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Structure of presentation

• The importance of theory in the social sciences
• The importance of testing and discussion of the empirical findings
  • a researcher cannot be indifferent to their findings!
• How my own empirical work has been informed by theory
What do we mean by theory?

• Theories are generalisations that try to rationalise and explain the world:

“Without generalisations and abstractions, the work would exist for us only as a chaotic patchwork of discrete, disconnected experiences and sensory impression.”

(Joans & Knobl 2009)
Ways of Knowing and Ways of Doing (Research)

• How can philosophical and theoretical issues be linked directly to methodology?

• Aitken & Valentine (2006)
  – we must be aware of the assumptions of particular ways of knowing, as they help us to raise appropriate research questions
Philosophical and theoretical issues

• Philosophy engages a larger system of webs and knowing related to beliefs, values and meanings (e.g. positivist, humanist, structuralist, post-structuralist)

• Concepts (e.g. inequality, segregation) provide an attractive centre point for the debate of theories (e.g. structuration theory)
Scientific thought

• Scientific thought is constantly moving between the extremes: metaphysical environment «» empirical environment
• For example, observations are close to reality, whereas general presupposition, models and concepts are close to abstraction.
Hypotheses

• Theory can be derived inductively (from empirical knowledge) or deductively (working from the general to the specific)
• Hypotheses are derived from theories and can be empirically investigated
• The scientific method is a process of testing hypotheses
The centrality to theory

• There are no pure observations, they are infiltrated by theories and guided by problems

• Every attempt to test a theory must conclude, and/or begin, with some basic scientific statements
Testing theories

• Hypotheses and theories have to be tested or scrutinised against empirical reality (data)

• For example:
  • The impact of urban and housing policy on social groups and areas within the city: who gets what, and why?
  • The critical analyses of inequality: why goods are so unevenly distributed within society?
Empirical research

• Mixed methods research: using qualitative and quantitative approaches across different stages of the research process
  • Qualitative methodologies are important for analysing conditions of social life, how social practices are implemented
  • Quantitative methodologies are important for classification, measurement and statistical analysis
TESTING THEORY 1
Welfare State Changes and Outcomes – The Cases of Portuga and Denmark from a Comparative Perspective

Sónia Alves
Instituto de Ciências Sociais, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal; Danish Building Research Institute, Aalborg University Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

Abstract
It is well known that welfare states ensure a certain level of social protection affecting levels of well-being and the extent of inequalities in society. Changes within crucial domains of social policy, such as education, health, or social protection, have, therefore, a major effect upon individuals’ opportunities. In this article I compare the effects of these changes in two countries from the mid-1990s to the financial crisis of 2008. Portugal that was a latecomer in welfare state development and Denmark was at the forefront of de-commodification and universalization of social rights. The conclusion of this article is that income inequality has been steadily increasing in Danish society; while in Portugal, despite improvements in many social domains (healthcare, poverty alleviation, unemployment protection), problems of inequality remain deeply embedded in the country’s social and institutional structures.
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Theory of Welfare States (WS)

• WS: a theoretical construct used for the measurement of the specific position of each country with regard to its capacity to support the welfare of its households and communities

• Factors that influence the creation and transformation of WS (local conditions, external influences) and its impacts on social policy and society (for example, levels of socio-economic inequality, protection of social rights)
Theory of Welfare States – the concept

• A social creation that must be seen as a historical construction, embedded in a specific socio-political, economic and ideological context

• Each country has implemented a welfare system in its own way, and its human and financial resources are shaped by a specific culture and set of customs
Esping-Andersen (1990)

• The welfare state is not just a mechanism that intervenes in, and possibly corrects, the structure of inequality, but it is, in its own right, a system of stratification
• It ensures a certain level of social protection
• It affects levels of well-being and of inequality in society
The contribution of the paper to WS studies

• The first section explores the relative position of Portuguese and Danish welfare states within the 3 worlds of welfare state:
  • Denmark is included in the Social Democratic Regime
  • Portugal’s inclusion is questioned in the light of findings:
    – is it an underdeveloped version of a corporative/conservative regime?
    – does it belongs to a fourth regime?
Reasons for the lack of agreement

