REVISTA INVECOM
ISSN en línea: 2739-0063

Influence of urban land value capture and recovery tools on community social capital

Influencia de la plusvalía urbana y herramientas de recuperación en el capital social comunitario

Received: 15/02/2026 - **Accepted:** 10/05/2026

Germán Bernardo Monteagudo Montenegro
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5294-3885
gmonteagudo@ucvvirtual.edu.pe
Universidad César Vallejo. Lima, Peru

Abstract

The research, linked to SDG 11, aimed to evaluate the impact of urban land value capture and recovery tools on community social capital in a district of the Cusco province. A quantitative, non-experimental, correlational-causal, cross-sectional design was used. The sample consisted of 120 residents selected from a population of 175; all participants completed questionnaires to measure the variables under study. The results showed that the inclusion of urban land value capture and recovery tools significantly improves the model's predictive capacity regarding community social capital. This was evidenced by the increase in the log-likelihood (from -495.363 to -485.183) and a chi-square value of 10.181 with a significance level of 0.006, indicating that the findings are not attributable to chance. However, the pseudo R-squared values (Cox and Snell 0.081; Nagelkerke 0.083; McFadden 0.021) were low, suggesting the presence of other, unaccounted-for factors that also influence community social capital. It is concluded that, although the analyzed variables significantly impact community social capital, further research is recommended, incorporating new variables to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the factors that strengthen community social cohesion and development.

Keywords: urban land value capture, recovery tools, community social capital.

Resumen

La investigación, vinculada al ODS 11, tuvo como objetivo evaluar el impacto de la plusvalía urbana y de las herramientas de recuperación sobre el capital social comunitario en un distrito de la provincia del Cusco. Se utilizó un enfoque cuantitativo, diseño no experimental, correlacional causal y corte transversal. La muestra estuvo integrada por 120 vecinos seleccionados de una población de 175 habitantes; a todos se les aplicaron cuestionarios para medir las variables estudiadas. Los resultados mostraron que la inclusión de la plusvalía urbana y las herramientas de recuperación mejora significativamente la capacidad predictiva del modelo sobre el capital social comunitario. Esto se evidenció en el aumento del logaritmo de la verosimilitud (de -495,363 a -485,183) y en un valor de Chi-cuadrado de 10,181 con significancia de 0,006, lo que indica que los hallazgos no son atribuibles al azar. Sin embargo, los valores de Pseudo R cuadrado (Cox y Snell 0,081; Nagelkerke 0,083; McFadden 0,021) fueron bajos, sugiriendo la presencia de otros factores no considerados que también influyen en el capital social comunitario. Se concluye que, aunque las variables analizadas impactan de forma significativa el capital social comunitario, es recomendable continuar la investigación e incorporar nuevas variables para comprender de manera más integral los factores que fortalecen la cohesión y el desarrollo social comunitario.

Palabras clave: plusvalía urbana, herramientas de recuperación, capital social comunitario.

Introduction

This article addresses the relationship between urban land value capture, land value recovery mechanisms, and community social capital within the context of contemporary urban growth. The research problem lies in the limited understanding among urban and social development researchers regarding the nexus between land value capture and social capital. Although both concepts have been extensively examined independently, a theoretical and empirical gap persists concerning how land value recovery mechanisms influence social variables such as trust, cohesion, and community engagement.

The importance of addressing this topic stems from the need to analyze the social effects of land value recovery instruments beyond their economic dimension. In contexts characterized by unequal land access and real estate speculation dynamics, it is critical to assess whether these mechanisms contribute to strengthening social capital or, conversely, generate fragmentation processes, thereby informing the formulation of more equitable and sustainable urban policies.

Theoretically, the study draws on urban land value theory and social capital theory. The latter, developed by Pierre Bourdieu, James Coleman, and Robert Putnam (cited in Horn & Barden, 2026), conceptualizes social capital as the set of networks, norms, and trust levels that facilitate collective action. Within this framework, the principal analytical variables are urban land value capture, recovery mechanisms, and the dimensions of community social capital, namely trust, cohesion, and commitment.

