

**Project Summary.** *The Rehabilitation of Consolidated Irregular Settlements in Latin American Cities: Towards a “Third Generation” of Public Policy Analysis and Development.*

In Latin American cities spontaneous (irregular) settlements commonly make up between 20 and 60 percent of the built-up area. Formed illegally, once the initial settlement is established residents self-build and improve their own homes, while government policies of aided self-help and upgrading include the regularization of land title, and the provision of basic infrastructure, etc. Over a period of 15-20 years these areas become fully integrated into the city fabric as working class consolidated settlements, such that governments prioritize more recently formed settlements that continue to capture un-serviced land at the ever-expanding periphery. During the past thirty years the applicant's work has been at the forefront of such applied research, and has contributed directly to two previous “generations” of housing policy in the 1970s and 1990s. Today, however, there is an urgent need for new thinking: namely to refocus attention on these consolidated settlements, which today comprise hundreds of thousands of dwellings and lots in what is now the inner ring of “old suburbs”. After thirty or forty years of intensive use, these areas and dwellings are heavily deteriorated physically; have high population and lot densities; are the locale of intense social problems born of a “new poverty” that is now embedded with these communities. The original nuclear family structure has been replaced with extended and “compound” households, as adult children and grandchildren become stakeholders in shared lot ownership, raising their own families alongside those of their parents and grandparents. Intensive use of the home over 30 years means that the dwelling is no longer suited to multiple-independent household occupancy, and there is an urgent need to understand the social dynamics, and to develop new policy approaches to facilitate in-situ reconfiguration and renovation of dwellings to contemporary needs; and for the retrofitting services and utilities at the lot and settlement/community levels.

Led by the PI at the University of Texas this is a multidisciplinary study built around a network of research groups in ten cities (seven Latin American countries), working independently to a mutually agreed methodology and strategy. Significant **intellectual merits** and **broader impacts** are anticipated. First, it will consolidate collaboration of a major research network, thereby strengthening local institutional development of the project groups, and provide extensive graduate training and teaching materials for junior faculty working in cross cultural comparative analysis and policy making. Second, as an entirely new approach and focus it contributes to multiple areas of theory: low-income housing market performance; patterns of property ownership, inheritance and asset building and usage; social and physical mobility patterns; informal housing arrangements for second and third generation residents in (former) irregular settlements; and how so called “new” poverty (of especially vulnerable populations) is being accommodated in these older inner-ring settlements, and which offer interesting parallel insights to a newly emerging US literature about “old suburbs”/innerburbs. More importantly, while these findings will be informed by local analysis, they will add to a broader generic understanding of processes across a range of Latin American cities. Third, the methodology embraces collaborative, multi- and inter-disciplinary participation and mixed-methods to gather quantitative and qualitative data. These include: GIS and census data at the citywide level; interview surveys for selected neighborhoods; and innovative use of intensive case studies to reconstruct dwelling to household dynamics over time (but focusing upon the present). Also innovative and timely is a three-city longitudinal re-study of households and lot sites first interviewed thirty or more years ago. Fourth, the study will generate new instruments and new directions in housing policy, renovation techniques, micro-financing, tools for improving land and housing market performance, etc. As well as impacting upon the international housing and urban planning constituencies, these ideas will directly feed into local and national housing agencies, since the case studies materials will have been derived from within those cities.

## **Full Project Description.**

### ***The Rehabilitation of Consolidated Irregular Settlements in Latin American Cities: Towards a “Third Generation” of Public Policy Analysis and Development.***

#### **Background: The earlier waves of irregular settlements and self help housing consolidation**

This multi-disciplinary and multi-city research project is the first to systematically examine the contemporary social and household dynamics and public policy needs of low-income settlements that formed illegally in Latin America thirty to forty years ago. For the PI and several others actively involved in the research network described below, this research comprises a reengagement with settlements and areas that we studied early in our careers (Gilbert and Ward, 1985; Roberts 1973). At that time our primary goal was to investigate the nature and dynamics of households and communities in irregular (squatter-type) settlements in Latin American and other Third World cities, and to come up with more accurate assessments about the nature of those settlements (Portes 1972, Perlman 1976, Ward 1976, Lloyd 1979). In policy terms this earlier work ultimately led to a major shift in approach, away from housing projects towards aided self-help for low-income irregular settlements (Ward 1982; 2005).

The “paradigm shift” in the way in which irregular settlements were viewed and treated occurred in the late 1970s, after which these “slums” began to be viewed as rational and viable responses by the poor given the incapacity of governments to undertake low-income housing production on a scale adequate to cope with rising urbanization. By the 1960s irregular settlements in many Latin American and other developing country cities made up 25-50% of the built-up area. Other things being equal, over a 15-20 year period these settlements were physically upgraded and improved through mutual aid activities of community residents, and through family organized self-help dwelling construction or “consolidation” as it came to be known. Starting with a rudimentary shack, incremental house construction allowed nuclear households to add rooms as needed and as their resources allowed: it was a flexible and pragmatic “architecture that worked” (Turner 1968; see also Figures 1a & 1b below). Governments, meanwhile, gradually installed basic infrastructure and services, “regularized” land titles giving formal ownership papers to de facto squatter owners, and encouraged upgrading and integration of these working class settlements into the physical fabric of the city. As cities continued to expand physically, this former periphery of suburban squatters gradually became part of the intermediate ring of the city, forming today’s old and often rather dilapidated first-ring suburbs. Depending upon the city, these inner suburbs today house between 15-30 percent of the total population, and while a minority are renters, the majority of the lots and housing fabric is in the hands of these owner (former) self-builders. Thus in any one city hundreds of thousands of homes and millions of people may be affected, and yet because they are now consolidated settlements, they are no longer the focus of attention and are largely ignored in contemporary housing policy.

