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Conclusions: Original Study

- “(...)favela residents are not economically or politically marginal but exploited and repressed; they are not socially and culturally marginal but stigmatized and excluded from a closed social system”
- “In short, they have the aspirations of the bourgeoisie, the perseverance of pioneers and the values of patriots”
- They are the victims of asymmetric integration
II – Current Research

1. Favela Growth

2. Conceptual Scheme

3. Research Progress

- relocated original interviewees
- randomly selected descendants
GROWTH IN FAVELAS IN RIO DE JANEIRO

Fonte: Pró - URB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Favela pop. (a)</th>
<th>Rio city pop. (b)</th>
<th>a/b (%)</th>
<th>% Favela Growth</th>
<th>% Rio Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>169.305</td>
<td>2.337.451</td>
<td>7.24%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>337.412</td>
<td>3.307.163</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>563.970</td>
<td>4.251.918</td>
<td>13.26%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>628.170</td>
<td>5.093.232</td>
<td>12.33%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>882.483</td>
<td>5.480.778</td>
<td>16.10%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.092.958</td>
<td>5.857.879</td>
<td>18.66%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fonte: IBGE (Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística)
Sample from 1969

Communities
- Catacumba: favela, housing projects
- Nova Brasilia: favela
- Duque de Caxias: loteamentos, favela
- 750 original participants
- Random Sample 200 in each
- Leadership Sample 50 in each

Agency

Public policies
(targeted and untargeted)
- Local
- State
- National
- International

Civil Society
- Family and neighborhood Networks
- Community based organizations
- External Non-profits

2002 Results

Fourth generation
Third generation
Second generation
Original participants 250

Contextual Variables

Brazilian Political and Economic Transformations
Rio de Janeiro Political and Economic Transformations
Rio de Janeiro’s Spatial and Functional Transformations
PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN INTERVIEWED (BASED ON TOTAL PARENTS WITH CHILDREN)

- **TOTAL**: 122 of 243
- **CATACUMBA**: 77 of 121
- **N. BRASÍLIA**: 22 of 67
- **CAXIAS**: 21 of 55
III. Preliminary Analysis

A. Meaning of Marginality
B. Framing of Fear
C. Increase of Inequality
D. Deception of Democracy
E. Agency and Optimism
A. Concepts of Marginality

- New concepts = exclusion, inequality, social injustice and spatial segregation
- However on the streets “marginal elements” have the same meaning as 30 years ago i.e. “bad guys”
- Drug dealers vs. residents/workers
B. THE FRAMING OF FEAR

Fear of what?

1969
Removal/
Eradication by the forces of dictatorship

2001
- cross fire
- police
- drug dealers
Have you or anyone in your family been the victim of:

- Pickpocketing: 57%
- Robbery: 56%
- Aggression: 22%
- Police extortion: 17%
- Homicide: 14%
- Burglary: 11%
- Extortion: 5%
- Sexual abuse: 2%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Exploiting Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Local merchants</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The electricity “providers”</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No one</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Politicians</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local merchants</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The electricity and water “providers”</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police and drug dealers</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Between drug dealers or police, who has most helped or harmed your community?
Expropriation of the community space by drug dealers results in:

- Less participation
- Less use of public space
- Lower sense of community
- Less socializing among friends and relatives
Decrease in participation

Religious assoc.

Children 2001: 39%
Parents 1969: 47%

Resident’s assoc

2001: 6%
1969: 28%

Sports club

2001: 2%
1969: 14%

Labor unions

2001: 4%
1969: 12%
Are the people here in the community united or not? (%)

Parents 1969

- Very United: 53%
- United: 24%
- Slightly United: 23%

Children 2001

- United: 61%
- Slightly United: 34%
The last time you borrowed money, where did you get it?