Regarding the literature, various studies have analyzed land value capture from an economic perspective. Research by Piketty et al. (2019) shows that land rent appropriation contributes to inequality, while authors such as Harvey and Smith (1996, cited in Paulsen, 2021) emphasized that land valorization processes tend to reproduce accumulation and speculation dynamics. In Latin America, Smolka and Amborski (2003) have documented the implementation of value recovery mechanisms as urban financing instruments. Regional studies highlight that these tools enable the capture of a portion of land value increases generated by public action; however, such research has addressed urban land value and social capital independently. In this regard, the present study offers an integrative approach that examines the relationship between the two.

The study is situated in contexts of rapid urbanization, characterized by urban land expansion, housing informality, and limited implementation of effective value recovery mechanisms.

Within this context, the general objective was to analyze the influence of urban land value capture and recovery mechanisms on community social capital, hypothesizing that these instruments affect levels of trust, cohesion, and social commitment depending on their design and implementation.

Methodology

This research is applied in nature, as it seeks to generate knowledge oriented toward solving practical problems (Ñaupas et al., 2018). It was developed under a quantitative approach, given that variables were numerically measured using structured instruments, enabling statistical analysis and hypothesis testing (Hernández-Sampieri & Mendoza, 2018). It also has a correlational-causal scope, analyzing the relationship and influence between urban land value capture and recovery tools.

The research design is non-experimental and cross-sectional, as variables were not manipulated and data collection occurred at a single point in time, observing phenomena in their natural context (Ñaupas et al., 2018; Hernández-Sampieri & Mendoza, 2018).

The population consisted of 175 participants from pro-housing associations, from which a sample of 120 was selected through probabilistic sampling. The unit of analysis was the leaders of these organizations. Inclusion criteria considered active members of the associations, while those who declined to participate were excluded.

Data were collected using survey techniques, with a structured Likert-scale questionnaire as the instrument (Reyes, 2016). The instrument was validated through expert judgment, and its reliability was determined using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, yielding adequate internal consistency values.

Data analysis employed both descriptive and inferential statistics, using SPSS software for correlation tests and hypothesis contrast (Hernández & Duana, 2020).

Regarding ethical considerations, voluntary participation, information confidentiality, and exclusive use of data for academic purposes were guaranteed. Finally, the cross-sectional nature of the design, which restricts analysis of changes over time, is acknowledged as a study limitation.

Results and discussion

Urban land value capture constitutes a key factor in territorial development, reflecting the increase in land value generated by public works and urban growth. Its study allows for an understanding of how populations perceive these changes and their repercussions on the community. In this context, Table 1 presents the frequency distribution of the urban land value capture variable according to participants' perceptions:

Table 1

Frequency of the Urban Land Value Capture Variable

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	9	7,5	7,5	7,5
	Medium	77	64,2	64,2	71,7
	High	34	28,3	28,3	100,0
	Total	**120**	**100,0**	**100,0**	

Urban land value capture is concentrated predominantly at the medium level (64.2%), followed by the high level (28.3%), and to a lesser extent, the low level (7.5%). These results indicate predominantly intermediate land valorization, suggesting development and growth processes at a consolidation stage.

The low proportion at the low level implies that most evaluated areas have experienced increases in land value, possibly associated with infrastructure improvements, greater access to services, or urban expansion. In contrast, high values indicate sectors where valorization is more intense, revealing intra-urban differences in the degree of territorial development.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that urban land value capture is not uniformly distributed across the study area, allowing for the inference of inequalities in valorization processes. These patterns justify the analysis of mechanisms designed to manage and redistribute these benefits.

Recovery tools function as mechanisms aimed at redistributing benefits generated by land valorization, contributing to financing and urban development. Accordingly, Table 2 presents the frequency distribution of the Recovery Tools variable according to participants' perceptions:

Table 2

Frequency of the Recovery Tools Variable

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Medium	95	79,2	79,2	79,2
	High	25	20,8	20,8	100,0
	Total	**120**	**100,0**	**100,0**	

Recovery tools are concentrated predominantly at the medium level (79.2%), followed by the high level (20.8%). This indicates a predominance of intermediate application of these mechanisms, suggesting that their implementation is still in a consolidation process in the studied context.

The small proportion at the high level points to only a portion of the sample employing more developed and robust recovery tools, a situation that may be linked to institutional, administrative, or urban management limitations. Consequently, recovery tools do not exhibit homogeneous development, revealing differences in their implementation and scope.

These inequalities in the application of recovery mechanisms may affect their impact on community social capital, particularly in dimensions such as participation, trust, and social cohesion. Community social capital precisely encompasses these elements (trust, participation, and cohesion among community members) which are fundamental for strengthening social development and coexistence.

