Introduction
Urban Living and Architecture

This study is about intermediate cities in the Andes region and about how different groups of urbanites occupy urban space: the city envisaged by architects and planners and the everyday city of residents and users. These two urban manifestations are basically impossible to distinguish from one another. In everyday life the conceived space, the used space, and the experienced space become intermingled (Lefebvre 1991). After all, the conceivers and makers of urban space may also be residents and users and vice versa. This book revolves around the city as a tangled and layered social space that is depicted and used in different ways by different social groups. In this approach, the city is not only the location positioning relations between actors in time and space but is also the spot where an anthropological researcher inevitably participates in knowledge production about the city and consequently becomes part of the social reality (Giddens 1984; Marcus 1995).

More of the world population now lives in cities than in the countryside. Contrary to what is often believed, over half the city dwellers in the world live in cities with fewer than 500,000 inhabitants (Satterthwaite 2006, 2007; UN 2008). Since the 1990s different international organizations (UN-Habitat, UNDP, UNESCO, and the World Bank) have called for policy that might promote sustainable urban development. Policy efforts are dedicated to curtailing additional growth of cities with over one million inhabitants and better steering the development of smaller cities. In the international urban planning debate, Latin American provincial cities are mentioned as examples of cities with urban quality of life and a human size (Scarpaci 2005; Herzog 2006). On the other hand, smaller cities—like metropolises—also experience rapid physical and social transformations as a consequence of globalization. Although urbanization processes in smaller cities tend to be manageable for city planners (Bolay and Rabinovich 2004; Satterthwaite 2007: 3), nearly half the growth of the urban population worldwide is expected to derive from the expansion of small and intermediate cities between 2007 and 2025, thereby increasing the pressure on urban facilities (UN 2008: 8). CEPAL has therefore stated with respect to Latin American cities that: "their intermediate size does not, in and of itself, guarantee them a bright future" (CEPAL 2000: 11).

Intermediate cities are difficult to define accurately. Population size may be an indication (Rondinelli 1983; Hardoy and Satterthwaite 1986), but because different definitions apply in different countries, a settlement of a few thousand may count as a city in one country, whereas in another country the minimum may be 20,000 inhabitants (Satterthwaite 2007: 7). Some authors therefore advocate a classification based on economic functions and ranking in the national hierarchy of cities (Lindert and Verkoren 1997).

The cities featured as case studies in this research are Riobamba and Cuenca, two provincial capitals in the highlands of Ecuador. Riobamba is the capital of the centrally located Chimborazo Province and Cuenca that of the southern province of Azuay. Both cities are important provincial commercial centers, and both unmistakably joined global networks and economies at the end of the twentieth century. Based on their rankings in the national hierarchy of cities and on their size and functions, Riobamba and Cuenca are defined in the literature as "intermediate cities" (Bromley 1979; Larrea 1986; Lowder 1990, 1997; Schenck 1997). This study is focused on how different groups of citizens make the city their home.

Two Cities, Two Perspectives

Like everywhere else, some people who live in Riobamba and Cuenca have occupations that involve making homes and arranging public space. In this study I describe them as professionals. They hold a university degree in architecture and are entitled to use the title *Arquitecto* before their name. They are architects, designers, urban planners, or urban developers, as well as politicians, entrepreneurs, university lecturers, or policy makers. Many registered architects do not derive their main income from producing designs, and many hold several paid positions at once. They tend to be high in the social hierarchy, in part because of the prestige associated with the Arquitecto title (Hirschkind 1981: 256).

Professionals engaged in architecture and urban planning therefore often have the occupational authority to determine the appearance of important venues in the city, and how urbanites are presented in the built environment. David Harvey has asserted that ongoing progress in architecture and urban development gave rise to a planning elite that increasingly controlled the representation of citizens in urban space:

> [T]here arose a whole host of professionals—engineers, architects, urban planners, and designers—whose entire mission was to rationalize the fragments and impose coherence on the spatial system … . These professionals, whose role became more and more marked as progressive urban reformers acquired political power, acquired as deep a vested interest in the concept of homogeneous, abstract, and

objective space as their professional confrères did with respect to the concrete abstractions of time and money. (Harvey 1985: 14–15)

Considering this power is essential in examining the role of professionals in arranging the city. In addition to being professionals and makers of urban space, however, the members of this research group are citizens and residents of the city. They live, work, engage in leisure pursuits, and raise their children there. How they view the city in their work is thus determined in part by their personal experiences as residents and users of the urban space.

At the other end of the spectrum are citizens who construct their own residential environment, as no other housing is available for them: they are residents of working-class neighborhoods. In addition to being residents and users of the urban space, they design and build their own homes, although they are rarely professionals. Residents of working-class neighborhoods come primarily but not exclusively from lower social classes. As citizens, they often feel overlooked by the government and sense that they have to make a far greater effort than residents from higher social classes to call attention to their residential environment. Still, they have acquired a certain power and say over their residential area, because they operate partially within and partially outside the local rules and regulations.