Two broad earlier “generations” of aided self help housing policy can be identified from the 1970s onwards (Ward 2005). The first was that of “urban projects” whereby national housing policies became more supportive of these informally entrained processes, and the conventional wisdom became one of upgrading and installing services to such areas (and no longer of their eviction as before). From the late 1980s, a second generation of policies emerged, this time seeking to strengthen the land market and local institutional and governmental capacity to implement housing actions in ways that were sustainable and less reliant upon direct state-led

intervention. These involve more effective and management systems, reduction or removal of subsidies, and greater expected cost recovery for services and improvements (Jones and Ward, 1994). Within that context of institutional strengthening and decentralization of policy making to sub-national and local governments, the principal policy approaches towards irregular settlements continue to be those of upgrading and “regularization” often supported by major external funding agencies such as the IBD, but now within an institutional and administrative context that emphasizes greater managerial autonomy, fiscal sustainability, public-private partnerships, legal titling and adherence to urban planning norms, etc. This policy direction is likely to continue to be predominant during the next decade and as long as new irregular settlements form at the urban periphery of cities (Ward 2005).

However, since the 1980s and 1990s economic restructuring change and neoliberal macro-economic policies have dramatically changed labor market structures and employment prospects for workers (Portes and Hoffman 2003). A “new” poverty and new vulnerabilities have emerged among recent migrants, the elderly, female headed households and the unprotected youth. Moreover, democratic change has led to government decentralization and downsizing, and the privatization of social policy and devolution to local government (Wilson et al 2008), such that there is an urgent need for a **new phase** of research and normative policy development – what I refer to here as a “third generation” of housing policy that is also embedded within a paradigm of sustainable and local government implementation.

Specifically, the proposed research will go beyond existing regularization policies to address the largely unstudied issue of **urban revitalization** – in this case focusing upon the older irregular settlements that were established twenty or more years ago. These old (once) self-help suburbs are located in what is now the inner or intermediate ring of city development and correspond to what, in the USA, have recently begun to be identified as the “innerburbs” (Katz et al, 2005). While these areas are different in nature to those of the USA, there are many common research issues to be addressed, such as: to better understand the processes of land-use change born of globalization and restructuring; demographic change (immigration and aging); housing and land densification, and the inevitable dilapidation that occurs after many years of intense usage and relative policy neglect. Despite their apparent full spatial and physical integration into the city fabric, these former irregular settlements are invariably in urgent need of attention and policy support for revitalization. If these areas were not slums in the traditional sense, as many of us argued in the past, they could readily become the slums of the future – if they aren’t already in some cases.

Part of the problem that these areas now face is that these dwellings were built gradually – as families grew, and as resources allowed. Being self-built and low cost, they relied upon little or no formal building skills, they were rarely conceived according to a complete dwelling plan, and they made no effort to comply with safety norms and codes, etc. That worked fine at the time, but 20-30 years later it has led to severe deterioration of the built environment (see photos in Figure 1b). Sometimes, as in Caracas or Mexico City in recent years, floods or earthquakes can lead to tragedy when such poorly built or severely dilapidated structures collapse, in part because of inadequate maintenance or because of a lack of more recent intervention to reconfigure and strengthen the physical structures of existing dwellings.

Equally important is the fact that the social composition of these settlements and households has changed markedly. Population densities are much higher, land uses are more mixed, and there is widespread renting and sharing (Varley and Blasco, 2003). However unlike US cities where urban ecological change is associated with high population mobility, in Latin America among these low-income self-help owner builders of yesteryear it appears that a “home is

forever” (Gilbert, 1999). The large majority of lots continue to be occupied by the original owners and their families.<sup>1</sup> That being the case, the household structure and size is now out of synch with the dwelling environment that evolved many years earlier. As well as being distressed, the dwelling is likely to be anachronistic with the family’s contemporary needs and space requirements.



Figure 1a. Sketch plan of the physical development of a squatter dwelling, Lima



Figure 1b. Three dimensional and photographic rendering of 1a showing current dilapidation.

<sup>1</sup> As part of the preparation of this proposal the PI conducted a pilot survey in eight settlements in Bogotá and Mexico City, returning to almost 300 dwellings where interviews were first conducted in the 1970s. That survey indicated that over 80% were the same families – i.e. there is very high stability and immobility.

## The Proposed Study

By opening up **an entirely new line of systematic enquiry**, this research promises to make a substantial contribution to sociological and urban theory in Latin America. Its findings will intersect with theoretical and empirical debates on household organization and dynamics among first, second and third generations living in working class consolidated communities, and their residential trajectories through the life course. It will offer insights about how residential space aids or constrains the survival strategies of those living in “new poverty” (González de la Rocha, 2000, 2004), and will identify second and third generation stakeholder interest in dwelling renovation and retrofitting. The research will speak to key contemporary issues about urban ecological changes that are underway in inner and first ring suburbs in Latin America, as well as provide a comparative perspective upon the growing interest in inner (now older) suburbs in major USA cities which have also been largely ignored to date. It will also address several major theories of residential land market behavior: specifically, the role and meaning of property ownership and the way in which it impedes or enhances housing market performance; asset building and the way in which this may accentuate tenure and social stratification between classes, and within classes (Wilson 1999).