Within this framework, Table 3 presents the frequency distribution of the Community Social Capital variable according to participants' perceptions:

Table 3

Frequency of the Community Social Capital Variable

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	8	6,7	6,7	6,7
	Medium	60	50,0	50,0	56,7
	High	52	43,3	43,3	100,0

Total	**120**	**100,0**	**100,0**	

Community social capital is concentrated primarily at the medium (50.0%) and high (43.3%) levels, while the low level is limited (6.7%). These results indicate favorable conditions for social interaction within the community, characterized by the presence of trust, cohesion, and commitment among members.

The low proportion at the low level suggests a relatively consolidated social fabric. Likewise, the considerable proportion at the high-level points to sectors with greater organizational capacity, integration, and collective action capacity in addressing common issues.

Overall, the findings paint a positive picture of community social capital and allow for the inference of social dynamics conducive to strengthening community relationships. Given this context, it was pertinent to assess whether urban land value capture and recovery tools influence these dynamics.

To this end, a statistical model was applied to analyze the influence of urban land value capture and recovery tools on community social capital. In this regard, Table 4 presents the results of the model examining the relationship between these variables:

Table 4

Model of Urban Land Value Capture and Recovery Tools on Community Social

Model	-2 Log-Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept only	495,363			
Final	**485,183**	**10,181**	**2**	**,006**

The logistic model shows that including urban land value capture and recovery tools significantly improves the explanation of community social capital. The reduction in the log-likelihood (from –495.363 to –485.183) demonstrates a better model fit regarding the dependent variable, indicating that the incorporated variables contribute relevant information for understanding community social capital behavior.

Furthermore, the chi-square value (10.181; p = .006) confirms the model's statistical significance, suggesting that urban land value capture and recovery tools jointly influence community social capital. These findings support the hypothesis that land valorization and recovery mechanisms have social effects beyond economic ones.

Nevertheless, the low pseudo-R^2 values indicate that the model explains only a limited fraction of the observed variability, so its explanatory power could be enhanced by incorporating other relevant variables. Factors worth considering in future studies include the level of citizen participation, local public policies, access to basic services, trust in authorities, and population socioeconomic conditions.

Analyzing parameter estimates further allows for the identification of each variable's degree of incidence within the model. In that sense, Table 5 presents the parameter estimates of urban land value capture and recovery tools in relation to community social capital:

Table 5

Parameter Estimates of Urban Land Value Capture and Recovery Tools on Community Social Capital

							95% Confidence Interval	
		Estimate	**Std. Error**	**Wald**	**df**	**Sig.**	**Lower Bound**	**Upper Bound**
Threshold	[V3 = 24.00]	-6,316	1,189	28,200	1	,000	-8,647	-3,985
	[V3 = 28.00]	-5,533	1,158	22,848	1	,000	-7,802	-3,264
	[V3 = 35.00]	-5,000	1,143	19,146	1	,000	-7,239	-2,760
	[V3 = 39.00]	-4,653	1,134	16,836	1	,000	-6,875	-2,430
	[V3 = 40.00]	-3,715	1,110	11,199	1	,001	-5,890	-1,539
	[V3 = 42.00]	-3,399	1,102	9,514	1	,002	-5,559	-1,239
	[V3 = 45.00]	-2,265	1,075	4,437	1	,035	-4,373	-,157

	[V3 = 56.00]	-,876	1,078	,660	1	,417	-2,989	1,238
Location	V1	-,095	,026	13,316	1	,000	-,147	-,044
	V2	,008	,022	,123	1	,726	-,036	,052
Link function: Logit.								

The logistic model estimates indicate that urban land value capture has a statistically significant influence on community social capital ($p < .001$), reflected in a negative coefficient ($\beta = –.095$). This suggests that as urban land value capture levels increase, the probability of achieving high levels of community social capital decreases.

Conversely, recovery tools showed no significant effect ($p = .726$), implying that, in the analyzed model, their influence is not determinant in explaining community social capital. Consequently, although urban land value capture emerges as a relevant factor, recovery tools require more integrated analysis with other social, economic, and institutional factors to better understand their impact on community dynamics.