• Statistical data and methods used ... domains, social groups, data sources, indicators, or cut-off points

• The highly fragmented nature of the welfare system, in terms of social groups and the domains of social protection (health, life expectancy, education)
The WS in Portugal and Denmark: changes since the mid-1980s

The transformation of the Portuguese and Danish welfare systems from a two-fold perspective:

**WELFARE SPENDING**

- Total social expenditure per capita

**EFFECTS ON SOCIETY**

- Economic inequality
- Education
- Health
Results

Total Unemployment (ages 15 to 74)

- Denmark
- Portugal

Inequality of income distribution

- Denmark
- Portugal

Years: 2003 to 2011

Income distribution data: 1995 to 2010
Results

Poverty rate before and after taxes and transfers in Denmark

Poverty rate before and after taxes and transfers in Portugal
Results

Social Expenditure on Health as percentage of GDP

Infant Mortality rate (per thousand)
Results - Portugal

- Portugal was a latecomer in welfare state development
- From the mid 1980s (EU accession was in 1986) until the economic crises of 2008, Portugal showed remarkable progress in many social domains:
  - e.g. health care, poverty alleviation, unemployment protection
Results - Portugal

• Austerity policies from 2008 to 2015 changed this pattern of gradual convergence in many social and economic domains (such as productivity, health, life expectancy, and educational attainment)

• Despite the slight decrease in inequality over time in Portugal, it remains one of the most unequal countries in the European Union and OECD
Results - Denmark

• Statistical data shows the increase in income inequality and poverty rates in Denmark. The reduction of access to passive welfare benefits and of the size of public benefits has led to a marked increase in the number of people living in poverty.

• However, Denmark continues to show one of the lowest levels of poverty, and one of the highest levels of universality of state benefits.
TESTING THEORY 2
Poles Apart? A Comparative Study of Housing Policies and Outcomes in Portugal and Denmark

Sónia Alves
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Kemeny’s Theory of Rental Housing Markets

• Kemeny developed a theory which seeks to explain the divergence between rental systems across countries.
• By distinguishing ideologies of ‘privatism’ versus ‘collectivism’, Kemeny identifies two main and opposing philosophies regarding the long-term structuration of rental markets. He distinguishes between two rental systems - the integrated versus the dualist rental system.
Kemeny’s theories of rental housing markets

• Collectivism: the state takes upon itself the direct responsibility of providing rental housing in need. To this end, non-profit rental housing is organised in the form of a state or local government monopoly

• Privatism: the state is either not a major provider itself, or if it is, access to such housing – often provided on a non-for-profit basis – is not limited to households in need. (Kemeny, 2001).
Kemeny’s theories of rental housing markets

- Integrated rental system: social (non-profit) and the private (for-profit) markets are incorporated into a single rental market; in the ‘dualist’ rental system, these are strictly separated.

- Integrated rental system: a social market model in which “the state encourages at cost rental housing to compete directly with the private rented sector in order to dampen rents and to provide good-quality housing on secure tenancy terms.” (Kemeny, 2006)
Purpose of the paper

• To test Kemeny’s typology of rental systems on a bi-country comparison of housing systems belonging to different welfare state regimes - Portugal and Denmark.
Hypothesis #1

In the context of broader political and socio-economic circumstances, ideology plays a crucial role in explaining the differences between housing strategies and outcomes in both countries.
Poles Apart: hypotheses

Hypothesis #2

Denmark is an example of an integrated rental system in which non-profit and for-profit markets are fairly evenly balanced in terms of size, rent levels, housing quality and tenants.
Poles Apart: hypotheses

Hypothesis #3

Portugal is an example of a dualist rental system, in which owner-occupancy is the dominant mode of tenure, the rental sector is minor, and the private and social rental markets are strictly separated.
Housing policies and outcomes: the comparative perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>43994</td>
<td>5,511</td>
<td>127.9</td>
<td>20,600 40,500</td>
<td>2,745a 2,583a</td>
<td>500a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>91,916</td>
<td>10,627</td>
<td>115.6</td>
<td>8,700 15,400</td>
<td>5,880b 3,991b</td>
<td>557b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Owner-occupancy</th>
<th>Private rental</th>
<th>Non-profit or social rental</th>
<th>Other (e.g. cooperatives)</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Occupied dwellings by tenure between 1960-2011 (5)