Professionals and residents of working-class neighborhoods encounter one another in their respective roles of professional designers, house builders and urban planners on the one hand and self-builders on the other hand, where—in controversial terms—the two groups face off as highly educated experts versus self-taught individuals with low levels of formal education. In addition, professionals and residents of working-class neighborhoods engage as policy makers and implementers versus citizens with rights and obligations. The policy makers and implementers are responsible not only for formulating the rules but also for enforcing them. In practice, local problems arise with policy implementation and enforcement alike. Residents of working-class neighborhoods, as well as professionals, take advantage of this lack of enforcement in the building process, so that legal activities become intertwined with illegal ones. The legal status of buildings and the legal position of owners and residents are often complex and unclear.

Both groups of urbanites try in their own way to improve residential quality in the city. They are all residents of the same city, although they come from different spheres, social networks, and cultural backgrounds. Architects tend to regard themselves as members of the local middle class or the elite, whereas most residents of working-class neighborhoods describe themselves as lower-middle class or as urban poor. Different balances of power and identifications therefore figure in the interactions between the groups. They are framed by the perception of social class differences in the Andes (Hirschkind

1981; De la Cadena 2000; Whitten 2003: 23–24), in which the class concept is not used according to the Marxist meaning based on division of production but as a constellation of different indicators relating social status groups to their chances in society (Portes and Hoffman 2003: 43).

Sometimes the social worlds of architects and residents of working-class neighborhoods overlap. In one of the neighborhoods studied, for example, lives a young, locally trained architect who knows the established professionals in the center and consequently wears both hats: that of a neighborhood resident and that of a highly educated architect. In other cases, residents and professionals also turn out to know the same people through their work or via the organizations in which they are active. Because Riobamba and Cuenca are not metropolises but intermediate cities with a relatively small territory, interactions between the makers, residents, and users of the urban space occur inside a limited area, thereby intentionally or unintentionally leading to more frequent contacts than in metropolises. As a researcher, I enjoyed the benefits that the spatial scale of the provincial city offered, making research through participant observation among two groups of urbanites perfectly feasible.

Understanding the developments in these cities required transposing the spheres of professionals onto those of residents of working-class neighborhoods. This yields an impression of a city where both groups either distinctly or interactively design places to live and attribute meaning to those places. The central question in this book is therefore as follows: How does the relationship between the views and approaches of professionals on the one hand and residents of working-class neighborhoods on the other hand influence the city as a place of residence? The double perspective of professionals and residents of working-class neighborhoods and the choice of two case studies (Riobamba and Cuenca) allows for a glimpse across the social boundaries of one research group and across the physical boundaries of one city, in an effort to supplement broad knowledge about provincial cities in the Andes.

This is theoretically important, because economic globalization and the influence of neoliberal policy have focused interest in urban studies primarily on what are known as World Cities and Megacities. The most and least functional cities receive academic consideration: functional, predominantly Western World Cities (e.g., Sassen 1994, 2002), and dysfunctional, predominantly non-Western Megacities are discussed the most in urban studies (e.g., Gilbert 1996; Caldeira 2000; Goldstein 2004; Koonings and Kruijt 2007, 2009). Cities that are less numerically remarkable are not addressed in the academic debate. This distinction coincides in part with the geographic distinction between Western and non-Western areas. The consequence is an imminent analytical dichotomy between social and economically prosperous cities in the West and unsuccessful or underdeveloped cities outside that area (Robinson 2006). Robinson's recommendation in favor of studying "ordi-

nary cities" fits in a broader discussion framework in urban studies, which I will address when I describe how I conducted this study.

The awareness that urban life is layered and complex raises the question of whether knowledge of and about cities, in addition to providing insight into sections of the city, may also be conducive to progressive and multi-disciplinary insight into the city as a model. Urban anthropologist Ulf Hannerz (1980) believes that this is certainly a worthwhile objective. He asserts that urban anthropology should be about anthropology *of* the city rather than anthropology *in* the city to gain insight into the roles people adopt in different social domains of urban life (Hannerz 1980: 102–5), and into how these social actions are situated in place, space, and time:

> The city is a piece of territory where much human interaction is crammed in. … [I]t is the cityscape we have to attend to, an environment which urbanites have created for themselves and each other. … [I]n addition, we should try to get a sense of how the cityscape spells out society in general and their own community in particular to the people inhabiting it, and how it facilitates some contacts and obstructs others. (Hannerz 1980: 305–6)

Based on my examination of human interactions in the urban landscape, I will attempt in this study to make clear the social reality in intermediate Andean cities. Around the visible and invisible facets of city life, the contours of a model city will be perceptible. If such a model city emerges in this study, then it is a provincial city in the highlands.

The relatively small size of the cities that figure in this book is empirically relevant, because the different residential areas are in relatively close proximity. Since public transport is good and inexpensive in the cities studied, the poorer population is mobile and easily able to travel from the periphery to the inner city. In provincial cities, informal neighborhoods are not the vast, isolated areas found in cities such as Guayaquil and Lima. One of the consequences is that policy makers and politicians consider the problems related to housing and poverty to be less acute in smaller cities than in metropolises and are less inclined to design programs to address them. Basically, smaller cities often face an "inhibiting advantage": social–spatial problems seem proportionately less serious there than in metropolises and are therefore less likely to be addressed. The societal relevance of this study is the contribution to local policy debates about the social sustainability of cities. An awareness of urban transformations in a rapidly changing world may figure in policy decisions with the potential to protect smaller cities from becoming unlivable as a consequence of rapid growth or the major impact of economic globalization. Understanding the mechanisms of social and spatial transformation not only in metropolitan areas but also in non-metropolises is therefore important from a scholarly and societal perspective.