While none of the proposed research methods are new, methodologically the proposed research is quite innovative being multi-disciplinary and comparative across ten cities; embracing mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative); taking both “top-down” and “bottom-up” vantage points of analysis; and combining nested survey techniques of GIS/remote sensing analysis, tailored surveys, and intensive household case studies. These case studies, in particular, will allow for the triangulation of attitudes and inter-personal dynamics between principal household stakeholders. It will also develop new methods and software to allow for the tracking of household expansion tied to physical development and expansion of the dwelling unit.

Concretely, too, this research will make a major contribution policy analysis as well as directly inform new normative approaches that will facilitate in-situ housing rehabilitation in older irregular settlements. To date, most urban renovation policy has focused upon inner-city redevelopment and cultural heritage restoration. This research will develop housing policy on a much wider-scale, targeting the older now deteriorated consolidated irregular settlements, by offering new strategies of financing and credit that are more culturally sensitive and workable than those proposed by de Soto (2000) and his followers; technical support about in-situ remodeling and retrofitting; and offer new legal instruments to facilitate stakeholder engagement. At a broader level it will provide policy guidance about improving residential land market behavior, and the future housing needs of second and third generations who currently have little prospect of sharing in home ownership.

Specifically for each city and the consolidated irregular settlements that we identify, the study will examine:

- Contemporary settlement land uses: mixes and overall population densities.
- The nature, production, and extent of rental opportunities in consolidated settlements.
- Residential trajectories of second and third generation family members.
- Tenure patterns (among owners and non-owners) at both settlement and intra-lot levels.
- Household structure and inheritance arrangements as original owners age and die.
- Household arrangements and social interaction patterns first, second and third generation households, both within lots/dwellings as well as at the intra-settlement levels.

- Employment and income earning opportunities among household members, and the insertion of a “new poverty” into residential household arrangements.
- On lot economic and rent seeking activities (workshops, petty production activities), etc.
- Patterns of contemporary disposal income and resource sharing between “stakeholders” living on each lot.
- The needs, claims, aspirations and opportunities for different “stakeholders”, and the prospects for 3<sup>rd</sup> generation (grandchildren).
- Data about household budgets and expenses associated with dwelling maintenance and improvement.
- Current physical dwelling structure arrangements including: layout, incremental construction, current usage; construction materials, levels of dilapidation, room improvements undertaken or planned.
- Contemporary housing needs relative to new and emerging household arrangements.
- Stakeholder-identified needs and priorities for dwelling redesign and rehabilitation.
- Contemporary techniques and practices for dwelling refurbishment, and the principal impediments (financial, judicial, familial) to their being undertaken.
- Local authority perceptions and policy approaches: for social problems; for retrofitting services; for sustained local development; for public participation and engagement.
- The ways in which local government and Non Government Organizations might intervene and support in-situ rehabilitation.

### **Hypotheses to be Tested & Propositions to be Explored:**

Following a common methodology and set of instruments and strategies (see Methodology below), the study will seek to test the following six broad hypotheses and sub-hypotheses. Instead of extending the narrative, it is hoped that outlining these hypotheses in detail will offer evaluators a more nuanced insight into the research that this project will explore. There are six broad areas of analysis:

#### **1) On Household Mobility Patterns:**

##### ***1a) Owners in irregular settlements, once established, show high levels of stability and longevity on the lot.***

- Mobility (out movement) will be relatively low with a high proportion of original owners (or their families) found to be still residing on the lot after 30 years.
- Self-builder families of yesteryear emphasize **use** value (for raising kids, patrimony, etc.), rather than **exchange** value;
- Few can sell, because the effective demand is stunted. Corner lots or those along main thoroughfares that offer potential for commercial use will be the exceptions (that prove the rule);

#### **2) On Family Life Cycle Household Arrangements and Size.**

##### ***2a) While there is considerable “churn” as adult children leave home, many will prefer to remain on the lot living separately in “compound” arrangements, raising their own families. This is because of:***

- Alternative housing options are unaffordable or poorly located
- Second generation adults are less willing to make same sacrifices and hardship as their parents (by moving out to self build in the current periphery)

- Cultural preferences to remain in the n’hood in which they grew up and maintain relative proximity to family and friends, etc.
- Expectancies of eventual lot (or part lot) inheritance and wish to remain active stakeholders;
- Need to give extended care to elderly or infirm parents, usually limited to a single unmarried daughter.

**2b) *Those who move away from the parent’s lot are most likely to be:***

- Better-off children with resources to allow them to purchase or to rent an apartment;
- Married female children moving to live with in-laws (cultural tradition);
- Those seeking and asserting their independence (for whatever reason [estrangement; life style, sexual preference, etc.]
- Those with lower stakeholder expectancies for eventual part lot ownership (i.e. female/daughter non care givers to parents; non siblings (cousins, etc);
- Kin related renters.