Portugal

- Occupied by the owner
- Occupied by the tenant

Denmark

- Occupied by the owner
- Occupied by the tenant
- Not stated
Total government expenditure 1996-2010
Housing cost overburden rate by tenure status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portugal</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied, with mortgage or loan</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied, no outstanding mortgage or housing loan</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant — rent at market price</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant — rent at reduced price or free</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Poles Apart: the results

• The empirical results of my analyses largely support Kemeny's theories, supporting the three hypotheses initially formulated in the paper

• Therefore, Kemeny’s claim that ideologies translate into housing policies and dominant forms of tenure and housing outcomes is true
Poles Apart: the results

• High home-ownership rates in Portugal are to a great extent the result of policies that have strongly supported the growth of home-ownership, while discouraging investment in the rental sector

• The Danish housing system is a perfect illustration of an integrated rental system, showing a striking balance between rental and owner-occupancy tenures and, in the former, limited differences between housing quality and rent levels
Poles Apart: the results

• Divergences between these two housing systems are explained by the prevalence of social democratic ideologies in Denmark that have supported social equality and long-term investment in the rental sector.

• Meanwhile, in Portugal, corporatist ideologies, first during the Salazar regime [1933–74] and then during subsequent periods of socialist and social-democratic governments, have supported owner-occupation at the expense of the rental sector.
TESTING THEORY 3
Assessing the impact of area-based initiatives in deprived neighborhoods: The example of S. João de Deus in Porto, Portugal

Sónia Alves

To cite this article: Sónia Alves (2017) Assessing the impact of area-based initiatives in deprived neighborhoods: The example of S. João de Deus in Porto, Portugal, Journal of Urban Affairs, 39:3, 381-399

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2016.1245081
Using ‘middle range’ theories

• Middle range theories produce generic propositions about:
  – the socio-spatial dialectic
  – the evaluation of urban regeneration policies
  – governance
The socio-spatial dialectic

- The geographies in which we live can have negative as well as positive consequences on practically everything we do (Soja, 2009)
- Places where people live, in terms of social composition, housing tenure and built environment, shape individual and communal opportunities
Social theory of Bordieu (1977) & Wacquant (2014)

• Discourses - statements that incorporate judgements, ideologies and ideas - reinforce the negative representation or stigmatisation of areas and groups (Wacquant et al., 2014)

• The ghetto discourse:
  • distinguishes problematic places and people from supposedly 'normal' instances
  • reinforces processes of social and spatial marginalisation
S. João de Deus: research objectives

• To fill an analytical gap regarding the criteria for evaluating area based initiatives (ABIs), both from a process and a substantive perspective vis-à-vis their effects on families and neighborhoods.

• I used the case study research as an evaluation method (Yin, 2014) to discuss the relationship between political ideologies and political strategy formulation and implementation, and their effects on social and territorial stigmatisation.
Evaluation model

