

# PUBLIC INTERVENTION IN INFORMAL SETTLEMENTS. NEW SCENARIOS, NEW CHALLENGES<sup>1</sup>

INTERVENCIÓN PÚBLICA EN ASENTAMIENTOS INFORMALES. NUEVOS ESCENARIOS,  
NUEVOS DESAFÍOS

MARCO ROJAS-TREJO <sup>2</sup>  
GUILLERMO VILLAGRÁN-CAAMAÑO <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research Directorate of the Catholic University of the Most Holy Concepcion

<sup>2</sup> Doctor en Sociología  
Profesor Adjunto, Facultad de Derecho y Ciencias Sociales  
Universidad San Sebastián, Concepción, Chile.  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4198-753X>  
[marojastrejo@gmail.com](mailto:marojastrejo@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup> Doctor © en Ciencias Sociales  
Académico, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales  
Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción, Concepción, Chile.  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4646-3732>  
[guillermovillagran@ucsc.cl](mailto:guillermovillagran@ucsc.cl)

Los asentamientos urbanos informales son parte del paisaje urbano en latinoamérica. Para abordar este problema de política pública, los estados han implementado diversas estrategias que han transitado entre la radicación y erradicación habitacional, asumiendo que la primera presenta ventajas significativas respecto de la segunda. El caso chileno no escapa de aquello. Para someter a discusión estas ideas, se analizan dos proyectos habitacionales ejecutados por el Ministerio de Vivienda y Urbanismo en la provincia de Concepción, Chile. La discusión se plantea a partir de los resultados de un estudio cuantitativo, con diseño probabilístico y muestreo aleatorio simple, con una muestra de 1.130 familias. Los resultados indican que, con independencia de la estrategia de operación de los proyectos, las familias presentan alto grado de satisfacción con la vivienda, al mismo tiempo que expresan una evaluación negativa de los vecinos y una percepción de heterogeneidad que deviene en distanciamiento social frente a relaciones sociales dentro del espacio barrial. Los resultados abren nuevas interrogantes respecto de la integración social en conjuntos de vivienda social.

**Palabras clave:** asentamientos precarios, gestión urbana, erradicación de asentamientos.

Informal urban settlements are part of the urban landscape in Latin America. To address this public policy problem, states have implemented diverse strategies that have transitioned between housing settlement and eradication, assuming that the former has significant advantages over the latter. The Chilean case is no different. To discuss these ideas, two Ministry of Housing and Urban Planning projects in the province of Concepción, Chile, are analyzed. The discussion is based on the results of a quantitative study, with a probabilistic design and simple random sampling, with a sample of 1,130 families. The results indicate that, regardless of the project's operation strategy, families are highly satisfied with their homes. However, they express a negative evaluation of neighbors and a perception of heterogeneity, resulting in social distancing regarding social relations within the neighborhood space. The results open new questions regarding social integration in social housing complexes.

**Keywords:** precarious settlements, urban management, settlement eradication.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Informal urban settlements represent a widespread phenomenon in Latin America (Fernandes, 2011). Although different expressions of urban informality can be traced back to colonial times (Abramo, 2012), irregular land occupation for housing only became a widespread phenomenon and public policy problem in the region during the first decades of the twentieth century. As a result, Latin American states have implemented diverse intervention strategies, mainly aimed at solving the problem of land ownership, the provision of essential services, and their socio-spatial integration (Clichevsky, 2007, 2009; Fernandes, 2003, 2008). In the Chilean case, the first actions appear in the mid-twentieth century. From that moment until today, the actions have been channeled through ad hoc programs that, in a substantive sense, alternate between housing resettlement and eradication.

For decades, the idea has prevailed that housing resettlement has significant advantages over eradication, conserving networks, community support, social capital, and the community identity (Elorza, 2019; Matus et al., 2019, 2020; MINVU & PUC, 2018; Sabatini & Vergara, 2018; Tironi, 2003). However, if we consider the changes in social housing complexes in contemporary Chile (Ibarra, 2020; Márquez, 2003; Márquez & Pérez, 2008; Salcedo et al., 2017; Salcedo & Rasse, 2012; Salcedo, 2010); it is worth asking, at the beginning of the third millennium, whether housing resettlement projects still have comparative advantages regarding strengthening social integration processes in social housing complexes over those using eradication.

In this sense, the study's objectives seek to know how the beneficiary families of two housing projects evaluate them vis-a-vis social relations and social integration in the new neighborhood. The working hypothesis points to whether resettlement projects positively impact the dynamics of social integration compared to eradication ones.

This work, therefore, looks to submit these ideas for discussion by analyzing the evaluation made by some of the beneficiaries of two projects implemented by the Ministry of Housing and Urbanism (MINVU) in the province of Concepción, Chile. The projects under study sought to solve the housing problems of 4,140 families living in informal settlements using opposing strategies: resettlement and housing eradication. The discussion is based on the results of a quantitative study, with probabilistic design and simple random sampling, carried out through a household survey of 1,130 families.