**2c) *The number of households and overall lot densities do not show a “bell shaped curve” as parents age and children leave, but actually increase over the years due to:***

- Internal subdivision and permanent lot sharing with adult children (and their children [grandchildren]);
- Some petty landlordism – renting out rooms
- Small family enterprises taking up residential space

**2d) *Third generation adults are likely to find it even harder to become owners than was the case for their parents.***

- This is because capacity to further subdivide on lots beyond the second generation demand is limited
- That their childhood dwelling environment experiences will have been at higher densities with less space than that of their own parents
- That the third generation is are unlikely to have the same long-term options of sharing as their (second generation) parents.
- That after their parents needs are met (albeit partially), then third generation needs will become an important future “tipping point”, creating new pressures to renovate and retrofit homes in consolidated settlements, as well as a new set of needs in housing policy formulation that go beyond that of the family patrimony provided by granparents.

**3) Inheritance and ownership.**

**3a) *Lot inheritance among stakeholders is unclear and often conflictive . Few original owners have wills of formally determine inheritance of lot and division among children;***

- Most die intestate for a number of reasons including cultural ones;
- Female spouses are much more likely to be the surviving heir than males, yet title regularization usually favors male head over female head or joint title;
- One titles are issued, subsequently very few actually change titles to reflect:
  - ✓ Spousal inheritance and continued residence after one partner dies or deserts;
  - ✓ Existing shared household rights to the housing (anticipated succession – of surviving son or daughter);
  - ✓ Formal inheritance of lot shares among children through will or succession agreements and dispositions;

- There is high insecurity and vulnerability about future rights over future occupancy and rights increase among stakeholders as parents age and especially after the death of one of them;
- There is an emerging interest in practices of willing property and/or of process of *sucesión* in order to clarify rights and prospective ownership;

**3c) Notwithstanding national and local policy programs of lot title “regularization” that have achieved over 95% title coverage within (formerly) irregular settlements in many countries, there is a reversal to informality and “clouded” property titles over time:**

- As original title holders die intestate and surviving spouse sees little need to formally change title holding to her/his name
- There are few incentives to change title due to:
  - ✓ Low ability to realize market (exchange) values by selling and moving out
  - ✓ Insecurity of old parent that allocation of lot to kids will leave them potentially unprotected and vulnerable;
  - ✓ Unwillingness to broach inheritance for fear it will create internal conflict among kids;
  - ✓ The legal fees and costs of transfer may be high (whether in terms of time or actual monetary costs)

**4) Land Use Change and Housing Market Performance**

**4a) Old consolidated self-settlements show relatively little land use changes over time from residential to non-residential uses**

- Any large scale changes in land use will be public sector induced rather than private sector
- Where they exist, transportation and warehousing are the most likely non-residential land uses
- On-lot mixed land uses will be common combining residential and self-employment activities

**4b) “Gentrification” (buy outs by better off households) is generally low:**

- But certain settlements are much more attractive than others
- Commercial conversion is the most common form of “gentrification” and occurs primarily on lot sites in primary access points (thoroughfares, etc.)
- Better off households who do buy out a former owner and retrofit or rebuild are second generation households with formal employment and socio-economic mobility and who retain close ties (childhood) to the settlement

**4c) Rental accommodation is common but the nature of renting varies between countries**

- In Mexico it is by lot conversion to rental as well as landlord-tenant;
- In Bogotá on lot landlord-tenant relationships are common.
- In all locations, renters are rarely close-kin

**4d) The inability to sell inherited property and/or to agree cede absentee rights of a share to another sibling is leading to a rise in renting:**

- As siblings inherit property that they do not use and cannot sell, they rent the room(s) out to liquidize some of the earnings from the “asset”;
- This leads to animosity and conflict with resident sibling families who resent the sub-letting to outsiders while their own children are bedroom space “deprived”;



- Or to the emergence of sub-letting between siblings in order to divide sleeping space.

## **5) Physical Upgrading and on Lot Rehabilitation Needs**

**5a) A significant proportion of multiple household lots will have urgent needs for dwelling redesign and retrofitting of services, with priority attention focused upon:**

- Privacy and private access
- Additional sleeping space for young children & grandchildren
- Physical repairs

**5b The norm, however, is for low income original and long term owners and their extended families to struggle in their capacity to make major on-lot housing refurbishment changes, due to:**

- Their relative poverty;
- Their low formal stakeholder (among children) status as “owners”;
- Lack of public sector credit and technical support targeting these arrangements;
- Their high on-lot numbers which make in situ rehabilitation problematic and difficult;

**5c) Paradoxically it is the modest number of middle income homeowners that are most likely and best capable of achieving significant on-lot refurbishment and rehabilitation.**

**This is because they are:**

- More recent arrivals (last 10 years) – “gentrifiers” who can “gut” the lot and modify or rebuild from scratch;
- Better off (“made-good”) original owners or one of the children who have secure and well paid jobs that allow them to consolidate in situ or nearby;
- Have access to formal financing and credit.