My decision to study Ecuadorian provincial cities took me to areas that usually exceed the scope of interest of urban studies. As a country, Ecuador is rarely a central academic focus (Whitten 2003), and studies about urban development and housing revolve primarily around Quito and Guayaquil. But the smaller cities in Ecuador offer an accurate impression of life in a society experiencing rapid economic and cultural changes influenced by globalization. This is because of the recent turbulent course of events in the country.

The years 1999 and 2000 marked a turning point in this recent history: following a severe economic recession in 1999 and a coup in 2000, in which the president was deposed, the dollar became the legal currency. This impacted the everyday life of the urban middle class. The national policy based on neoliberal principles coincided with decentralization of government responsibilities. Cities had to raise their profile to attract events and tourists. Due in part to the political and economic recession, migration to the United States and Europe increased, together with an influx of Peruvian and Colombian migrants to Ecuador. The outflow of labor migrants also coincided with an influx of foreign exchange, products, and ideas. Some foreign products and customs that migrants brought back home were absorbed in local ways of life. The urban middle class adopted a cosmopolitan lifestyle. In response, the cultural elite endeavored to protect national and local standards and values. Because of the extensive changes in the architecture and arrangement of the city, I will revisit ideas about urban space in various chapters. I will start with a review of relevant literature relating to anthropology of residential space, architectural theory, and urban studies.

Theoretical Framework

The Built Environment as a Social Phenomenon

The built environment is both a medium and an outcome of social intervention. The relationship between people and the built environment is dynamic and reflexive: we build the things we conceive, and our structures lead us to new ideas and approaches (Parker Pearson and Richards 1999). Examining processes for making and using buildings and spaces gives anthropologists insight into the cultural features of societies. In his theory about proxemics, for example, Edward Hall (1974, 1990 [1966]) has explained how inter-human distances in public spaces are constructed, and what this reveals about a society. Richardson (1982) describes the phenomenological experience of being-in-the-world for selected public spaces in Costa Rica. He reveals "how people incorporate material culture into the situation they are creating so that they can bring about unity between the situation and the material setting" (Richardson 1982: 423). Some authors (Humphrey 1988; Amerlinck

2001; Vellinga 2005) believe that anthropologists should focus more on how social interactions are embedded in certain places and in building than they do at present. This is especially true for Latin America, where, as Hernández postulates: "the fact that numerous socio-cultural differences coexist in the urban space of Latin American cities is a condition pregnant with opportunities for architectural exploration" (Hernández 2005: xiv).

If we want to know how intermediate cities changed in the late twentieth century because of the increasing international contacts, then examining the built environment, especially the residential environment, is a useful approach: "The house … is an extremely important aspect of the built environment, embodying not only personal meanings but expressing and maintaining the ideology of prevailing social orders" (Duncan 1981: 1). Considering the control that individuals have in a society over the architecture and use of space and the freedoms and limitations they have in making their residential environment a place of value provides insight into broader patterns of city life. In addition, local authorities deliberately depict provincial cities in the Andes as pleasant places to live, thereby making the residential environment a logical location for research on everyday life in such cities. Accordingly, this study addresses the social domain of living and the expectations and opportunities that the makers and residents in provincial cities have in this respect.

Research on the built environment has always been deeply divided by discipline. While architecture and art history deal primarily with exceptional and unusual forms of architecture, anthropology and geography focus mainly on traditional, broadly based, and everyday building methods. The interest of anthropologists in the built and inhabited space began in the nineteenth century with studies on the relation between use of space and social interactions in small residential communities, as exemplified by Morgan's study on domestic life among American Indians from 1881 (Morgan 1965 [1881]). With the rise of the Chicago School in the early twentieth century, ethnographic interest in inhabited space started to include urban studies and the changing social composition of residential neighborhoods.

Early studies about everyday architecture mentioned the merits of building traditions that had evolved from within the society, because they were often better suited to daily life than buildings designed on the drafting board (Rapoport 1969; Oliver 1975, 2003; Glassie 1975, 2000; Bourdier and Al-Sayyad 1989).

> The architect determines the forms that seem appropriate to the needs of a particular building or building complex within a society … . The individual within a tribal or folk culture does not become the form-giver for that society; instead he employs the forms that are essential to it, building and rebuilding within determinants that are as much symbolic as physical or climatic. (Oliver 1975: 12)

Anthropological study of popular architecture has benefited greatly from the work of Claude Lévi-Strauss. He became renowned for his structuralist analyses of indigenous architecture and residential buildings, which he interpreted as a representation of superior religious and social orders: a microcosm. In his definition of *sociétés à maisons*, he associates the home as a material and social unit with kinship relations (Joyce and Gillespie 2000). Later structuralists elaborated on aspects insufficiently addressed in his work, such as the role of architectural design in cultural dynamics (Bourdieu 1977, 1990; Carsten and Hugh-Jones 1995; Waterson 1997; Joyce and Gillespie 2000).