Pseudo-R^2 indicators further allow for the evaluation of the model's explanatory degree regarding the relationship between urban land value capture, recovery tools, and community social capital. These values show that the independent variables provide information, but the model's explanatory capacity is limited, so incorporating other variables in subsequent research is advisable.

In this context, Table 6 presents the pseudo-R^2 values obtained in the applied statistical model:

Table 6

Pseudo-R^2 of Urban Land Value Capture and Recovery Tools on Community Social Capital

Measure	Value
Cox and Snell	,081
Nagelkerke	,083
McFadden	,021

The pseudo-R^2 values (Cox and Snell = .081; Nagelkerke = .083; McFadden = .021) demonstrate low explanatory capacity of the model regarding community social capital. Although the model is statistically significant, its explanatory power is limited: urban land value capture and recovery tools influence community social capital but do not alone explain its behavior. This confirms that community social capital is a complex phenomenon, also determined by social, economic, and institutional factors not considered in this study.

Among the dimensions of community social capital, trust occupies a central place, as it facilitates cooperation, participation, and coexistence among community members. Given the above, it is pertinent to assess how urban land value capture and recovery tools specifically affect trust.

Accordingly, Table 7 presents the results of the model analyzing the influence of urban land value capture and recovery tools on trust as a component of community social capital:

Table 7

Model of Urban Land Value Capture and Recovery Tools on Trust within Community Social Capital

Model	-2 Log-Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept only	447,655			
Final	**435,942**	**11,714**	**2**	**,003**

The logistic model indicates that incorporating urban land value capture and recovery tools improves the fit for explaining trust within community social capital, as reflected in the reduction of the log-likelihood (–2 LL). This suggests that the incorporated variables contribute relevant information for understanding trust behavior in the community.

Furthermore, the chi-square value (11.714; $p = .003$) confirms the model's statistical significance, implying that urban land value capture and recovery tools jointly influence community trust. These results show that land valorization processes and recovery mechanisms are related to perceptions of trust among community members.

Turning to another dimension of social capital, cohesion also plays a key role, as it reinforces relationships and integration among inhabitants. Therefore, it is pertinent to analyze whether urban land value capture and recovery tools also affect community cohesion.

In this regard, Table 8 presents the results of the model evaluating the influence of urban land value capture and recovery tools on cohesion within community social capital:

Table 8

Model of Urban Land Value Capture and Recovery Tools on Cohesion within Community Social Capital

Model	-2 Log-Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept only	416,341			
Final	**388,678**	**27,662**	**2**	**,000**

The logistic model shows a significant improvement in fit when incorporating urban land value capture and recovery tools, as evidenced by the reduction in the –2 log-likelihood (from –416.341 to –388.678). This decrease indicates that the included variables offer a better explanation of cohesion within community social capital.

Moreover, the chi-square value (27.662; p = .000) confirms that the model is highly significant, demonstrating that urban land value capture and recovery tools jointly and substantially influence community cohesion. These findings suggest that land valorization processes and recovery mechanisms contribute to strengthening integration, cooperation, and sense of belonging among community members, indicating greater sensitivity of cohesion to these factors.

Commitment constitutes another dimension of community social capital, related to participation and the assumption of responsibilities by community members. Accordingly, Table 9 presents the results of the model evaluating the incidence of urban land value capture and recovery tools on commitment within community social capital:

Table 9

Model of Urban Land Value Capture and Recovery Tools on Commitment within Community Social Capital

Model	-2 Log-Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept only	461,189			
Final	**451,008**	**10,181**	**2**	**,006**

The logistic model showed improved fit when incorporating urban land value capture and recovery tools, reflected in the reduction of the –2 log-likelihood (from –461.189 to –451.008). This decrease indicates that the included variables contribute to better explaining commitment within community social capital. Likewise, the chi-square value (10.181; p = .006) confirms the model's statistical significance, evidencing that urban land value capture and recovery tools jointly influence community commitment.

The results suggest that land valorization processes and the application of recovery mechanisms are related to levels of participation, responsibility, and involvement among community members. However, the observed influence on commitment is more moderate compared to other dimensions of social capital, indicating that commitment also depends on social and institutional factors not included in the model, such as community leadership, citizen participation, and sense of belonging.

