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Introduction

- CPNet, (S)HSC, & United Way of Toronto

- Vertical Poverty Report

- Novel empirical study
  - High-Rise apartments
  - Inner suburbs
Immigration Trends & Theory

• **Immigration to Canada – “settler society”**
  - ~ 250,000 / year
  - High visible minority component
  - Asia / Pacific ~ ½
  - Africa / Middle East ~ ¼
  - MTV concentration
  - Toronto share down over past decade – smaller centres growing

• **Traditional theory:**
  - Concentration & then dispersal (“up & out” model)
  - Rent then buy part of assim lit. too

• **Now various challenges to model:**
  - Some going direct to suburbs &/or buying homes initially
  - Continual ethnic concentration
  - Highly variable by ethnic group, resources, etc.
  - Transnationalism?
Immigration & Housing Literature

- Housing trajectories concept:
  - Growing awareness in the literature of 3 classes of ‘housed’ immigrant:
    1. relatively easy HO,
    2. struggle HO,
    3. “stuck in rental” – “urban underclass” discourse

- Again, my focus for the report:
  - High rise, Inner suburbs, & Private renters
Methodology

- High-rise / Inner suburbs & Private rental tenure
  - ~ 2,100 interviews (out of ~2,900)

- Secondary data analysis
  - Descriptive
  - Sets the stage for future statistical analysis

- Immigrant focus – 75 % of the sample
  - 4 categories (sub-groups):
    1. Canadian-born
    2. Long-term immigrants: 10 Years +
    3. Recent Immigrants: 5 – 10 years
    4. Very recent immigrants: < 5 years
       - Separation of < 10 years
Summary of Results

• Builds on important research found in Vertical Poverty

• Importance of this housing stock for newcomers – a starting place in Canada
  ◦ And long term renters

• 5 Themes:
  1. Sample Characteristics
     • Immigrants in this housing stock become more like Cdn born as length of time in Canada increases
  2. Current Location / Housing
     • High poverty neighbourhoods and clustering
  3. Previous Housing Experiences
     • Insight into immigrant mobility (& Canadian born)
  4. Housing Satisfaction & Future Plans
     • Satisfaction generally high, but movement more likely for Imms and for different reasons
  5. Social Cohesion & Neighbouring
     • Generally good news – many similarities across groups
I) Sample Characteristics

- Immigrants < 10 years
  - Better educated
  - Less English in home
  - Nuclear families
  - South Asian higher %

- Immigrants 10 + more like Canadian born
  - Older
  - Jamaican / Caribbean higher %

- Country of Birth & Ethnicity
  - Low Chinese % throughout
Table 1: Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canadian Born</th>
<th>10 + Years Immigrants</th>
<th>5-10 years Immigrants</th>
<th>&lt; 5 Years Immigrants</th>
<th>All Immigrants &lt; 10 Years</th>
<th>All Immigrants</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status of Respondent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or Common Law</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (Never married)</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent Families</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Parent Families</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language most often spoken at home</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main household income source</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Assistance</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Caribbean</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaican</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal/Métis/Inuit</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) Current Location

Figure 1: Study Area

In the sample:

- Immigrants under-represented in low poverty neighbourhoods
- Immigrants over-represented in high poverty neighbourhoods

High Poverty is > 40% below LICO

- City of Toronto Planning Areas
  Source: United Way of Toronto

Source: United Way of Toronto
### Current Spatial Concentrations

#### Table 2: Neighbourhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood2 (% of Neighbourhood Cluster)</th>
<th>Canadian Born</th>
<th>10 + Years Immigrants</th>
<th>5-10 years Immigrants</th>
<th>&lt; 5 Years Immigrants</th>
<th>All Immigrants &lt; 10 Years</th>
<th>All Immigrants</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Scarborough (n=227)</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>2176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset-Kennedy (n=246)</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston-Mount Dennis (n=275)</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane-Finch (n=256)</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rexdale (n=285)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flemingdon-Thorncliffe (n=158)</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other High Poverty Areas (n=264)</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-High Poverty Areas (n=465)</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Immigrants under 2/3s in low poverty neighbourhoods in sample
Immigrants usually 75 – 85 % in high poverty neighbourhoods in sample
Main reason for moving to current place:

- Cdn born = more price consciousness
  - But we know from literature that affordability is greatest Immigrant housing issue

- Imm < 10 years: importance of friends & ethnocultural presence
  - Especially < 5 years
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Housing Experiences Previous to Current Place</th>
<th>Canadian Born</th>
<th>10 + Years Immigrants</th>
<th>5-10 years Immigrants</th>
<th>&lt; 5 Years Immigrants</th>
<th>All Immigrants &lt; 10 Years</th>
<th>All Immigrants</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Places Lived in Past 5 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or more</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Length of Time in Neighbourhood                      |               |                      |                     |                     |                          |              |             |
| Less than 1 year                                     | 17.7          | 11.7                 | 14.4                | 28.8                | 23.5                     | 19.2         | 18.8        |
| 1 year to less than 2 years                         | 15.2          | 8.0                  | 16.0                | 29.8                | 24.7                     | 18.6         | 17.7        |
| 2 years to less than 3 years                        | 9.0           | 8.5                  | 11.7                | 20.2                | 17.1                     | 14.0         | 12.7        |
| 3 years to less than 5 years                        | 12.1          | 11.7                 | 17.3                | 18.7                | 18.2                     | 15.8         | 14.9        |
| More than 5 years                                    | 46.1          | 60.0                 | 40.7                | 2.5                 | 16.4                     | 32.5         | 35.9        |