In addition to the cultural analysis of building traditions and architectural designs, American researchers focused mainly on the psychological, symbolic, and emotional meanings of residential settings (Duncan and Duncan 1976; Duncan 1981; Altman and Low 1992). James Fernandez regards the built environment as "a physical stimulus coupled with associations, recollections, recallings, memories of the past which arise by means of significant activities that take place in that space or by means of signs that are in some way attached to it" (Fernandez 1992: 216, see also 1984). Unless we understand the emotional and symbolic connotation that physical surroundings have for residents and users, he believes that we will be unable to fathom the social life. He uses an analytical distinction between metaphors and symbols to differentiate active from passive forms of non-verbal communication. Residential architecture may be regarded as a metaphor for social relations and lifestyles, as they are mediated through designs. Mendoza's (2000) anthropological study on dance in Peru is based on Fernandez's insights. She invokes design associations between ritual and everyday attire to argue that dance performances are a metaphorical arena for social claims. By the same token, I regard architectural statements as a performance asserting status claims or expressing social distinctions.

Architecture as a Cultural Representation

In the West, architecture is often associated with a specific quality standard. References to Architecture (with a capital A) concern an art, distinguishing it from building designs that are "ordinary" and are therefore not labeled as Architecture. In social science texts, art and refined cultural products are identified as high culture. High culture comprises sophisticated forms of art and culture, such as classical music, theater, literature, and architecture, where aesthetic and style principles are paramount. These are distinguished from less exclusive, everyday products considered to be popular culture. The analytical distinction between high culture and popular culture has deeply influenced ideas about culture in Latin America.

The difference between culture qualified as high and that qualified as popular is based on an evolutionary culture model that derives from Enlightenment thought. Culture and civilization in Western societies were regarded as superior to those in non-Western societies. This hierarchy was introduced not only between but also within societies, based on values presumed to be universal. A hypothetical division existed between refined and sophisticated art on the one hand and popular or "primitive" expressions on the other. Kantian ideas about the autonomy of cultural activities and individuals have fostered the idea that true artistic experience consists of an autonomous form transcending the function of objects. Conversely, forms arising from purely functional considerations are not art.

> High culture has used art as a key distinguishing mark, with the judgement that the aesthetic productions of the popular sectors do not qualify as art. Indeed the term "aesthetic" has been denied to works of popular art, given their embeddedness in ritual and other uses. (Rowe and Schelling 1991: 197)

Popular culture covers a far broader conceptual scope than high culture. A broad range of cultural expressions and products is attributed to popular culture, varying from craftsmanship, soap series, and pop music to tawdry art. This conceptual category depicts culture as being accessible to a general public, because no prior knowledge is required, regardless of whether such culture is produced through craftsmanship or industrially. The only element that these products have in common is that they do not meet the academic standards and values required of art but pertain to a residual category. That is also the analytical problem with this concept (Rowe and Schelling 1991: 2).

As stated, the continuum from "high" to "low" culture applies to architecture as well. Architecture with a capital A is associated with complex societies that have become highly specialized and is regarded as an exceptional cultural achievement exceeding the mundane and juxtaposed against structures regarded as mundane and "ordinary," as popular architecture. Whereas artistic architecture is a paragon of exclusivity, popular architecture exemplifies everyday traditions and routines. While artistic architecture may supersede its surroundings, popular architecture is embedded there. Old temples, medieval cathedrals, and contemporary monuments such as the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao, are regarded as high quality architecture. Farms, self-built homes in working class neighborhoods, and indigenous architecture from non-Western countries tend to be labeled as popular architecture. The distinction is packaged in normative and ideological qualifications, which have been addressed at length in academic debate, and which I depict here as the most important points of view.

Architecture originated as a superior artistic or scientific discipline in Paris during the eighteenth century. The École des Beaux Arts and the École Poly-

technique are considered the first two formal institutes of architecture instruction (Benevolo 1971: 5–9; Rabinow 1989: 47–57). The Beaux Arts program highlighted aesthetic refinement in architecture, while the polytechnic one stressed the technical and scientific design aspects. Classical views on beauty as a universal doctrine that links perception of beauty to the construction and function of a building thus countered the Kantian view, according to which beauty is a subjective perception allowing the idea and the expression of that idea in a building to prevail over its utility. These two views have alternated over the course of architecture history. The focus on building as an artistic pursuit or alternatively as a technical skill that benefited society defined university architecture curricula that emerged later on in Europe and served as models for architecture programs elsewhere in the world, including Ecuador.

An inventory of a few leading architecture books from recent decades reveals how embedded this distinction is in Western ideas about building. In the renowned series *Weltgeschichte der Architektur* edited by Nervi, the distinction between "primitive" and "sophisticated" architecture figures explicitly. The first volume in this series describes early high cultures in the West, followed by volumes dedicated respectively to trends in Roman and Byzantine architecture, books about medieval, Renaissance, and Baroque architecture, as well as architecture from the modern period. The final volume, which differs somewhat from the rest of the series, is entitled *Architektur der primitive Kulturen* (Guidoni 1976).