## **6) On the Needs and Perspectives for Renewed Public Policy Formulation and Intervention:**

**6a) There is low sensitivity among policy makers towards the prioritization of housing policy development needs for consolidated low-income settlements due to:**

- Lack of research and lack of awareness of the second and third generation housing needs already embedded in such areas
- Complacency that the problems have been successfully resolved by former rounds of title regularization;
- Un-serviced irregular settlement at the periphery remains the priority
- Focus is upon community maintenance, not large scale retrofitting
- Not yet on multilateral agencies radar screens, so little external pressure

**6b) Conversely, local government and NGO policy makers and actors have high sensitivity to social problems and to the need for poverty alleviation programs for vulnerable populations in such areas, principally:**

- Abuse: Drug, alcohol, domestic violence, etc.
- Gang and anti-social behavior
- Elderly and street children welfare campaigns

## The Methodology in Detail

The proposed research is both multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary, and will be conducted by a number of independent (but coordinated) groups that form part of a research network anchored at the University of Texas at Austin and directed by the PI. Initiated at a meeting of several of the interested principals in Austin in August 2006, the network has been extended to include the following participants and their respective research clusters:

- Buenos Aires (Argentina), Dr. Mercedes di Virgilio (Universidad de Buenos Aires)
- Bogotá (Colombia), Dra. Angélica Carmargo (Universidad Piloto de Colombia)
- Guatemala City, Dr. Bryan Roberts (UT-Austin)
- Lima (Peru), Arq. Martha Lazarte (*Alternativa* NGO)
- Mexico City (Mexico), Dr. Peter Ward (UT-Austin), Dr Ann Varley (UC London)
- Guadalajara (Mex) Dr. Edith Jiménez (Univ. de Guadalajara)
- Monterrey (Mex) Dr. Peter Ward and graduate students (UT Austin)
- Recife (Brazil) Dr. Flavio de Souza (Univ. of Algoas), to be confirmed)
- Santiago (Chile). Dr. Fco. Sabatini & Dra. Carolina Flores (Catholic Univ.)
- Montevideo (Uruguay) Dra. María José Alvarez (to be confirmed) Catholic Univ.)

### **Opportunities for Institutional Development and Further Funding Support, Teaching and Graduate Training.**

Working within local interdisciplinary groups of anthropologists, sociologists, geographers, architects, engineers, and housing policy specialists, the research aims to gather and analyze data that will provide for a new generation of normative approaches to be developed for in-situ upgrading and refurbishment. By taking the lead in fomenting this multi-site research program and design, the University of Texas is actively promoting the strengthening of research group clusters and their capacity to undertake collaborative research and to secure significant regional funding for their own institutional and personal career development. The current proposal (in a somewhat less detailed form) has been given to the aforementioned collaborators and translated into Spanish with the goal that they will be able to access major research resources. This has already been achieved in Mexico (Guadalajara) through a US\$135,000 grant from CONACYT, and in September-October 2008 two months similar proposals will be submitted to CONICET (Argentina) and FONDICET (Chile). Other foundations will also be approached elsewhere. And while not all will be successful, it is hoped that, if approved, the proposed NSF funding will provide some support for local surveys and, more importantly, will retain the continued engagement of research clusters within the network.

In addition, graduate training forms an integral part of the research program. In most cities project teams comprise (or will comprise) one or more senior researchers (the principal[s]), working with their masters and doctoral graduate students. At UT, for example, several graduate students are already completing theses on topics closely related to the research, and, if funded, the project will support two full time GRAs for a two-and-a-half year period. In 2008-09 a two semester Policy Research Project (PRP) led by the PI at the LBJ School will provide training for 20 graduate students who will be working on comparative policy research on the “Innerburbs” comparing Austin, San Antonio, and Monterrey. Half of the students will be working and gathering data in Monterrey as part of the research project. Separate funding (\$25,000) has been obtained from the University for this PRP. A similar PRP class is proposed in the budget for 2009-10 and will focus upon policy implications arising from the emerging research findings, with a capstone conference in Austin in April 2010.

Several levels and phases of methodological analysis have been agreed by the principals. This includes a Combined Pilot and Household Mobility Survey that was undertaken in 2007-08 (see 6 below).

**1) Contextual Analysis of Study Cities** (Phase 1 and Ongoing). All of the principal personnel involved have worked extensively in low-income settlements and knowing their home contexts intimately. Therefore, our initial task in the formative meeting in late 2006 was to define the parameters for the national and city contextual level analysis. Specifically we have gathered data intensively for the “ring” or “arc” of established self-help settlements dating to the 1970s or 1980s in each city, plotting data such as housing and population density; incomes; household size; average age of household heads; levels of poverty; dwelling characteristics, etc. From 1990 onwards in most cities census data allow us to generate detailed spatial databases at block or settlement level using census and GIS spatially related software. Thus we are developing a common framework and database in order to identify equivalent areas of our case study cities.

Of course, not all cities show a single or clearly defined intermediate ring area, and even those that do often have a number of sub-areas that contain the agreed defining characteristics but more peripheral locations. For example, Buenos Aires for historical and socio-economic class structure reasons has virtually no working class self-help neighborhoods in the first ring (*cordon*), but they are to be found in the third *cordon* of the current periphery. Conversely, it does have a number of *Villas* (consolidating settlements) in the inner-city and on the inner edge of the *primer cordon*.

This contextual analysis is designed to provide a detailed socio-spatial diagnostic of the characteristics of informal settlement dating to this period of development (1960s-70s). This will enable each group to identify possible neighborhoods for further analysis, as well as obviate the need to gather socioeconomic information about the neighborhoods in our own surveys. Rather than repeat the collection of data that already exist, the objective of Phase 2 surveys (below) will be to explore household and dwelling characteristics that are not available through other sources. In most countries/cities these baseline data have been prepared. For example, in all three cities of Mexico this phase is complete or almost complete.