The results indicate that, regardless of the project's strategy, families are highly satisfied with their housing. However, they express a negative evaluation of neighbors and a perception of heterogeneity, leading to social distancing within the neighborhood space. The results open new questions regarding social integration in social housing complexes.

The article addresses some conceptual aspects of informal urban settlements and regularization strategies used in Chile and Latin America before presenting the study's methodology, main results, discussion, and conclusions.

## II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

### Theoretical background information

Irregular land occupation for housing is a historically constant phenomenon in Latin America (Abramo, 2012; Fernandes, 2011). Informal urban settlements only became widespread in the region during the first decades of the twentieth century, turning them into a relevant public policy problem.

The origin and growth of these settlements are linked to typical processes in the region. In a context marked by inequality and poverty, the processes of urbanization, internal migration, and demographic growth seen at the beginning of the twentieth century exceeded the available housing and the capacity of the State to respond to the growing demand (Clichevsky, 2009; Di Virgilio, 2015; Fernandes, 2011). During this period, the housing needs of new urban dwellers begin to be solved through self-managed strategies located outside the formal market and legality. In this way, the new urban lower classes began to occupy, without authorization, land on the urban periphery to build their homes.

The informal settlement phenomenon is associated with interrelated factors (ONU-Habitat, 2015). However, this work has coincided with Fernandes (2003, p. 6) in that, in the substantive sense, the problems of access to housing and the emergence of informal settlements would be the result of "an exclusionary pattern of urban development, planning, and management, whereby land markets, political systems, and legal systems do not offer suitable and reasonable conditions of access to land and housing for the lower classes."

Informal settlements, which have different names, are part of the region's urban landscape. Beyond local particularities, they are understood as areas or neighborhoods where inhabitants do not have the

security of land tenure, do not have essential services and infrastructure, housing does not comply with urban planning regulations, and, in addition, are usually located in geographically and/or environmentally dangerous areas (UN-Habitat, 2015). Therefore, the informal condition is determined by the transgression of legal regulations that define the right to property and/or by non-compliance with urban planning regulations (Clichevsky, 2007, 2009; Di Virgilio et al., 2014). However, stating its inhabitants on the margins of society or assuming the existence of an “informal city” is problematic. On the contrary, what happens are interrelationships and couplings between formal and informal sectors (Di Virgilio et al., 2014) and dialectical relations between formality and informality (Fernandes, 2008). Informal settlements do not arise outside the law and institutionality but are somewhat related. Informal settlements and their residents are a constituent part of the city and of the social, economic, and cultural processes that sustain the reproduction of Latin American societies.

### Informal settlements and regularization programs

Both policies and programs for the regularization of informal settlements have a long history in the region. The strategies implemented have varied and evolved (Fernandes, 2008), but generally, these interventions have been organized around three fundamental objectives. First, solving the problem of land ownership; second, access to essential services; and third, socio-spatial integration (Fernandes, 2003, 2008). Over recent decades, more complex objectives have been added, such as reducing poverty and socio-urban exclusion (Clichevsky, 2009; Fernandes, 2008).

All these interventions have a “corrective” nature (Clichevsky, 2007; Fernandes, 2003). In this sense, an essential condition for any regularization program is recognizing what exists and, depending on that, establishing the action plans that solve the urbanistic/ ownership shortcomings (Clichevsky, 2007, 2009). Likewise, the rights acquired by residents over time should not be lost sight of, as well as the subjective aspects involved in the intervention (Fernandes, 2008, 2011). Therefore, regularization programs must respond, at a general level, to the legal regulations and, at a specific level, to the particular characteristics of each settlement (Fernandes, 2011). Such requirements complicate any intervention process (Clichevsky, 2007).

The programs generally respond to three typologies: those that seek to regularize property, those that aim at

urban-environmental improvement, and comprehensive programs (Clichevsky, 2007, 2009; Fernandes, 2003, 2011). In the first, the intervention is limited to regularizing the property according to legal provisions and urban regulations. On the other hand, urban-environmental improvement programs have a range of possible interventions, such as access to essential services, community equipment, and, in some cases, housing improvement and/or construction. Finally, the comprehensive programs, besides solving ownership informality and urban-environmental shortcomings, include social accompaniment actions, training, and employment generation (Clichevsky, 2007, 2009).

### Chile and informal settlements

In Chile, irregular land occupation for housing can be traced back to the late nineteenth century (Hidalgo, 2019). However, it only became a recurring matter in the late 1930s. Until the mid-’30s, the housing needs of the poorer population were channeled through legal instruments such as renting, letting, and other similar measures (de Ramón, 1990). From the end of the ’30s until 1945, irregular land occupations appeared as a phenomenon characterized by individual actions and a lack of organization (de Ramón, 1990; Espinoza, 1998). In practice, low-income families and rural migrants settled on land alongside urban centers, gradually forming informal settlements.

Between 1945 and 1973, irregular occupation increased significantly. This stage involved previously organized collective action that surprisingly occupied urban land (Angelcos & Pérez, 2017; de Ramón, 1990; Espinoza, 1998). In this period, irregular land occupation and the settlers’ movement were characterized by substantial organization and the progressive incorporation of political parties (Ibid). In this way, the residents’ movement and the struggle for housing leave their claims behind to assume a robust political significance (Abufhele, 2019; Espinoza, 1998).