- **Parents**: 14% (2001), 15% (1969)
- **Friends/neighbors**: 5% (2001), 21% (1969)
- **Boss**: 4% (2001), 11% (1969)
- **Bank**: 21% (1969), 21% (Children 2001)
C. INCREASE IN INEQUALITY

- Higher consumption of collective and individual goods and services
- More education and higher income
- But, much less than privileged groups
- Greater perceived inequality and discrimination
### Consumption of Collective Urban Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piped/running water</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick housing</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing Conditions

- 30% of the children live in housing projects, 40% in neighborhoods and less than 1/3 in favelas.
- 91% of the children (vs. 37% of their parents in ‘69) live in brick or concrete houses.
- 100% of the children have a bathroom inside the house (vs. 61% of their parents in ‘69).
Income of Parents (1969) and Children (2001) in minimum salaries (ms)

Parents 1969:
- Up to 1ms: 55%
- 1ms – 2ms: 25%
- 2ms – 3ms: 15%

Children 2001:
- Up to 1ms: 26%
- 1ms – 2ms: 30%
- 2ms – 3ms: 26%
- 4ms or +: 18%
# Educational Mobility – Parents (1969) and Kids (2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can read and write</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school incomplete</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school complete</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school incomplete</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school complete</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school incomplete</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school complete</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University incomplete</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University complete</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=237  N=794
Educational Mobility
Parent / Child Comparison

- 73% of the children have more years of education than their parents
- 18% of the children have the same educational level as their parents
- 9% have less education than their parents (6% were daughters of a male original interviewee)
## Occupational Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Kids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office workers</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-manual workers</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation workers</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security- public and private</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled manual labor</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (semi-skilled)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other semi-skilled workers</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic service</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled workers</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=237  N=794
Parent / Child Comparisons

- 37% of the children have higher skilled jobs than their parents;
- 36% have the same level jobs as their parents;
- 27% have less skilled jobs than their parents.
Unemployed for over 1 month

Parents 1969: 20%
Children 2001: 65%
Mobility and Inequality

- Upward educational mobility (74%) not reflected in occupational mobility (34%)
- Vestibular exam is barrier to advanced education needed for desirable jobs
Globalization and Technology

- 66% see globalization as negative while the rest see no impact.
- 78% do not have a computer at home, 80% have never used the internet.
% watching TV every day

Parents 1969: 54%
Children 2001: 96%
Is there discrimination on the basis of:

- Skin color: 73%
- Favela: 70%
- Style of dress: 68%
- Place of origin: 60%
- Baixada Fluminense: 57%
- Women: 56%
- North Zone: 50%
- Housing Project: 39%
Does racial discrimination exist in Brazil?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. DECEPTION OF DEMOCRACY

The hope:

Direct vote → Greater bargaining → power
Greater voice → Community
Improvements → Better quality of life
Less than 30% think that any level of government has helped them:

- Fed. gov.: 7% helped, 30% neutral, 63% harmed
- State gov.: 23% helped, 41% neutral, 36% harmed
- City gov.: 25% helped, 40% neutral, 35% harmed
- City council: 19% helped, 59% neutral, 22% harmed
- Foreign agencies: 7% helped, 54% neutral, 39% harmed
Post-Dictatorship:

- **IMPROVED**
  - Housing
  - Sanitation
  - Transport
  - Access to education

- **WORSENED**
  - Health service
  - Security
  - Economic situation
  - Exclusion
  - Bargaining power
E. AGENCY AND OPTIMISM

- Today there is less passivity and paternalism;

- Greater belief that political participation can make a difference especially at the municipal level.
For example:

- 84% (vs 30% in 1969) think that “all Brazilians should participate”;

- 35% (vs 17% in 1969) think that they can influence government decisions.
Factors most important for a successful life

- Job with a good salary: 69%
- Education: 43%
- Own a house: 16%
- Union/Peace/Love: 12%
- Honesty: 8%
- Dignity: 4%
- Safety: 4%
Compared to your expectations/aspirations your life is:

- Better: 45%
- Equal: 25%
- Worse: 30%
V. Next Steps:

- Analyze life histories
- Interview 3rd and 4th generations
- New random sample in the 3 communities:
  - Add similar favelas with the opposite policy interventions;
  - Add favelas in the west zone;
- Disseminate results
MEGA-CITIES
Innovations For
Urban Life