3 dimensions

8 components

translated into

assumptions

research questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Research questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Organizational structure, key actors and institutions involved and excluded. Roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>Who has participated and why? Who was excluded? To what extent were the residents included?</td>
<td>How do politics and values affect the organization of the initiative? Which forms of governance were most effective? Was there an environment in which all stakeholders were encouraged to discuss needs and actions? Were the beneficiaries and local communities sufficiently involved in shaping the program? What was done to increase participation and develop consensus? Were the program mechanisms supportive and open to grassroots voices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processual</td>
<td>Practices and work routines: cross-sector and collaborative? Levels of participation and interaction between actors and institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional capacity</td>
<td>Knowledge resources</td>
<td>Ways of thinking and acting (Haley et al., 2002)</td>
<td>What was the logic of the program and its assumptions? Was it questioned and negotiated? In what ways did the sharing of information generate new knowledge about the people and their area? Was it important for the process of strategy formulation and delivery?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational resources</td>
<td>Social relations and interactions</td>
<td>Perception of the potential of the initiative to produce the share of interest and norms that generate cooperation and help to resolve problems (Cars et al., 2002)</td>
<td>What outputs were generated by social and institutional relations and collaborative work? Were the relations based on trust and cooperation? What was the impact of the initiative, individually and institutionally? Was the approach integrated? In what ways? What were the factors underlying its successes/setbacks? What lessons were learned along the way? How successful was mobilization around the program and the strategy? How was it encouraged? What were the results and impacts of the initiative regarding the SJD neighborhood and residents? Have some elements been more successful than others? Some examples of successful/unsuccessful projects in terms of outputs and impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization capacity</td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>Reproduction/change (Haley et al., 2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusion</td>
<td>Sphere of market exchange</td>
<td>Changes wrought by the initiative in terms of opportunities in the market sphere (Murie and Mustard, 2001)</td>
<td>How were the lives of residents affected by the project? What new improved skills job opportunities, and expectation were generated? What were the effects of the initiative in terms of labor market participation: training, job creation? Did the initiative provided means (goods, services, or revenue) for the most vulnerable households? How have changes in the provision of social housing and other types of support impacted families? How important was the sphere of mutual support?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphere of redistribution</td>
<td>Changes wrought by the initiative in terms of opportunities for state support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphere of embeddedness</td>
<td>Type of social relations in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S. João de Deus: results

• Urban regeneration: improving the quality of life for people in poor and disadvantaged urban areas

• At European and national levels, several urban regeneration programs have been launched to increase financial support for areas in need, allegedly to improve their inhabitants' prospects

• However, at a local level, the implementation of ABIs has not always been used as part of a strategy to fight social exclusion
Factors and circumstances influencing the effectiveness of ABIs

• Complex social, economic, physical, and organisational problems cannot be resolved by a narrow approach via sectoral, hierarchical, and uncoordinated procedures

• The value of ABIs lies in their competence to comprehend and promote innovative and flexible ways to resolve problems that are identified locally though collaborative methodologies
S. João de Deus: results

• The existence of different political beliefs and values regarding the main causes and possible solutions to problems explains the formulation of different strategies, sometimes contrasting in their objectives and approaches.

• Political struggles, rather than political commitments, can result in undesired outcomes that most affect those living and working there.
S. João de Deus: results

• Political discourses that add pathological explanations about the area and its residents reinforce processes of territorial stigmatisation that negatively affect social relations and opportunities.

• Although physical intervention can generate infrastructural improvements, demolition and forced evictions only displace problems between different neighborhoods without affecting their causes.
TESTING THEORY 4
REQUALIFICAÇÃO E GENTRIFICAÇÃO NO CENTRO HISTÓRICO DO PORTO
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Gentrification Theory

• Gentrification: a process which operates in the residential housing market
• It refers to the rehabilitation of working-class and derelict housing, and to the consequent transformation of an area into a middle-class neighbourhood
• Hypothesis of gentrification - the replacement of low-income families by an upper middle class, in the context of the historical centre of Porto
Key competing explanations:

- Economic / cultural forces: the emergence of a new middle class and of a post-industrial city
  - the switch from manufacturing industry to service-based activities
  - new cultural values and residential preferences (e.g. for an urban lifestyle rather than suburban monotony)
- Rent gap theory - gentrification is a structural product of the land and housing markets. When the gap grows and is sufficiently large, rehabilitation can begin
• Neil Smith’s Rent Gap theory: investment, disinvestment and reinvestment in the built environment

• Rent gap: the disparity between the potential ground rent and the actual ground rent, capitalised under the present land use
Gentrification of Porto: methodology

• Mixed methodology approach
  • qualitative analysis: semi-structured, in-depth interviews with residents and former residents, and with officials involved in the transformation of the area
  • quantitative analysis: statistical analysis of population and housing data in order to understand changes in the economic, social and housing structures of the city in recent decades
Measuring gentrification using census data

• Examine trends of housing market activity:
  • large increases in rents and home prices?
  • increases in renovations, conversion of rental units to ownership?
  • development of luxury housing, office, retail and restaurants?