With the 1973 coup d’état, the movement of settlers and irregular land occupation were violently interrupted. However, repressive state action did not eliminate the problem. The search for alternative housing solutions significantly increased “clustering”<sup>4</sup> (Angelcos & Pérez, 2017).

After the return to democracy (1990) and until the first few years of this century, land occupation was more sporadic. However, informal settlements and their

<sup>4</sup> Clustering refers to people or families living in houses of third parties, either within them or the lot, but who maintain an independent budget.

families have grown over the past decade. According to the National List of Camps conducted by the MINVU (2011), 657 camps were identified nationwide, with 27,378 families. By 2018-2019, there were 802 informal settlements, with 47,050 families. The National List of Camps 2020-2021 of Fundación TECHO-Chile (2021) identified 969 settlements with 81,643 families. The last period, 2018 to 2021, saw an increase of 20.32% in the number of settlements and 73.52% in the number of resident families.

### Informal settlements and public policy

Historically, Chilean housing policy has been characterized by a "provisionist" strategy, which sought to solve the housing deficit through a sustained increase in housing production (Hidalgo et al., 2016). However, the strategy failed to effectively address informal settlements, as poverty levels and the complexities of life in an informal settlement constituted a barrier to the conditions established by the public offer. As a result, in the middle of the twentieth century, the first State-led actions to address informal settlements emerged through ad hoc programs that, in the substantive sense, alternated between housing resettlement and eradication.

Eradication outside the city's walls was inaugurated during the government of Gonzales Videla (1946-52) (de Ramón, 1990). The formula consisted of transferring irregular occupants to sites allocated and urbanized by the state on the urban periphery to build new housing.

A different strategy was "Operation Site" (*Operación Sitio*). In this case, the state regularized property, delivered urbanization works, and, in some cases, basic sanitary units for each family to self-build. In practice, Operation Site privileged access to land more than to housing. Between 1965 and 1970, about 71,000 solutions were delivered nationwide (Hidalgo, 2007, 2019).

During the military dictatorship (1973-1990), through the National Urban Development Policy in 1979, a massive eradication of informal settlements towards social housing complexes in the urban periphery was initiated. Between 1979 and 1984, 78,820 families were eradicated (Hidalgo, 2019).

After the return to democracy, to size up the problem of informal settlements, the Faculty of Architecture of the University of Chile made, in 1996, the "National List of Camps and Precarious Settlements" commissioned by the MINVU, identifying 972 settlements in the country, with

93,457 homes and 445,943 people. 53.1% of the national total was concentrated in three regions: Bío Bío with 298 settlements, Los Lagos with 114, and the Santiago Metropolitan Region with 113.

As a result, an intersectoral program aimed explicitly at informal settlements was created in 1997, called the Chile-Barrio Program (1997-2005), which the MINVU coordinated. This program emerged to address housing precariousness and strengthen the socio-labor insertion of families in the identified settlements. During its implementation, the program delivered 113,806 housing solutions: 61.7% through resettlement, 23.7% through eradication, and 14.5% through mixed solutions (Raczynski et al., 2007).

Subsequently, the informal settlements are again handled by the regular offer of the MINVU. However, given its limitations, the Camps Program was implemented in 2011 and operated through three strategies: settlement based on a housing project, settlement with an urbanization project and neighborhood consolidation, and relocation (Matus et al., 2019, 2020). Of the 655 settlements registered in 2011, 55.1% were closed between 2011-2018 (Matus et al., 2019, 2020); of these, 6.1% were for housing projects, 8.5% were urbanizations, and 40.5% were relocations.

### III. CASE STUDY

Between 1995 and 2005, the MINVU developed two housing projects in the Province of Concepción<sup>5</sup> to solve the housing problems of approximately 5,000 families living in different informal settlements. The "Urban Recovery Program of the North Bank of the Bío-Bío River" (hereinafter Ribera Norte) and the "San Pedro de la Costa Comprehensive Plan" (hereinafter San Pedro de la Costa) follow alternative strategies to address the housing problem. While Ribera Norte built a housing settlement project in the city's central areas, San Pedro de la Costa used eradication in the urban periphery. According to the type of intervention, both projects are defined as comprehensive programs since, along with housing provision, they considered social accompaniment, training, and labor activation actions (Clichevsky, 2007, 2009; Fernandes, 2003, 2011).

The Ribera Norte Program represents an urban recovery intervention of 140 hectares in front of the city center of Concepción, in whose intervention area there was

<sup>5</sup> The Province of Concepción is one of three provinces that make up the Bio Bio Region. It comprises twelve communes, with Concepción as the provincial capital.