Since these books were published in the 1970s, the dominant paradigms in social sciences and humanities have changed. If published today, the title would probably be different. Still, the selection available in architecture bookshops tends to comprise two distinct categories that accommodate the interests of scholars in the discipline. On the one hand, there are studies on the art history or art theory of architecture in the West or about Architecture with a capital A exported from the West to other parts of the world. These studies relate to the Western canon of architecture history (Crysler 2003: 33). This segment rarely includes anthropological reflections. Paul Rabinow's (1989) analysis of nineteenth-century French architecture and James Holston's (1989) study of Brasilia's modernist architecture are the best-known exceptions (see also Fraser 1990; AlSayyad 1992).

At the other end of the spectrum are a great many anthropological publications about "traditional," "indigenous," and "unofficial" architecture in non-Western countries. Most specifically concern housing and domestic life. Rudofsky's (1998 [1964]) authoritative book *Architecture Without Architects* from the 1960s elicited widespread interest in cross-cultural inventories of indigenous architecture. Popular architecture all over the world was examined, but which selection criteria were applied? Rudofsky refers very generally to architecture "without a pedigree" to denote buildings by designers or builders

who are unknown or in any case not famous. Jean-Paul Bourdier and Nezar AlSayyad have used the term "traditional" as a comprehensive concept. They define traditional architecture as comprising both rural popular architecture and urban self-built homes. They argue that the term traditional eliminates the need for specific designations, such as vernacular, indigenous, primitive, folklorist, anonymous, and popular. The authors describe the traditional built environment as encompassing: "dwellings and settlements whose form originated out of cultural processes rather than specialized aesthetic judgments" (Bourdier and AlSayyad 1989: 6). Bourdier and AlSayyad do not deny, however, that the concept of traditional architecture also has shortcomings.

Paul Oliver, one of the best-known authors on popular architecture, does not take issue with the categories "high" and "popular." He distinguishes between "architecture of the people, and by the people, but not for the people" (Oliver 2003: 14; also see Storey 1994: 5). Oliver bases his distinction between popular architecture and professional architecture in part on the type of society in which architecture originates. According to his classification, indigenous architecture exists primarily in tribal societies, and he argues that societies with a planning elite no longer have "true" vernacular architecture. He acknowledges that some types of architecture are difficult to classify based on that model, but this observation is of no consequence for the distinction he applies. His book *Dwellings: The Vernacular House Worldwide*, for example, contains a chapter about self-built homes in working-class neighborhoods in large cities (Oliver 2003). Oliver asserts in this chapter that self-built homes may be regarded as architecture of the people, but that they cannot be labeled a "new vernacular," as Lisa Peattie (1992) had suggested in an article. In response to her view that self-built homes also qualify as authentic popular architecture, he writes:

> If the waste products and discarded materials of the city are regarded as the "local materials and resources" some may consider these factors as justifying such an argument. However, though some settlements may have a phase when traditional houses are built on the fringe of a city, the majority of squatter houses are erected without a tradition. (Oliver 2003: 225)

Without a building tradition, there is no authentic popular culture, Oliver reasons. While there is a lot to say about the concepts of authenticity and tradition, addressing them in depth would exceed the scope of this book. All that matters in this context is that some authors have a rather evolutionist view of popular architecture.

Amos Rapoport disagrees with Oliver's approach. He believes that self-built homes in working-class neighborhoods are indeed specimens of vernacular design. He postulates a modeled continuum, extending from traditional, indigenous building styles (traditional vernacular architecture) to international, academically conceived construction methods (high architec-

ture). Along this continuum, explains Rapoport (1988: 55): "spontaneous settlements [are] closer to traditional vernacular than to any other type of environment and farthest from professionally designed, or 'high-style,' environments." Peter Kellett and Mark Napier (1995) elaborate on this view, warning readers against classifying architecture based on social typologies, as Oliver and Rapoport both do. They also regard self-built homes as a specific form of popular architecture, albeit from the perspective that owner-occupants have erected the buildings themselves in a setting that is not centrally planned. My objection to all the preceding definitions of popular architecture is that they rule out the involvement of professionals. In my study, I will reveal that self-builders often hire professionals at certain stages in the building process. The distinction between "of," "for," or "by" the people is thus not always possible with self-built homes. Nor is it always relevant for understanding the development of popular architecture.

Henry Glassie's description best approximates the Ecuadorian situation. Glassie (2000: 20) writes: "we call buildings 'vernacular' because they embody values alien to those cherished in the academy." Self-builders do not always design their houses according to an academic theory of ideology but may also use their personal ideas, desires, and needs. The definition provided by Glassie differs substantially from that of Bourdier and AlSayyad. Bourdier and AlSayyad argue that popular architecture does not derive from aesthetic ideas. The position that self-builders are driven exclusively by functionalist considerations has been adopted by Bourdieu (1986) as well and was later criticized for being deterministic. This study will reveal that Ecuadorian popular architecture does not correspond with the views of intellectuals and yet it is based on aesthetic ideas.

I agree with Kellett and Napier that social typologies cannot serve as indicators of popular architecture. Their suggestion that morphological features receive more attention does not seem like an adequate solution. Analyses according to this alternative method would also entail the risk of overlooking the social construction of categories. I therefore advocate greater consideration for the role of agents (self-builders, professionals) in the processes of building and living, including consideration for impressions and procedures alike. This brings to mind debates from the 1980s over the extent to which self-built homes were equivalent to DIY ones. At the time, Peter Ward (1982: 200) argued that self-built homes might involve different degrees of paid labor and did not exclude commissioning expertise. In my view, the same holds true for the notion of popular architecture: popular architecture in urban settings does not rule out involvement from professionals. The degree to which architecture is qualified as high or popular or as artistic or traditional is a social construct of both intellectuals on site and scholars in international academia.