Regarding the general objective, the findings show that urban land value capture and recovery tools affect community social capital, although they neither determine it exclusively nor linearly. The incorporation of these mechanisms is associated with improvements in community dynamics, but the low pseudo-R^2 values indicate limited explanatory capacity: the analyzed variables explain only part of social capital behavior, while other social, cultural, and institutional factors also intervene. This offers partial confirmation of the proposals by Piketty et al. (2019) and Smolka and Amborski (2020), by showing that land value redistribution is relevant but insufficient to guarantee social cohesion.

Concerning trust, the results point to recovery tools potentially fostering perceptions of greater equity and, consequently, community trust. However, their low explanatory capacity suggests that this dimension also depends on subjective factors, such as institutional legitimacy, authority transparency, prior participation experiences, and perceptions of social justice, challenging approaches centered exclusively on economic considerations.

In the case of cohesion, the relationship with urban variables was more consistent: improvements in infrastructure, access to services, and collective actions appear to foster neighbor interaction and sense of belonging. These results coincide with Contreras and Ojeda (2019) and Rojas and Bautista (2023), reinforcing the idea that redistributive policies can strengthen social bonds and that collective dimensions respond more intensely than subjective ones.

Finally, globally, the study provides empirical evidence from San Sebastián (Cusco) that the relationship between urban land value capture and community social capital is significant but of low explanatory capacity, and that different social capital dimensions do not respond homogeneously to urban variables. Practically, this suggests that land value recovery policies should be complemented with social and institutional strategies to strengthen trust, participation, and community organization. The development of more comprehensive models incorporating governance, informality, inequality, citizen participation, and access to basic services, as well as the use of mixed approaches to better understand the phenomenon's complexity, is recommended.

Conclusions

The results support the assertion that urban land value capture and recovery tools constitute relevant factors in shaping community social capital, evidencing that land valorization processes are not solely economic phenomena but also social ones. In this sense, urban land value management should be understood from a perspective that considers not only its economic effects but also its impact on community dynamics, consistent with theoretical approaches linking urban development and social cohesion.

Likewise, empirical evidence confirms that these variables affect community trust, suggesting that urban interventions and recovery mechanisms can contribute to strengthening social relationships. Nevertheless, the model's moderate explanatory reach indicates that trust does not depend exclusively on structural factors but also on cultural and institutional elements, coinciding with social capital theoretical frameworks that highlight its multidimensional character.

Regarding social cohesion, the results show greater explanatory capacity, supporting the claim that urban land value recovery tools can play a significant role in consolidating collective bonds and social organization. This finding reinforces the idea that urban policies can generate positive effects on social structure when appropriately oriented.

On the other hand, community commitment also presents a significant relationship with the studied variables, although with lower explanatory level, suggesting that citizen involvement in collective processes responds to a more complex interaction of factors. In this sense, it is argued that land value recovery tools should be articulated with strategies for institutional strengthening and citizen participation to enhance their effects.

Finally, the results open avenues for future research, particularly in identifying additional variables that would allow for a deeper explanation of community social capital, such as cultural, institutional, and local governance factors. Likewise, the need for longitudinal studies to analyze the evolution of these relationships over time is raised, as well as comparative research evaluating the effectiveness of different land value recovery tools in diverse contexts.

References

Braticevic, S. (2020). Valorización inmobiliaria regional y escenario post-COVID-19: El caso de la Quebrada de Humahuaca, Argentina. *Semestre Económico, 23*(55), 161–182. https://doi.org/10.22395/seec.v23n55a7

Calderón, J. (2019). El Estado y la informalidad urbana: Perú en el siglo XXI. *PLURIVERSIDAD, 3*(3), 45–64. https://doi.org/10.31381/pluriversidad.v3i3.2234

Carabaca, C., & Lobos, R. (2023). La ciudad como derecho. *Revista Planeo: Espacio para territorios urbanos y regionales*, (56). https://revistaplaneo.cl/2023/07/23/mas-alla-derecho-de-la-ciudad-hacia-la-vida-buena-y-la-defensa-de-la-comunidad/

Contreras, A., & Ojeda, F. (2019). Recuperación de plusvalías: Herramienta impuestaria para gobiernos autónomos. El caso ecuatoriano. *Bitácora Urbano Territorial, 29*(1), Artículo 1. https://doi.org/10.15446/bitacora.v29n1.64548

Hernández, S., & Duana, D. (2020). Técnicas e instrumentos de recolección de datos. *Boletín Científico de las Ciencias Económico Administrativas del ICEA, 9*(17), 51–53. https://doi.org/10.29057/icea.v9i17.6019