Sample size Ratio 0.5 Maximum error 0.05. Confidence interval - 95%	RIBERA NORTE	SAN PEDRO DE LA COSTA	TOTAL
Total Families	1,426	2,714	4,140
Total Sample	310	820	1,130

**Table 1.** Population and Sample Size. Source: Preparation by the authors.

an old informal settlement with approximately 2,000 families. For this reason, the intervention proposal had to reconcile the urban development objectives and solve the resident community's housing problems, constituting the program's feasibility. Based on this, between 1998 and 2004, a 15-hectare neighborhood was constructed, including community facilities, a health center, and 1,426 housing units.

For its part, San Pedro de la Costa arises within the framework of the Chile-Barrio Program. In 1998, several informal settlements in the Province of Concepción had to be relocated totally or partially due to technical and regulatory constraints. Based on this, the MINVU launched the "San Pedro de la Costa Comprehensive Plan" in 2003 to solve the housing deficit of 3,222 families living in 70 informal settlements.

This plan consisted of two projects. The first one, located in the commune of Chiguayante, contemplated 500 houses. The second, San Pedro de la Costa, built between 2003 and 2006, built a new neighborhood of 73 hectares in the commune of San Pedro de la Paz with community facilities, educational services, health, public security, and 2,714 homes for families from 59 irregular settlements in the communes of Concepción, Talcahuano, and San Pedro de la Paz.

#### IV. METHODOLOGY

This quantitative study worked with primary sources through a non-experimental design. The population under study was represented by the dwellings attached to the housing projects of Ribera Norte (1,426) and San Pedro de la Costa (2,714). Work was done with a probabilistic design and simple random sampling. The sample size was defined with a ratio of 0.5, a maximum error of 0.05, and a confidence interval of 95%, yielding a total sample of 1,130 families (Table 1). A table of random numbers was used for the selection of the cases. The observation unit was the

household, represented by the heads of household or their spouses.

The information collection process was done through a home survey during the second semester of 2009. The survey comprised 160 questions, distributed in seven sections: identification of the family group, education, health, occupation, housing, and neighborhood evaluation, evaluation of the origin program, and pre/post housing evaluation.

The analysis considered an exploratory and descriptive statistical analysis to later move on to comparing relevant variables and dimensions between both projects. In the first stage, an exploratory and descriptive analysis differentiated by project was made, where the unit of analysis was housing. In the second stage, a comparative analysis was made between both projects based on relevant variables and dimensions. The SPSS software assisted with the statistical analysis.

#### V. RESULTS

Although the housing programs of Ribera Norte and San Pedro de la Costa shared similar objectives in solving the housing problem, they adopted different strategies. Ribera Norte focused on constructing a neighborhood that would allow former residents to stay close to the city center of Concepción. On the other hand, San Pedro de la Costa, conditioned by technical-regulatory aspects, opted for an eradication approach, moving the inhabitants to the urban periphery.

It is widely recognized that housing resettlement projects have significant advantages over those that use eradication in conserving networks and social capital, thus preserving the sense of community identity. In contrast, housing relocation projects usually have a negative impact on community identity and integration, as they represent a break in pre-existing relationships and social networks (Elorza, 2019; Matus et al., 2019, 2020; MINVU & PUC, 2018; Sabatini & Vergara, 2018; Tironi, 2003).

Items	Mean	Stand. Dev.	No. valid	Lost	Mean	Stand. Dev.	N° valid	Lost
Quality of housing	5,749	1,2828	309	0	6,059	1,0963	819	1
Size of the home	5,214	1,6902	309	0	5,654	1,3450	820	0
Number of rooms	4,947	1,8668	309	0	5,159	1,6064	820	0
Equipment of the neighborhood	5,359	1,7936	308	1	4,792	1,8919	817	3
Location of the neighborhood	6,063	1,4618	308	1	5,292	1,7486	819	1
My family is happy in this neighborhood	5,45	1,761	308	1	5,43	1,716	820	0
Neighbors of the neighborhood	5,178	1,9467	309	0	5,202	1,7422	818	2
Neighbors are united	4,13	2,084	309	0	4,31	1,970	816	4
There are good relations between neighbors	5,17	1,863	307	2	5,11	1,798	814	6
Most of the neighbors are willing to help when needed	4,84	1,915	306	3	4,63	1,958	812	8
You can trust the neighbors in the neighborhood	3,81	1,988	307	2	4,14	1,940	816	4
This neighborhood is safe	3,68	2,046	309	0	3,61	1,888	817	3
I feel safe walking around the neighborhood	4,63	2,024	308	1	4,17	1,957	820	0
I feel safe in my house	5,59	1,849	309	0	5,36	1,847	820	0
Living in this neighborhood makes me feel proud	4,91	2,051	309	1	4,90	1,873	820	0
This neighborhood has a good image	3,74	1,998	309	0	3,93	1,881	817	3
Access to public transport	5,968	1,5115	309	0	5,827	1,4226	820	0
Access to schools and health facilities	5,748	1,5742	308	1	5,659	1,4892	815	5

\* Likert Scale: 1 means very dissatisfied, and 7 very satisfied.