Balances of power obviously figure in the social construction of architecture. The makers and public of high culture generally have a privileged social status, commensurate with an advanced education and socioeconomic prestige. High culture thus pertains to the elite:

> This [high] culture differs from all other taste cultures in that it is dominated by creators—and critics—and that many of its users accept the standards and perspectives of creators. It is the culture of "serious" writers, artists, and the like, and its public therefore includes a significant proportion of creators. (Gans 1999: 100)

Exhibiting good taste in cultural products may be an important mechanism for retaining control over resources and over symbolic representations of power. The cultural elite comprises architects and artists, "who as the inventors and professionals of the 'stylization of life' are alone able to make their art of living one of the fine arts" (Bourdieu 1986: 57). Because the cultural elite is regarded as a group of experts knowledgeable about good cultural representations, they ultimately determine what is labeled as cultural heritage as well (Bourdieu 1986; Garcia Canclini 1995: 109–15).

This system perpetuates itself through refined forms of expression that impart codes understandable only to insiders. In other words, members of the dominant social classes devise strategies they apply to monopolize knowledge of higher culture forms. Abner Cohen (1981) has postulated that the elite tries to keep knowledge of codes and use of symbols among its own to mystify its identity as a power group. As a consequence, these forms of expression are hard to fathom for people who do not associate with the cultural elite. While this does not make high culture impossible for a general public to appreciate, a public of non-insiders will probably perceive art differently from connoisseurs. Assessments of "beautiful" and "ugly" relate to what is familiar to the beholder. Applying knowledge about aesthetics thus gives rise to a social distinction between "connoisseurs" and "lay people." Good taste creates and represents the social hierarchy.

Prior knowledge necessary to comprehend high culture is derived in part through education and in part through gradual familiarization with the codes.

> A work of art has meaning and interest only for someone who possesses the cultural competence, that is, the code, into which it is encoded. The conscious or unconscious implementation of explicit or implicit schemes of perception and appreciation … is the hidden condition for recognizing the styles. (Bourdieu 1986: 2)

The educated cultural elite thus obtains a monopoly on making and consuming high culture, as well as a symbolic means for distinguishing itself from the people. Less educated groups lack the knowledge to draw a qualitative distinction between expressions of the mundane and the sublime. As a consequence, Bourdieu believes that their aesthetic taste reflects "a systematic

reduction of the things of art to the things of life" (Bourdieu 1986: 5). The utility of the products they make and consume is presented as their main concern. This deterministic perspective, which also appears in the work of Bourdier and AlSayyad (1989), has been debated in social science because of the lack of interest in the performative nature of taste constructs (see Hennion 2007).

Perceiving popular and high culture forms in different gradations nurtures political ideals. The civilization notion that characterizes social-democratic and Christian-democratic ideology is based on the idea that promoting the dissemination of high culture may give rise to a better society. If those lower down in the social hierarchy become familiar with sophisticated cultural expressions, they will have greater freedom and will be able to make their lives more meaningful (Blokland 1997). The rise of Cultural Studies as a discipline in the twentieth century, for example, aroused new interest in the analytical distinction between high and popular culture and in the social issue of disseminating culture (Storey 1994). Early twentieth-century conservative and Marxist scholars based their positions on the civilization ideal. They argued that popular culture and mass culture comprised unauthentic manifestations alienating humanity from "true" culture, which was why people needed to be protected from themselves: "The Lords of kitsch … exploit the cultural needs of the masses in order to make a profit and/or to maintain their class rule" (Macdonald 1957: 60). The idea that society needed to be protected from cultural homogenization was adopted by architects all over the world (Ellin 1996).

In the 1980s and '90s academic interest shifted from cultural products to the social groups that constructed the distinction between high and low and the processes constructing or neutralizing that difference. In addition, scholars emphasized increasingly that the analytical distinction between high and popular culture has shortcomings, not only because it implies a social hierarchy, but especially because researchers are often lured into a form of social messianism: identification with people from lower social classes to whom they attribute popular culture. Social messianism in fact covertly adds emphasis to the hierarchical distinction: "the opposition high culture/popular culture is not symmetrical, and simply reversing it does not help in getting rid of the distortions it generates" (Rowe and Schelling 1991: 197). Identifying with the marginalized does not enhance understanding of social relations, according to these critics.

Considering shifts in how popular architecture is conceptualized makes sense not only from a policy perspective. There is an ethical connotation as well. Emphasizing the distinction between "architecture with architects" and "architecture without architects" romanticizes the latter and makes it more exotic (Crysler 2003: 20). On this subject, Nezar AlSayyad wrote the following in the 1980s:

There is an implied bias in our work toward preserving what can still be preserved of traditional dwellings and settlements. This bias seems to stem from the fear that if these settlements change, as some of their residents may desire, we will lose our research subjects and hence our means of livelihood. As a discipline, the study of traditional dwellings and settlements, no matter how young, seems to have fallen into the trap of constructing a social reality dependent on its own particular jargon. (AlSayyad 1989: 530)

Studies about vernacular architecture have changed little over the past decade. Independently built, traditional architecture remains the main focus, perhaps even more so than in the past (Vellinga 2005).