| Length of Time in Building                          |               |                      |                     |                     |                          |              |             |
| Less than 1 year                                     | 26.2          | 16.4                 | 18.9                | 35.8                | 29.6                     | 24.8         | 25.1        |
| 1 year to less than 2 years                         | 17.2          | 11.6                 | 18.4                | 30.7                | 26.2                     | 20.8         | 19.9        |
| 2 years to less than 3 years                        | 10.5          | 11.2                 | 16.8                | 18.9                | 18.1                     | 15.6         | 14.3        |
| 3 years to less than 5 years                        | 11.4          | 15.4                 | 18.4                | 12.9                | 14.9                     | 15.1         | 14.2        |
| More than 5 years                                    | 34.7          | 45.4                 | 27.5                | 1.7                 | 11.1                     | 23.7         | 26.5        |

| Top 5 Reasons for Moving to Current Neighbourhood¹  |               |                      |                     |                     |                          |              |             |
| Affordable Rent                                     | 27.4          | 20.6                 | 23.4                | 16.4                | 19.0                     | 19.6         | 21.5        |
| Family in Area                                      | 20.0          | 20.8                 | 15.2                | 18.1                | 17.0                     | 18.4         | 18.8        |
| Friends in Area                                     | 9.6           | 7.7                  | 15.7                | 20.8                | 19.0                     | 14.8         | 13.5        |
| Ethno-cultural Group in Area                        | 2.9           | 6.0                  | 8.8                 | 13.3                | 11.7                     | 9.6          | 7.9         |
| Size of Unit                                        | 8.8           | 8.5                  | 11.2                | 4.3                 | 6.8                      | 7.4          | 7.8         |
4) Satisfaction & Future Plans

- Good neighbourhood to live in: **all very positive**
  - 1/3 of all would stay in neighbourhood
  - **BUT** ~1/2 would leave

- Planned length to stay in building **longer** for Cdn-born & 10+ Immigrants
  - Sign of satisfaction in some cases
  - “Stuck” in unsatisfactory rental in other cases
  - Sign of “up and out” model development for Immigrants < 10 years?

- Most important reason would move away from building:
  - Expensive rent for Cdn-born
  - Desire to own for all Immigrant groups – so many long-term renters 10+ still want to make tenure move

- All positive with little difference for possible “why move” variables:
  - landlord treatment, maintenance, safety/security, etc.
  - But evidence of overcrowding appears in <10 year Imms
  - **Perceptions & expectations**
5) Social Cohesion & Neighbouring

- Cdn born know more tenants.
  - Imm <10 slightly more limited to friends/family

- Casual /mundane “neighbouring” lower for Imm < 5
  - Visiting more often though for Imm <5 & lowest for Imm 10+ (as found in literature)
  - Both within building & neighbourhood

- “Trust” quite high across all groups

- Getting along, feeling welcome, sense of place, & cross-cultural harmony all highly rated across all groups

- Presence/activity in common rooms low across all groups
  - But Immigrants <10 years most likely to use them

- For all Immigrants, religion is important
  - Newcomers <5 have more reliance on religious ties as part of social network
Recommendations

Retain quantity & quality of this stock
- Private rental where most newcomers start
- Inner suburban high-rises: important places of “integration”
  - Crucial stock for Immigrants at arrival
  - And also long term renting
- Toronto Tower Renewal initiative
- Insufficient supply of public/social housing

Privileged position of homeownership should be re-evaluated
- Housing trajectories not just a move to HO
- About improving circumstances in rental too for many immigrants
- Affordability (30-50%)
- Adequacy (state of repair)
- Suitability (crowding)
Recommendations & Discussion cont’d

Linking spatial concentration of newcomers to service delivery
- Services to reach best located in those neighbourhoods (& buildings?)
- Welcoming Communities Initiative – Teixeira & Murdie framework

Greater integration of immigration and housing policy
- Cannot be siloed if goals are econ dev & demographic renewal
- Greater policy ties
- Housing downloaded to municipalities in Ontario

Prioritize improvement of the “social” environment
- More services in building and neighbourhood – social network diversity & “weak ties”
- Safety & security, etc. can improve neighbouring and social inclusion

Demand side supplement options
- Affordability main issue for Imms
- Funds to help compete in private market

Results / findings inform local service providers at municipal levels to meet requirements in Housing Services Act
- Many Imm “at-risk” of homelessness
- Place-based initiatives are important – but findings applicable to other regions
Conclusion & Future Steps

- Builds on important research found in Vertical Poverty
  - **2 lenses to discuss this research:**
    1. Type & location of dwelling – high-rise, inner suburbs
    2. Immigrant focus

- Importance of this housing stock for newcomers – a starting place in Canada
  - High poverty neighbourhoods
  - Insight into immigrant mobility, satisfaction (+ findings), & future plans

- Continuing partnership with United Way of Toronto for PhD

- Ray & Preston, 2009
  - Neighbouring in Canada – **high-rise apartments stands out**
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