**Table 2.** Degree of satisfaction with the new neighborhood\*. Source: Preparation by the authors.

If you compare your life in this neighborhood with the neighborhood you lived in before, you would say that...	Has Worsened		Stayed the same		Improved		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
My family's quality of life	28	9.1	60	19.4	218	70.6	306	99.0
The pride of living in this neighborhood	50	16.2	115	37.2	141	45.6	306	99.0
The image of the neighborhood	73	23.6	93	30.1	139	45.0	305	98.7
The integration of the neighborhood into the city	42	13.6	107	34.6	157	50.8	306	99.0
The neighbors of the neighborhood are well-received everywhere	70	22.7	164	53.1	71	23.0	305	98.7
The security of the neighborhood	115	37.2	116	37.5	76	24.6	307	99.4
My family's involvement in community organizations	53	17.2	215	69.6	39	12.6	307	99.4
The trust between neighbors	81	26.2	150	48.5	75	24.3	306	99.0
Solidarity between neighbors	62	20.1	148	47.9	94	30.4	304	98.4
Relations between neighbors	69	22.3	149	48.2	86	27.8	304	98.4
The neighborhood participation	85	27.5	156	50.5	62	20.1	303	98.1
Access to health facilities	72	23.3	106	34.3	128	41.4	306	99.0
Access to educational establishments	40	12.9	144	46.6	116	37.5	300	97.1
The job opportunities	70	22.7	183	59.2	52	16.8	305	98.7

**Table 3.** Comparative Evaluation of Housing and Neighborhood Ribera Norte. Source: Preparation by the authors.

If you compare your life in this neighborhood with the neighborhood you lived in before, you would say that...	it has Worsened		Stayed the same		Improved		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
My family's quality of life	82	10.0	187	22.8	550	67.1	819	99.9
The pride of living in this neighborhood	175	21.3	296	36.1	346	42.2	817	99.6
The image of the neighborhood	296	36.1	280	34.1	243	29.6	819	99.0
The integration of the neighborhood into the city	229	27.9	356	43.4	232	28.3	817	99.6
The neighbors of the neighborhood are well-received everywhere	269	32.8	404	49.3	136	16.6	809	98.7
The security of the neighborhood	377	46.0	263	32.1	177	21.6	817	99.6
My family's involvement in community organizations	53	17.2	215	69.6	39	12.6	307	99.4
The trust between neighbors	232	28.3	363	44.3	221	27.0	816	99.5
Solidarity between neighbors	226	27.6	358	43.7	232	28.3	816	99.5
Relations between neighbors	212	25.9	381	46.5	222	27.1	815	99.4
The neighborhood participation	232	28.3	422	51.5	160	19.5	814	99.3
Access to health facilities	177	21.6	316	38.5	323	39.4	816	99.5
Access to educational establishments	146	17.8	330	40.2	333	40.6	809	98.7
The job opportunities	286	34.9	406	49.5	119	14.5	811	98.9

**Table 4.** Comparative Evaluation of Housing and Neighborhood San Pedro de la Costa. Source: Preparation by the authors.

Although the initial study hypotheses predicted different results, especially regarding social relations and community integration, the data analysis indicates another scenario. According to the findings, there is a generally positive perception regarding the housing in terms of quality, size, and aspects such as access to public transport and services in both projects. However, the evaluation of other elements related to the social fabric and the quality of life in the new neighborhood is not so positive. Aspects such as the evaluation of the neighbors, the security, and the neighborhood's image do not show favorable results. In particular, the low levels of trust toward the neighbors of the neighborhood in both projects are paradoxical (Table 2).

The results of the comparative evaluation between the old and the new neighborhoods, reflected in Table 3 and Table 4, indicate that the quality of life of the family group has improved significantly in both projects, which is a positive aspect. However, there are differences in the perception of other vital elements.

In Ribera Norte, the image and integration of the neighborhood in the city, as well as access to services, are evaluated positively. On the other hand, in San Pedro de la Costa, although access to services has improved considerably, the image of the neighborhood and its integration with the city have not experienced significant

changes. However, in both projects, there is a diminished perception of security within the neighborhood. This is a worrying aspect as it directly affects residents' well-being and quality of life.

The most paradoxical finding is the negative evaluation of relations with neighbors and social cohesion in both projects. A negative evaluation in San Pedro de la Costa was expected due to the effect associated with housing eradication. However, finding a similar negative evaluation in a housing project such as Ribera Norte is unexpected since it would be anticipated that housing close to the city center would favor community integration and social relations.

The fact that there has been a negative evaluation in terms of relations with neighbors in a resettlement project demonstrates a departure from the results as to what could be expected based on the nature of each project. This suggests that other factors influence how social relationships are formed in these new neighborhoods. This trend aligns with the horizontal integration indicators of the Guttman scale. According to Table 5 and Table 6, in both projects, social distancing increases to the extent that the bond implies greater closeness. In practice, there is resistance to establishing relationships with an "other", who is perceived as different.