However important these studies are for preserving and imparting indigenous building traditions in danger of disappearing due to globalization, new types of popular architecture merit consideration as well. Irene Cieraad (1999), who conducted anthropological research on Western domestic space, has deplored the minimal anthropological interest in housing in Europe. She believes that unilateral Western interest in non-Western houses entails the evolutionist assumption that in modern Western societies the relationship between citizens and their architecture and use of space has disintegrated. I argue that the same holds true for the minimal anthropological interest in Western-looking houses elsewhere in the world. Homes that look "international" or Western are often automatically dismissed by researchers as "unauthentic" and consequently as not worth researching. The social and cultural shifts underlying the new design therefore tend to be overlooked. This is still truer in smaller towns than in metropolises.

Some authors believe that the distinction between high and low culture presents special problems for cultural analysis of Latin America, because aesthetic and use quality usually coincide in artistic expressions there (Rowe and Schelling 1991; García Canclini 1995). High culture and popular culture are so intertwined there that conceptual distinction becomes impossible: "Just as the opposition between the traditional and the modern does not work, so the cultured, the popular, and the mass-based are not where we are used to finding them" (García Canclini 1995: 2). García Canclini therefore labels these mixed varieties as hybrids. His theory about hybrid cultures has elicited extensive criticism as well. If all culture in Latin America is hybrid, individual assessments become impossible to make. Moreover, his theory reflects evolutionist principles, because he regards hybridization as a progressive process of intermingling, in which previous stages were by definition less sophisticated (Ouweneel 2005: 124). The general observation is that while hybrid culture specimens are easy to identify in Latin America, they are difficult to define (Salman 1996).

In this study I use the concept of architecture in a general sense that encompasses both the design and the physical structure of buildings according

to the broadest scope of the term: Architecture with both a capital A and a lower-case a. To provide the most equivalent possible descriptions of the views of different actors on residential environment, I note which design elements were fashionable at a specific point in a certain social circle, and how this fashion was created or transformed. That relates to my theoretical approach of the city as a social-symbolic arena, which I will explain below.

Architecture is never timeless (Rybczynski 2001: 47). Because architectural design depends in part on the technological means and cultural standards and customs, architecture is associated with the period and society where it is produced and used. In societies where people have little knowledge of each other's activities, they derive information primarily from material signs and performative relations (Veblen 1957 [1899]; Bourdieu 1986; Colloredo-Mansfeld 1999: 200). By regarding architecture as a contingent activity, the urban space may be viewed as a medium *and* as the outcome of social action, with specific consideration for the expressive and dramaturgical aspect of architecture as a performance. This enables architecture trends to be placed at a certain juncture in time and the actors and ideas or ideologies behind the manifestations to be visualized.

Architectural changes are of special anthropological interest, because they denote social transitions. Like dress and dance, architecture is an effective identity marker that is sensitive to fashions and trends.

> [F]ashions are the obvious example here of the way tendencies toward competition stimulate cultural flux, in many fields ranging from clothing to the latest in intellectual -isms. What is sought here, obviously, is often less a sense of absolute originality than that of belonging to the select, or at least not to a hopelessly outdated minority. And when one no longer shares a fashion only with the right people, it is time to move on. (Hannerz 1992:135)

People who (temporarily) conform to shared expression forms exude a non-verbal collective identity. Those introducing variations to the conventional pattern contribute to changes and innovations in the conventional fashion trends. If the deviations from the norm become excessive, individual conduct may be corrected by the rest of the group, until a new norm emerges. In addition, a group may decide collectively that the time has come for innovation. They are the avant-garde.

In modern, urban societies, architectural design trends succeed one another fairly rapidly: "It is not buildings that change, but architectural fashions" (Rybczynski 2001: 50). Architectural standards that prevail for a while as a convention and subsequently remain recognizable are referred to in the literature as architectural styles. Rybczynski asserts: "If style is the language of architecture, fashion represents the wide—and swirling—cultural currents that shape and direct that language" (2001: 51). Style denotes a transcen-

dental idiom, fashion a variable cultural context, in which morphological conventions and innovations come about.

The variable nature of fashions reveals nothing about how long a given trend will last. Some expression forms last for generations or return regularly, because they keep coming back into style (the prefix "neo" is added to the name of the style in such cases). Some styles last so long or return so many times that they ultimately become part of the cultural heritage. Certain buildings and design perspectives are preserved and remembered, while others are intentionally or unintentionally forgotten (Hernández 2005; see Shore and Nugent 2002: 13). Crysler (2003: 7) has written that "in the grand narratives of architectural history, certain buildings are excluded as 'real' architecture (vernacular or otherwise), and become invisible," although he adds: "Decades or centuries later, they are recovered because they are viewed as 'important' within a different discursive system." The leading notions and built representations determine architectural standards in a society. Such standards may limit individual makers and users of the urban space, as I will demonstrate in the following chapters.

