K. 2008 *Who Gentrifies Low-Income Neighborhoods?* Washington: Centre for Economic Studies, Bureau of the Census.

- Marcuse, P 1985, 'Gentrification, abandonment and displacement: connections, causes and policy responses in New York City ', *Journal Urban Contemporary Law*, vol. 28, pp. 193–240.
- 1986, 'Abandonment, gentrification and displacement: The linkages in New York City', in Smith, N. & Williams, P. (eds), *Gentrification of the City*, London: Unwin Hyman.
- 1993, 'What's so new about divided cities?', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 355–365.
- 1999, 'Comment on Elvin K. Wyly and Daniel J. Hammel's "Islands of decay in seas of renewal: Housing policy and the resurgence of gentrification"', *Housing Policy Debate*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 789–797.
- Martin, L 2007, 'Fighting for control – Political displacement in Atlanta's gentrifying neighborhoods', *Urban Affairs Review*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 603–628.
- Millard-Ball, A 2002, 'Gentrification in a residential mobility framework: Social change, tenure change and chains of moves in Stockholm', *Housing Studies*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 833–856.
- Newman, K & Wyly, EK 2006, 'The right to stay put, revisited: Gentrification and resistance to displacement in New York City', *Urban Studies*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 23–57.
- Niedt, C 2006, 'Gentrification and the grassroots: Popular support in the revanchist suburb', *Journal of Urban Affairs*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 99–120.
- O'Sullivan, A 2005, 'Gentrification and crime', *Journal of Urban Economics*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 73–85.
- Podagrosi, A & Vojnovic, I 2008, 'Tearing down Freedmen's Town and African American displacement in Houston: The good, the bad, and the ugly of urban revival', *Urban Geography*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 371–401.
- Redfern, PA 2003, 'What makes gentrification "gentrification"?', *Urban Studies*, vol. 40, no. 12, pp. 2351–2366.
- Robinson, T. 1995 Gentrification and grassroots resistance in San Francisco's Tenderloin, *Urban Affairs Review*, 30, 4, pp.483-513.
- Rodin, J 2005, 'The 21st century urban university – New roles for practice and research', *Journal of the American Planning Association*, vol. 71, no. 3, pp. 237–249.
- Schill, M. H. and Nathan, R. P. 1983 *Revitalizing America's Cities: Neighbourhood Reinvestment and Displacement*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Shaw, W. 2005 *Heritage and Gentrification: 'The good old days' in Sydney, Australia*, Chapter in R. Atkinson and G. Bridge, *The New Urban Colonialism: Gentrification in a global context*, London: Routledge.
- Shaw, K 2008, 'A response to "The eviction of critical perspectives from gentrification research"', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 192–194.
- Singer, A 1984, 'When worlds collide: Gentrification, neighborhood revitalization and the displacement of low-income residents', *Historic Preservation*, vol. 36, no. 4, p. 32.

- Slater, T 2006, 'The eviction of critical perspectives from gentrification research', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 737–757.
- 2008, 'A literal necessity to be re-placed' A rejoinder to the gentrification debate', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 212–223.
- Smith, N. 1986, 'Gentrification, the frontier, and the restructuring of urban space', in Smith, N & Williams, P (eds), *Gentrification of the City*, London: Unwin Hyman.
- 1998, 'Comment on David Listokin, Barbara Listokin, and Michael Lahr's "The contributions of historic preservation to housing and economic development": Historic preservation in a neoliberal age', *Housing Policy Debate*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 479–485.
- 2008, 'On "The eviction of critical perspectives"', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 195–197.
- Smith, N & Williams, P (eds) 1986, *Gentrification of the City*, London: Unwin Hyman.
- Smith, N & Le Faivre, M 1984, 'A class analysis of gentrification', in Palen, J & London, B, *Gentrification, Displacement and Neighbourhood Revitalization*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Sullivan, DM 2006, 'Assessing residents' opinions on changes in a gentrifying neighborhood: A case study of the Alberta neighborhood in Portland, Oregon', *Housing Policy Debate*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 595–624.
- 2007, 'Reassessing gentrification – Measuring residents' opinions using survey data', *Urban Affairs Review*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 583–592.
- Sumka, H. J. 1979 Neighbourhood revitalization and displacement. A review of the evidence, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 45, 4, pp. 480-487.
- Susnik, A & Ganesan, S 1997, 'Urban renewal and displacement in Hong Kong', *Urban Geography*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 324–346.
- Uitermark, J & Duyvendak, JW 2008, 'Civilising the city: Populism and revanchist urbanism in Rotterdam', *Urban Studies*, vol. 45, no. 7, pp. 1485–1503.
- Vankempen, R & Vanweesep, J 1994, 'Gentrification and the urban-poor – Urban restructuring and housing policy in Utrecht ', *Urban Studies*, vol. 31, no. 7, pp. 1043–1056.
- Wacquant, L 2008, 'Relocating gentrification: The working class, science and the state in recent urban research', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 198–205.
- Wagner, GR 1995, 'Gentrification, reinvestment, and displacement in Baltimore', *Journal of Urban Affairs*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 81–96.
- Walks, RA & Maaranen, R 2008, 'Gentrification, social mix, and social polarization: Testing the linkages in large Canadian cities', *Urban Geography*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 293–326.
- Warde, A 1991, 'Gentrification as consumption: Issues of class and gender', *Environment and Planning D*, vol. 9, pp. 223–232.
- Werwath, P 1998, 'Comment on David Listokin, Barbara Listokin, and Michael Lahr's "The contributions of historic preservation to housing and economic development"', *Housing Policy Debate*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 487–495.

- Wulff, M and Maher, C. 1998 Long term private renters in the Australian housing market, *Housing Studies*, 13, 1, pp. 97- 112.
- Yates, J., Wulff, M. and Reynolds, R. 2004 Changes in the supply of and need for low rent dwellings in the private rental market, Final Report, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute
- Zukin, S 1982, *Loft Living: Culture and Capital in Urban Change*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

AHURI Research Centres

Queensland Research Centre
RMIT Research Centre
Southern Research Centre
Swinburne-Monash Research Centre
Sydney Research Centre
UNSW-UWS Research Centre
Western Australia Research Centre



Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute
Level 1 114 Flinders Street, Melbourne Victoria 3000
Phone +61 3 9660 2300 Fax +61 3 9663 5488
Email information@ahuri.edu.au Web www.ahuri.edu.au