Regarding your neighbors...	YES			NO			TOTAL		
	N	%	% valid	N	%	% valid	N	%	% valid
You know them, at least by sight.	289	93.5	93.8	19	6.1	6.2	308	99.7	100
You go to their house or invite them to yours	71	23.0	23.1	236	76.4	76.9	307	99.4	100
You share celebrations with them	68	22.0	22.1	240	77.7	77.9	308	99.7	100
They support each other when facing traumatic events	212	68.6	68.6	97	31.4	31.4	309	100	100
You are willing for your children to spend time with them	163	52.8	61.7	101	32.7	38.3	264	85.4	100
You would be willing for one of your children to marry one of your neighbors	101	32.7	39.5	155	50.2	60.5	256	82.8	100
You would be willing to marry one of your neighbors (single)	20	6.5	16.3	103	33.3	83.7	123	39.8	100

**Table 5.** Guttman Scale Ribera Norte. Source: Preparation by the authors.

Regarding your neighbors...	YES			NO			TOTAL		
	N	%	% valid	N	%	% valid	N	%	% valid
You know them, at least by sight.	779	95.0	95.1	40	4.9	4.9	819	99.9	100
You go to their house or invite them to yours	265	32.3	32.4	553	67.4	67.6	818	99.8	100
You share celebrations with them	204	24.9	24.9	614	74.9	75.1	818	99.8	100
They support each other when facing traumatic events	499	60.9	61.4	314	38.3	38.6	813	99.1	100
You are willing for your children to spend time with them	456	55.6	65.0	246	30.0	35.0	702	85.6	100
You would be willing for one of your children to marry one of your neighbors	249	30.4	36.7	430	52.4	63.3	679	82.0	100
You would be willing to marry one of your neighbors (single)	20	2.4	12.4	141	17.2	87.6	161	19.6	100

**Table 6.** Guttman Scale San Pedro de la Costa. Source: Preparation by the authors.

Concerning the neighbors of the neighborhood, you would say that:	NOTHING		LITTLE		A LOT		NK/NA		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
There are economic differences between neighbors	20	6.5	119	38.5	134	43.4	36	11.7	309	100
There are differences in education levels	22	7.1	113	36.6	137	44.3	37	12.0	309	100
There are differences in the type of work they do	21	6.8	106	34.3	136	44.0	46	14.9	309	100
There are differences in their customs	33	10.7	94	30.4	151	48.9	31	10.0	309	100
There are differences in religious beliefs	18	5.8	112	36.2	131	42.4	47	15.2	308	99.7
There are differences in political preferences	23	7.4	66	21.4	107	34.6	111	35.9	307	99.4

**Table 7.** Perception of Homogeneity Ribera Norte. Source: Preparation by the authors.

Concerning the neighbors of the neighborhood, you would say that:	NOTHING		LITTLE		A LOT		NK/NA		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
There are economic differences between neighbors	71	8.7	300	36.6	373	45.5	73	8.9	817	99.6
There are differences in education levels	67	8.2	267	32.6	382	46.6	97	11.8	813	99.1
There are differences in the type of work they do	68	8.3	276	33.7	368	44.9	103	12.6	815	99.4
There are differences in their customs	63	7.7	212	25.9	478	58.3	61	7.4	814	99.3
There are differences in religious beliefs	65	7.9	261	31.8	328	40.0	156	19.0	810	98.8
There are differences in political preferences	68	8.3	162	19.8	264	32.2	314	38.3	808	98.5

**Table 8.** Perception of Homogeneity San Pedro de la Costa. Source: Preparation by the authors.

In addition, as shown in Table 7 and Table 8, both projects present a perception of homogeneity that differs from the objective conditions. On the other hand, the evaluation based on the characteristics, habits, and customs has a perception of significant heterogeneity.

Finally, the consistency between the negative evaluation of neighborhood relations and the horizontal integration and perception of intra-neighborhood homogeneity indicators confirms that the results do not align with what would be expected based solely on whether the project is for resettlement or eradication.

## VI. DISCUSSION

The study reveals a paradox in the inhabitants' perceptions of their housing and social environment in two housing projects. Both projects show a high degree of satisfaction with the housing and the quality of life of the family group. The positive evaluation of life "inside" differs from the evaluation of other components. Both projects have an unfavorable evaluation of the neighbors and a perception of heterogeneity, leading to distancing regarding significant social relationships.

This dissonance is expected in relocation contexts such as San Pedro de la Costa, but it is surprising in Ribera Norte, where such a result was unexpected. Equivalent results indicate that the evaluation of the subjects is decoupled from the project's nature and is based on other elements.

The explanation for these contradictory results can be found in the transformation processes of identity references in urban space. Within this record, we see that daily relationships and practices in social housing complexes are progressively distancing themselves from the trends observed during the twentieth century.

The social housing complexes of contemporary Chile show great socioeconomic, cultural, and identity diversity, expressing themselves in changes in values and practices (Salcedo et al., 2017; Salcedo & Rasse, 2012). Proof of this is the privatization of everyday life, the withdrawal from public space, and decreased contact between neighbors (Ibarra, 2020; Márquez, 2003; Márquez & Pérez, 2008; Salcedo, 2010). Such changes would be associated with status conflicts, such as the emergence of differentiation practices within the same social housing complexes (Márquez, 2003; Márquez & Pérez, 2008; Rojas & Silva, 2021; Salcedo, 2010).