**2) Settlement Selection and Initial Survey** (Phase 2) Next, it is anticipated that between two and four settlements will be selected for survey. At the 2006 meeting the originally agreed criteria for selection were age/period of development; that the dwelling environment be fairly typical locally of successful and substantial consolidation; that the modal lot size be around 200m<sup>2</sup>. As mentioned above, unambiguous location in the intermediate ring is no longer a requirement. Nor is the similar lot size, since it is apparent that this varies both between cities and within cities; and in some cities such as Buenos Aires the *loteos* are 200-300m<sup>2</sup>, while the *Villas* are very much smaller. Thus instead of seeking to control lot size as a basis for comparing dwelling and household evolution as we originally intended, we have resolved to examine these challenges **as they exist typically** in that particular city. While exact comparability will be lost, we will be able to speak to the commonly experienced processes of lot and dwelling evolution and the policy challenges that arise in each city. Our sample universe has not changed, although some of the common criteria have been relaxed. This may actually enhance hypothesis testing by allowing for greater variability among dependent and independent variables (lot size, location, number of households, etc.).

Following fieldwork (windshield/walkabout surveys) of a number of possible sites in each city, between two and four settlements deemed “typical” are selected. (This has been completed in

Mexico [all 3 cities] and Guatemala; Bogotá, Buenos Aires and Santiago are being finalized, while selection is pending elsewhere.)

Depending upon settlement size, sample blocks will be randomly selected to provide a lot or household listing from which a household survey will be drawn. It is anticipated that each settlement will comprise 80-100 interviews. This relatively small number is justified insofar as the aim is not to generate an extensive database about housing (this will come from city wide GIS and census analysis), but is more of an “oversample” of these populations in order to elicit specific information not generally available. The questionnaire survey has been designed and discussed by several of the principals, and is being tested in Guadalajara, where it will be applied in the early Fall, and in Monterrey in January 2009. In the first instance, the survey will target owner households only and gathers information on: lot acquisition; household structures; dwelling units on the lot and relationships to the owner/head; lot titles and whether current; inheritance/succession plans (if any); dwelling characteristics and use of space, etc. These data will be crucial in their own right and will allow us to interrogate many of the hypotheses outlined above. A subsequent (or parallel) and purpose-designed survey will be applied to renter populations in each settlement, although the strategy of selection will vary according to the nature of renting in each city.

**3) Intensive Mixed Method Analysis of “Interesting” Case Studies** (Phase 3). The aforementioned survey will also provide the step-off point for multiple and intensive qualitative analysis of a small number of what will be determined as “interesting” case studies. Given the resources and time to be spent on each “case” (see below), and the need for these analyses to be conducted under the direct supervision of an experienced and senior member of the research team, it is anticipated that maybe a total of 12-20 (maximum) case profiles would be conducted. Case selection has yet to be decided, but in principle the idea is that each case should offer significant “insights” into a particular aspect of the research questions. For example, this might include cases where the earlier survey had indicated a complicated and somewhat conflictive inheritance issue; another where it was formally resolved and without conflict; another where the original owner had made clear informal instructions and this was being adhered to, or not. Other interesting cases would be where there were particular dwelling renovation issues, etc. Thus the aim is not to be able to generalize, but to better understand the dynamics, challenges, and most effective responses.

Anthropologists such as Oscar Lewis (see his 1966 methodological introduction to *La Vida*) have used multiple techniques to great effect, and while researchers will not be embedded to anything like the same extent, we believe that using a number of different techniques in combination will be necessary to gather information about individual perceptions and aspirations; about intra-household conflict and dynamics; household exit and entry experiences; lot titling and sharing of dwelling costs; stakeholder interests in ownership, etc. The techniques will include: participant observation; “crisis” snap-shots; one-on-one interviews (on site and off site); focus group discussions; detailed architectonic lot and dwelling chronologies and reconstructions using sketch-map and architectural software to elaborate lot and dwelling plans (as for Figure 1a). At our 2006 meeting we began to explore how to collect these life and dwelling histories. Because of their complexity we resolved to focus primarily upon two cross sections in all cases: a) the current arrangement; b) the early period of establishment and initial self help. It was felt that a complete reconstruction in all cases of a full dwelling chronology was probably unrealistic. These detailed sketch-maps will be tied to building material used, state of (dis)repair, along with perceptions from the various stakeholders on the lot and their respective inputs and investments (they are usually kinsmen). Remittances and home improvement are also likely to be an increasingly important element here.

These cases will require multiple visits often by two or three personnel, and probably totaling 10-12 hours in each case. It is anticipated that it will be necessary to offer some compensation for people's time, probably in form of some cash voucher to each person interviewed (see budget). While the data and portfolio structure of each case will be prepared to a common format, the latter has yet to be thought through, and will be discussed further at the workshop in April 2009.

**4) Unstructured, Semi-structured interviews and Contextual Research with NGOs and with Local and National Officials.** (During Phase 2 & 3) The "bottom-up--top down" research strategy is one that we adopted in our original housing research some thirty years ago (Gilbert and Ward 1985, Appendix). It allows for triangulation between techniques and more importantly between levels, testing the evidence of what we know to be local reality with the rationale underpinning the policy making environment and actors. This phase of the research will run in parallel with the household surveys, and key-informant interviewing interviews will be conducted by the principal researchers in each city, usually accompanied by a junior team member. The purpose of these interviews will be to gain insight about the viewpoints, positions and actions of supra-neighborhood actors. Where ever possible these interviews will explore both generic and general perceptions of the issues facing these consolidated neighborhoods, as well as questions relating to the particular settlements with which we are most familiar. Different policy and program experiences will be documented. As well as in the Gilbert and Ward study (1985) these interview techniques have been used extensively by the PI throughout his research on governance and politics over the past 20 years and are amply reported in his various publications.