Hernández-Sampieri, R., & Mendoza, C. (2018). *Metodología de la investigación: Las rutas cuantitativa, cualitativa y mixta*. McGraw Hill Education.

http://www.biblioteca.cij.gob.mx/Archivos/Materiales_de_consulta/Drogas_de_Abuso/Articulos/SampieriLasRutas.pdf
Horn, S., & Barden, J. (2026). Capital social em foco: Conceitos, fundamentos teóricos e trajetórias do debate. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos de Gestão e Desenvolvimento Regional,* 7(3), 98–111. https://doi.org/10.30681/rbegdr.v7i3.14521
Agencia Estatal Boletín Oficial del Estado. (2022). A la responsabilidad social por la contratación pública. https://www.boe.es/biblioteca_juridica/publicacion.php?id=PUB-PB-2022-249
Lamy, B., Ochoa, J., & Serrano, A. (2019). Migración interna y sus efectos en el crecimiento urbano del municipio de Querétaro. *Quivera. Revista de Estudios Territoriales, 21*(2), 49–61. https://doi.org/10.36677/qret.v21i2.12449
Liu, Y., & Yau, Y. (2020). Urban entrepreneurialism vs. market society: The geography of China's neoliberal urbanism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 44*(2). https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12859
López, N., & García, E. (2020). Método de corrección de factores: Alternativa para la valoración de suelos. Caso Arequipa Metropolitana. *Revista Alfa, 4*(12). https://doi.org/10.33996/revistaalfa.v4i12.86
Ñaupas, H., Valdivia, M., Palacios, J., & Romero, H. (2018). *Metodología de la investigación cuantitativa-cualitativa y redacción de la tesis* (5.ª ed.). Ediciones de la U. https://edicionesdelau.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Anexos-Metodologia_%C3%91aupas_5aEd.pdf
Palacín, B. (2022). *A la responsabilidad social por la contratación pública*. Agencia Estatal Boletín Oficial del Estado. https://www.boe.es/biblioteca_juridica/publicacion.php?id=PUB-PB-2022-249
Páramo, C., & López, E. (2020). Principios, progresividad y factibilidades de la recuperación de "plusvalías" urbanas en el Chile actual. *Revista de Geografía Norte Grande*, (76), 121–142. https://www.scielo.cl/scielo.php?pid=S0718-34022020000200121&script=sci_abstract
Paulsen, A. (2021). David Harvey y Neil Smith: Capital financiero, propiedad inmobiliaria y cultura. *Revista de Geografía Norte Grande*, (40), 109–110. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-34022008000200009
Piketty, T., Yang, L., & Zucman, G. (2019). Acumulación de capital, propiedad privada y creciente desigualdad en China, 1978–2015. *American Economic Review, 109*(7), 2469–2496. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20170973
Reyes, M. (2016). *Metodología de la investigación: Telebachillerato comunitario. Primer semestre*. Secretaría de Educación Pública; FLACSO. https://libros.conaliteg.gob.mx/20/TB1IA.htm
Rojas, C., & Bautista, A. (2023). Cambios en la renta del suelo urbano por el uso de instrumentos normativos de ordenamiento territorial: Localidad de Chapinero, Bogotá, Colombia. *Perspectiva Geográfica, 28*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.19053/01233769.14495
Smolka, M., & Amborski, D. (2003). Recuperación de plusvalías para el desarrollo urbano: Una comparación interamericana. *Revista EURE, 29*(88). https://doi.org/10.4067/S0250-71612003008800003
Sotomayor, V. (2019). El impuesto a la plusvalía en Guadalajara: Un instrumento de captura de valor en el siglo XX. *Diagnóstico FACIL Empresarial, Finanzas, Auditoría, Contabilidad, Impuestos, Legal, 14*. https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=10058850
Torres, D., & Ruiz, J. (2019). ¿Derecho a la vivienda o la propiedad privada? De la política pública a la informalidad urbana en el Área Metropolitana de Lima (1996–2015). *Eure, 45*(136), 5–29. https://www.scielo.cl/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0250-71612019000300005
Verduzco, B., & Valenzuela, M. (2018). Captura de plusvalías, regularización de edificios y aglomeraciones turísticas en Guadalajara. *Economía, Sociedad y Territorio*, (57). https://doi.org/10.22136/est20181182