Fear is omnipresent in working-class neighborhoods (Ibarra, 2020; Márquez, 2003; Márquez & Pérez, 2008). In this context, social relationships arise from low levels of trust (Ibarra, 2020), with the consequent weakening of the social organization (Ibarra, 2020; Márquez, 2003; Márquez & Pérez, 2008; Salcedo, 2010; Salcedo et al., 2017; Salcedo & Rasse, 2012).

On the other hand, due to the changes registered in contemporary societies, social relations within the urban space are woven, considering diverse variables, which can act as a mechanism of identification and/or social differentiation (Márquez, 2006; Soja, 2008). The variables that structure social categories have diversified, redefining social boundaries. Therefore, the subjects can appeal to different criteria to establish hierarchical distinctions and symbolic borders within the neighborhood space (Soja, 2008). In this way, social identification and/or differentiation practices acquire greater complexity, resulting in a polymorphic and fractured social geometry (ibid).

Along these lines, the study's results suggest the existence of symbolic intra-neighborhood boundaries. Boundaries in social housing complexes have been seen previously (Márquez, 2003; Márquez & Pérez, 2008; Matus et al., 2020);

however, these boundaries referred to housing complexes with a social mix, where families of diverse origin and socioeconomic status converge. Again, this would explain the San Pedro de la Costa results but not Ribera Norte.

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the results in both projects indicates that the evaluation of the residential habitat made by the families is disassociated from the nature of the housing project and, instead, is associated with other elements. The negative evaluation of the neighbors and a perception of heterogeneity that turns into social distancing versus social relations in both cases are highlighted in both cases.

Historically, the idea has prevailed that housing resettlement has advantages over eradication projects since they conserve networks, supports, and community identity, facilitating social integration processes. However, at the beginning of the third millennium, this idea seems to be losing strength or beginning to relativize its weight within the equation.

Strictly speaking, the distinction between effects associated with housing resettlement and eradication projects seems insufficient to explain the findings of this study. Together with the differentiated effects generated by one and the other, the transformation of the identity references within the urban space invites the expansion of the analytical framework. In particular, the emergence of social distinction and differentiation practices in social housing complexes is a fact that we cannot ignore.

Therefore, the study's results raise new questions regarding intervention strategies with informal urban settlements, where the variables traditionally considered should be extended to the forms of relationships and social practices prevailing in contemporary Chile, as there we find new challenges for management and social research. The possibilities of strengthening social integration in social housing complexes are not only involved in the housing project alternative used; it will also be necessary to analyze further the dynamics and forms of relationship that occur within the urban space, as both dimensions have particular conditioning factors and challenges in the perspective of strengthening integration in social housing complexes.

## VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

ABRAMO, P. (2012). La ciudad com-fusa: Mercado y producción de la estructura urbana en las grandes metrópolis latinoamericanas. *Revista EURE - Revista de Estudios Urbano Regionales*, 38(114), Article 114. <https://doi.org/10.7764/68>

ABUFHELE, V. (2019). La política de la pobreza y el gobierno de los asentamientos informales en Chile. *Revista EURE - Revista de Estudios Urbano Regionales*, 45(135). <http://www.eure.cl/index.php/eure/article/view/2898>

ANGELCOS, N., & PÉREZ, M. (2017). De la "desaparición" a la reemergencia: Continuidades y rupturas del movimiento de pobladores en Chile. *Latin American Research Review*, 52(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.25222/larr.39>

CLICHEVSKY, N. (2007). Informalidad y regularización del suelo urbano en América Latina: Algunas reflexiones. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Urbanos e Regionais*, 9(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.22296/2317-1529.2007v9n2p55>

CLICHEVSKY, N. (2009). Algunas reflexiones sobre informalidad y regularización del suelo urbano. *Bitácora Urbano Territorial*, 1(14), Article 14.

DE RAMÓN, A. (1990). La población informal. Poblamiento de la periferia de Santiago de Chile. 1920-1970. *Revista EURE - Revista de Estudios Urbano Regionales*, 16(50), Article 50. <https://www.eure.cl/index.php/eure/article/view/1049>

DI VIRGILIO, M. M. (2015). Urbanizaciones de origen informal en Buenos Aires. Lógicas de producción de suelo urbano y acceso a la vivienda. *Estudios demográficos y urbanos*, 30(3), 651-690.

DI VIRGILIO, M. M., GUEVARA, T. A., & ARQUEROS, M. S. (2014). Un análisis comparado sobre la implementación de políticas de regularización de asentamientos informales en Argentina, Brasil y México. *Revista INVI*, 29(80), 17-51. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-83582014000100002>

ELORZA, A. (2019). Segregación residencial y estigmatización territorial. Representaciones y prácticas de los habitantes de territorios segregados. *Revista EURE - Revista de Estudios Urbano Regionales*, 45(135). <http://www.eure.cl/index.php/eure/article/view/2903>

ESPINOZA, V. (1998). Historia social de la acción colectiva urbana: Los pobladores de Santiago 1957-1987. *Revista EURE - Revista de Estudios Urbano Regionales*, 24(72), Article 72. <https://www.eure.cl/index.php/eure/article/view/1176>

FERNANDES, E. (2003). Programas de Regularización de la tenencia de la tierra urbana y pobreza urbana en Latinoamérica. *Facultad de Arquitectura, Universidad de la República, Uruguay*, 12, 5-16.