Using standard content and contextual analysis techniques we will also analyze local newspapers, policy and agency reports. Where possible we will collect independent data on victimization surveys; morbidity and mortality data; gang activity, etc. This will be for the city as a whole; for the "intermediate ring", and, most specifically, for the neighborhoods in question.

**5) 2007-08 Pilot and Household Mobility Survey** (Phase 1. Already completed). One or two of us worked in specific settlements some thirty years or so years ago and have data sets with original owners interviewed when these settlements were either incipient or more usually in the early consolidation phase. Thus in 2007 in Mexico City and Bogotá, and in 2008 in Guatemala City, having first "harvested" information about owner households from our original data sets and questionnaires, we sought to identify those same lots and dwellings today, and to interview the present owner households. This kind of restudy is relatively rare in the social sciences, especially over a thirty year period. It allowed us to gather accurate information about the level of turnover and cross generational mobility, land use changes, household structures, etc. and to provide an initial base line about the relevance of our hypotheses and the appropriateness of our research direction and strategy. It also allowed us to pre-test some of the survey instruments and sample framework techniques that we would be applying in the later stages.

The findings confirmed many of our initial hypotheses: there has been minimal land use change and more than 80 percent of the original families remain on the lot, (even though the original owner may have died). Lot densities have increased significantly, as has the average number of households per lot. In Mexico sharing a lot is almost exclusively with close kin (adult children); while in Bogotá they are kin as well as renter households. Self estimates and tax office assessments show that the value of lots today is considerable, with median values approaching US \$90,000 and \$25,000 in Mexico City and Bogotá respectively. Residential mobility is highly constrained partly because second and third generation households have high incentives to

remain on lots with their parents, and because of the limited alternative options (Ward 2008a, 2008b).

The pilot study also alerted us to a number of additional lines of enquiry that we had not seen previously: such as the reemergence of “clouded” land titles and the need for new thinking about shared titling systems; the conflicts around inheritance and succession; formal and informal inheritance processes; the complexity of residential trajectories and housing options for second and third generation households; the importance of petty landlord-tenant relations embedded within kin-related sharing arrangements. It also allowed us to develop IRB umbrella approval for the project.

Finally, as with most pilot studies, it allowed us to better “frame” questions and manner of presentation that has made for a much improved draft survey instrument that will still go through several further iterations.

### **Dissemination of Findings, Data Storage and Public Access**

**Dissemination.** While the study will offer generic policies capable of wider (international) application, the regionally embedded approach whereby project teams are gathering data and working with local public officials and NGOs, will also facilitate the adaptation and application of policies to the specific local reality and policy making environment. Dissemination of the findings will be undertaken through those locally embedded networks, as well as through journal publications, international seminars, and ultimately through a series of books and monographs. The advantage of having project teams from several countries will enhance publication and dissemination in Spanish and Portuguese, as well as English. Also, past experience suggests that as the results come on line so interest and active (financial) involvement will be elicited from national and multinational agencies. Among the latter are the WHO, the World Bank, the UNDP, and the UN Center for Human Settlements – many of which are familiar with our previous research, and for whom we have sometimes worked as consultants. But the science needs to be tackled first, and that is what is being proposed here through the joint endeavors of those engaged in this research network.

The research will add significantly to the teaching and training benefits of participants. For many the experience of undertaking collaborative cross culture research will be new, as will the sharing of information about using mixed methods -- quantitative and qualitative. Greater awareness about the socio-economic and physical dynamics of these settlements will directly inform scholarly analysis and public policy. It is hoped that the formulation of new housing policy approaches will shape a new generation of “conventional wisdoms” about housing rehab in developing countries at an international level, as well as promote the adoption of new policies in the very localities in which the knowledge was produced.

**Data Storage and Sharing.** Ultimately, a collaborative enterprise of this nature requires full sharing of collected materials and clear protocols of dissemination. As overall project coordinator it will be my primary responsibility to host and manage access to the jointly constructed database. Data collection will be to a commonly agreed structure, and while questionnaires will be adapted to local conditions and to particular research extensions of personnel involved, 80 percent of data collected will be derived from identically coded survey questions. Electronic datasets will be mounted on a listserve at UT-Austin to which all participating personnel will have open access. Prior to mounting on the listserve, all individual personal identification material will have been removed, with the master dataset and key remaining under the local control of individual project leaders.

Regarding the qualitative materials, the intensive case studies will be prepared to an agreed protocol, and will be formatted to a common format allowing for direct comparability. Again, individual identifiers will remain with the local project leader. Interview materials and contextual analysis documentation will be summarized into “Base Documents” (annotated directories) written to a common structure. The PI has extensive experience in using this method (in student based PRP research) and which offers an excellent intermediate stage in collating comparative research materials (See Gilbert and Ward, 1985: Appendix). These materials will also be mounted on the listserv. The listserv will be directly controlled and maintained by the PI (through one of the GRAs).

Publication and dissemination of generic and comparative findings will require agreement of the Coordinating PI (Ward) and will be by consensus with local project directors. The latter will be free to publish locally collected materials (which remain their property), but consultation with the PI and appropriate acknowledgement will be expected. Ultimately the electronic datasets and materials will be publicly available on open access from the UT-Austin site.