• Examine changes in the social composition of the residential area:
  • changes in the structure of employment and occupation
  • increases in the percentage of the work force employed in professional, managerial, technical and administrative jobs?
Gentrification of Porto: example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional workers</td>
<td>12,697</td>
<td>14,316</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>31,961</td>
<td>35,472</td>
<td>3,511</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual workers</td>
<td>43,528</td>
<td>41,361</td>
<td>-2,167</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual workers</td>
<td>59,809</td>
<td>48,142</td>
<td>-11,667</td>
<td>-19.5</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled manual</td>
<td>28,377</td>
<td>21,635</td>
<td>-6,742</td>
<td>-23.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>197,981</td>
<td>174,295</td>
<td>-23,686</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gentrification of Porto: example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number 2011</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number 2001</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Absolute 2001</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Higher managerial, administrative and professional occupations</td>
<td>807,936</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>640,162</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>167,774</td>
<td>26.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lower managerial, administrative and professional occupations</td>
<td>1,410,785</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>1,178,092</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>232,693</td>
<td>19.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>2,218,721</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>1,818,254</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>400,467</td>
<td>22.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intermediate occupations</td>
<td>723,354</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>542,568</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>180,786</td>
<td>33.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Small employers and own account workers</td>
<td>575,331</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>339,188</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>236,143</td>
<td>69.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lower supervisory and technical occupations</td>
<td>305,781</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>264,617</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>41,164</td>
<td>15.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle or Intermediate Class</td>
<td>1,604,466</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>1,146,373</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>458,093</td>
<td>39.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Semi-routine occupations</td>
<td>633,790</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>479,074</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>154,716</td>
<td>32.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Routine occupations</td>
<td>453,923</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>306,901</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>147,022</td>
<td>47.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>1,087,713</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>785,975</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>301,738</td>
<td>38.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total classified</td>
<td>4,910,900</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,750,602</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,160,298</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>700,292</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>1,230,975</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>-530,683</td>
<td>-43.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed etc</td>
<td>506,290</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>318,704</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>187,586</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All categories: NS-SeC</td>
<td>6,117,482</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5,300,281</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>817,201</td>
<td>15.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Resident population by socio-economic group 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Porto (município)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Centro Histórico</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total população residente (ativos + inativos)</td>
<td>263131</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>13218</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empresários com profissões intelectuais, científicas e técnicas</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empresários da indústria, comércio e serviços</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pequenos patrões c/prof.intelectuais e científicas</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pequenos patrões c/prof.técnicas intermédias</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pequenas patrões da indústria</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pequenos patrões do comércio e serviços</td>
<td>5049</td>
<td>4,0</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>3,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profissionais intelect. e científicos independentes</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profissionais técnicos intermédios independentes</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trabalhadores industriais e artesanais independentes</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestadores serviços e comerciantes independentes</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directores e quadros dirigentes do estado e empresas</td>
<td>5251</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirigentes de pequenas empresas e organizações</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadros intelectuais e científicos</td>
<td>19823</td>
<td>15,8</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>5,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadros técnicos e intermédios</td>
<td>12106</td>
<td>9,6</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>5,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadros administrativos intermédios</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empregados administrativos do comércio e serviços</td>
<td>32532</td>
<td>25,7</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>29,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operários qualificados e semi-qualificados</strong></td>
<td>17239</td>
<td>13,6</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>19,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assalariados do sector primário</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trabalh. administ. comércio e serv. não qualificados</td>
<td>15737</td>
<td>12,4</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>22,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operários não qualificados</strong></td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pessoal das forças armadas</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outras pessoas activas, n.e.</td>
<td>2519</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total população residente (ativos)</td>
<td>126413</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>5884</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inactivos</strong></td>
<td>136587</td>
<td>51,9</td>
<td>7331</td>
<td>55,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Padrões de residência população empregada no sector secundário

Taxa de variação da população residente entre 2000-2011
Gentrification of Porto: empirical results

• Initially, the displacement of low-income families owed more to housing degradation than to housing rehabilitation

• The current phase of neoliberal policy is reinforcing the process: area-based initiatives can contribute to the further marginalisation and impoverishment of already vulnerable families and groups
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