FERNANDES, E. (2008). Consideraciones generales sobre las políticas públicas de regularización de asentamientos informales en América Latina. *EURE (Santiago)*, 34(102), 25-38. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0250-71612008000200002>

FERNANDES, E. (2011). *Regularization of informal settlements in Latin America*. Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

HIDALGO, R. (2007). ¿Se acabó el suelo en la gran ciudad?: Las nuevas periferias metropolitanas de la vivienda social en Santiago de Chile. *Revista EURE - Revista de Estudios Urbano Regionales*, 33(98), Article 98. <https://doi.org/10.7764/1351>

HIDALGO, R. (2019). *La vivienda social en Chile y la construcción del espacio urbano en el Santiago del siglo XX*. RIL EDITORES.

HIDALGO, R., PAULSEN, A., & SANTANA, L. (2016). El neoliberalismo subsidiario y la búsqueda de justicia e igualdad en el acceso a la vivienda social: El caso de Santiago de Chile (1970-2015). *Andamios, Revista de Investigación Social*, 13(32), Article 32. <https://doi.org/10.29092/uacm.v13i32.525>

IBARRA, S. (2020). La dimensión socioespacial del capital social. Análisis del capital social vecinal y la eficacia colectiva en ocho conjuntos de vivienda social en Chile. *Revista EURE - Revista de Estudios Urbano Regionales*, 46(138), Article 138. <https://doi.org/10.7764/2908>

MÁRQUEZ, F. (2003). Identidad y Fronteras urbanas en Santiago de Chile. *Psicología em Revista*, 10(14), 35-51. <https://doi.org/10.5752/181>

MÁRQUEZ, F. (2006). Identidades urbanas en Santiago de Chile. En *Proposiciones* (pp. 70-83). SUR Ediciones.

MÁRQUEZ, F., & PÉREZ, F. (2008). Spatial Frontiers and Neo-communitarian Identities in the City: The Case of Santiago de Chile. *Urban Studies*, 45(7), 1461-1483. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098008090684>

MATUS, C., RAMONEDA, Á., & VALENZUELA, F. (2019). La integración social como desafío: Análisis del programa de campamentos en Chile (2011-2018). *Revista INVI*, 34(97), 49-78. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-83582019000300049>

MATUS, C., RAMONEDA, Á., VALENZUELA, F., & RUIZ-TAGLE, J. (2020). *Los campamentos en la política urbana chilena: Desafíos y propuestas para abordar una problemática en crecimiento*. Temas de Agenda Pública, Centro de Políticas Públicas, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile.

MINVU, & PUC (Eds.). (2018). *La vida después del campamento*. Minvu - PUC.

ONU-HABITAT. (2015). *Documento temático sobre asentamientos informales*. Temas Habitat III.

RACZYNSKI, D., VALDERRAMA, C., MINGO, J., PINO, R., AEDO, C., GONZALEZ, P., GALAZ, H., RUIZ-TAGLE, J., FERNANDEZ, J., SALINAS, D., & TASSARA, G. (2007). *Evaluación de Impacto Programa Chile-Barrio*.

ROJAS, M., & SILVA, M. (2021). Integración social en proyectos de vivienda social. Un análisis en el Gran Concepción, Chile. *Revista INVI*, 36(103), Article 103.

SABATINI, F., & VERGARA, L. (2018). ¿Apoyo a lugares o apoyo a personas? Dos proyectos chilenos de vivienda socialmente integrada. *Revista INVI*, 33(94), 9-48. <https://doi.org/10.4067/invi.v33i94.1337>

SALCEDO, R. (2010). The Last Slum: Moving from Illegal Settlements to Subsidized Home Ownership in Chile: *Urban Affairs Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087410368487>

SALCEDO, R., & RASSE, A. (2012). The Heterogeneous Nature of Urban Poor Families. *City & Community*, 11(1), 94-118. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6040.2011.01385.x>

SALCEDO, R., RASSE, A., & CORTÉS, A. (2017). Del proyecto colectivo al aislamiento: La desaparición de la noción de barrio. En *Salcedo*. Editorial Bifurcaciones.

SOJA, E. W. (2008). *Postmetrópolis: Estudios críticos sobre las ciudades y las regiones*. Traficantes de Sueños.

TECHO CHILE, FUNDACIÓN VIVIENDA, & CENTRO DE ESTUDIOS SOCIOTERRITORIALES. (2021). *Catastro Nacional de Campamentos 2020- 2021*.

TIRONI, M. (2003). *Nueva pobreza urbana: Vivienda y capital social en Santiago de Chile, 1985-2001*. Universidad de Chile, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales: PRESDDES y RIL Editores.