The project will be coordinated by the PI at the University of Texas at Austin who will continue to make annual visits to the project sites and will be in regular contact with project leaders by video-conference. Bimonthly (virtual) meetings between teams to review progress are planned using video conferencing facilities at each location (and/or Skype). Of key importance at different stages will be the four regional three-day workshop meetings proposed in the budget that are designed to discuss and agree methods; share fieldwork experiences, improve instruments, and assist with training; and to discuss results and policy implications. The Workshop Meetings are designed to allow for that (with some teams reporting on findings, while others will report on how they propose to amend instruments in light of those experiences and local conditions, etc.). However, it is proposed that all groups will be able to embark upon either Phase 2 or Phase 3 fieldwork (see above) starting in June 2009, with a second Workshop (in Buenos Aires, in October) to discuss preliminary findings; and will continue with fieldwork through the Fall 09 and through 2010. Two further Workshop Meetings are planned in April 2010, (in Guadalajara, Interim Findings Discussion); and a Final Workshop (Lima) in December 2010 at which the principal policy recommendations would be drawn up for circulation and dissemination. Funding continues for eight months into 2011, during which time the database would be prepared for public access, and final book MS(s) and paper drafts would be completed and circulated.

Our experience to date is that teams do not proceed at the same pace. This is to be expected, but it does allow for feedback and support to those moving ahead more slowly. The disadvantage is that not everyone is “ready” to discuss findings and policy at the same time, but even here local knowledge and the experience of the personnel involved do appear to allow full participation in discussion of interim findings and in policy discussions.

## References Cited

- De Soto, Hernando. 2000. *The mystery of capital: why capitalism triumphs in the West and fails everywhere else*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gilbert, Alan 1999. "A home is forever? Residential Mobility and Homeownership in Self Help Settlements". *Environment and Planning*. 31, 1073-91
- Gilbert, and ward, Peter. 1985. *Housing, The State and the Poor: Policy and Practice in Three Latin American Cities*, Cambridge University Press.
- González de la Rocha, Mercedes. 2001. "From the Resources of Poverty to the Poverty of Resources? The Erosion of a Survival Model," *Latin American Perspectives* 28 (4): 72-100.
- Jones, Gareth, and Ward, Peter. 1994. Co-Editors. *Methodology for Land and Housing Market Analysis*. London: University College Press, 286 pp.
- LARR. (Latin American Research Review) 2004. (González de la Rocha, M., Jelin, E., Perlman, J., Roberts, B., Safa, H., and Ward, P.) "From the Marginality of the 1960s to the 'New Poverty' of Today." *Latin American Research Review*, 39, 1, -183-203.
- Lewis, Oscar. 1966. *La Vida*. New York: Random House.
- Lloyd, Peter. 1979. *Slums of Hope? Shanty Towns of the Third World*. St Martin's Press.
- Katz, Bruce et al. 2005. *Redefining Urban and Suburban America*. Brookings Institution.
- Perlman, Janice E. 1976. *The myth of marginality: urban poverty and politics in Rio de Janeiro*. Berkeley : University of California Press
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004. "Marginality: From Myth to Reality in the *favelas* of Rio de Janeiro, 1969-2002. In Annanya Roy and Nezar AlSayyad (eds.), *Urban Informality: Transnational Perspectives from the Middle East, Latin America and South Asia*. Lexington/Center for Middle Eastern Studies, UC Berkeley. (pp. 243-70)
- Portes, Alejandro. 1972. "Rationality in the slums: an essay in interpretive sociology." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 14 (3).
- Portes, Alejandro and Kelly Hoffman. 2003. "Latin American Class Structures: Their Composition and Change during the Neoliberal Era." *Latin American Research Review* 38 (1):41-82.
- Puentes, R. and Warren, D. 2006. "One Fifth of America: A Comprehensive Guide to America's First Suburbs". Washington: Brookings Institution.
- Roberts, Bryan. 1973. *Organizing Strangers: Poor families in Guatemala City*. Austin: University of Texas Press.



- Turner, J. F. C 196b. "The squatter settlement: architecture that works." *Architectural Design*, 38, 355-60.
- Varley, Ann and Blasco Maribel. 2003. "Older women's living arrangements and family relationships in urban Mexico." *Women's Studies International Forum*, 26, 6, 525-39
- Ward, Peter M. 1976. "The squatter settlements as slum or housing solutions: evidence from Mexico City." *Land Economics* 2 (3): 330-46.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. "The Lack of 'Cursive Thinking' with Social theory and Public Policy: Four Decades of Marginality and Rationality in the so-called 'Slum'". In Roberts, Bryan and Wood, Charles, *Rethinking Development in Latin America*, (pp. 271-96). Pennsylvania State University Press
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008a. Hacia una segunda etapa de la regularización de los títulos de propiedad en México. (O, visto de otra manera) "¿Ay mamá, por qué moriste sin dejar un testamento? ¡Ya hay que hacer la regularización de nuevo!" In Alfonso Iracheta (ed). *Segundo Congreso Sobre Suelo Urbano y Regularización*, El Colegio Mexiquense, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008b. "A Patrimony for the Children": Low income homeownership and housing (im)mobility in Latin American cities. Journal article: under review.
- Wilson, William Julius. 1999. *The Bridge Over the Racial Divide: Rising Inequality and Coalition Politics*. Berkeley. University of California Press.