Latin American Cities and Social Inequality

Twentieth-century geographers and sociologists have conducted extensive studies on Latin American urbanization patterns, uncontrolled urban growth, and the advantages and disadvantages of self-building as a housing option. The urbanization model of Griffin and Ford (1980), which was based on models from the Chicago School, has guided ideas about Latin American cities. Their model diagrams the organization of Latin American cities. The central business district, the residential neighborhoods of the elite, and a commercial axis are the core elements. Around these elements other neighborhoods are concentrically situated, with the poorest and most recent ones farthest from the center. In a revised model from 1996, the authors have distinguished the historic inner city, which has a classical market function, from the central business district. They identify middle-class neighborhoods, gentrification processes, and shopping malls as well. This model has instigated debate over whether the development of Latin American cities differs from that of North American ones. While some authors note an essential distinction between cities in the United States and cities in Latin America (Ward 1993; Scarpaci 2005), others perceive only gradual differences (Barros 2004).

Interest in urban growth, informal neighborhoods, and self-built homes peaked in the 1960s and 1970s, thanks in part to the work of the architect John F.C. Turner (1968a, 1968b, 1976) and the anthropologist William Mangin (1967). Turner described settlement patterns of rural–urban migrants and argued that they compared the benefits of the location, the degree

of input they had about their home, and the residential attributes. According to Turner's theory, the individual housing decisions by large groups of rural migrants influenced the transformation of the city. Together, they believed, small-scale activities might help new neighborhoods consolidate.

The consolidation concept figures prominently in neighborhood studies. Consolidation entails expanding facilities and social networks, in conjunction with more solid legal claims to land and home (Keivani and Werna 2001). The design thus comprises a physical-spatial, a social, and a legal component. The physical-spatial component involves building homes (spatial densification) and installing basic facilities. The origins of neighborhoods help determine the pace of physical consolidation: an illegal invasion neighborhood develops differently from a site that was purchased legally but has been divided into lots and built up illegally. The legal status of land ownership, user rights, and ownership of buildings is highly complex and often obscure in practice, rendering the distinction between legal and illegal far from straightforward (Hardoy and Satterthwaite 1989: 25–29). The attitude of the local authorities determines the development opportunities of a neighborhood, as they decide whether to oppose, tolerate, or assist neighborhood residents in legalizing and installing basic facilities. The consolidation process is also influenced by the actions of a neighborhood organization and by social relations between neighbors. Neighborhoods where many households are related to one another or come from the same village function differently from neighborhoods with households representing a variety of backgrounds (Kellett 1999). All these factors combined determined the pace of neighborhood consolidation.

In their texts about informal neighborhoods, Turner and Morgan emphasized the benefits of self-building. They were criticized for abetting a neoliberal policy approach (Burgess 1982; Mathéy 1997). Researchers following in Turner's footsteps analyzed the emancipatory effect of having a say about housing. Many authors used models comprising multiple stages to explain how simple, temporary abodes were transformed into comfortable homes suitable for permanent habitation (Ward 1982; Gilbert and Ward 1985; Wiesenfeld 1997; Kellett 1999; Gough and Kellett 2001). In the models, stages of consolidation are distinguished according to the quality of building materials, the functional arrangement of the home, and access to basic facilities (Drummond 1981). Some include indicators about consumption and lifestyle. Individual scores are aggregated to reflect the consolidation level for the neighborhood as a whole (Ward 1982; Kellett 1999; Gough and Kellett 2001).

This interest in progressive housing was paralleled by a school of researchers that focused on community participation as a decisive factor for a livable neighborhood (Gilbert and Ward 1985; Gough and Kellett 2001). The leading paradigms in urban research of the 1970s indicate that a strong sense of togetherness exists among residents of working-class neighborhoods. The

authors suggested that residents of poor neighborhoods were more socially cohesive than residents of wealthy ones. According to this idea, poor neighborhoods were imbued with "neighboring," a neighborhood sentiment in which neighbors felt a common bond (García et al. 1999; see Forrest and Kearns 2001: 2130). This idea was based on various explanatory models.

Anthropologists following the tradition of Oscar Lewis attributed this bond to a shared destiny, arguing that residents of poor neighborhoods were stuck in a vicious cycle of cultural values, customs, and practices, perpetuated from one generation to the next—the "culture of poverty" paradigm (Lewis 1970). According to another, more structuralist explanatory model, the structure of urban society is the main reason why poor urbanites rely on each other. Lacking access to regular sources of subsistence, they are forced to form their own, informal society-within-the-society, even though that distinction between formal and informal is untenable in daily life (Perlman 1976). In these approaches, residents of working-class neighborhoods came to be regarded as group members, who formed a type of parallel society.

This biased and romanticized image of residents of working-class neighborhoods has elicited criticism (Forrest and Kearns 2001: 2131). The capricious sociopolitical processes that influenced urban development and the agency of residents started to receive greater consideration (Burgwal 1995; García et al. 1999; Greene and Ortúzar 2002; Greene 2003; Hernández et al. 2009). The health and environmental issues that complicated sustainable urbanization received greater consideration from the 1990s as well (Hardoy et al. 1990; Hordijk 2000).

By the end of the twentieth century, the urban space was taken for granted less and came to be seen more as a complex phenomenon, of which the social components needed to be identified. One of the dominant approaches, which derived from Marxist ideology, was the late-twentieth century city as the stage of a symbolic struggle:

> [T]he city and its periphery tend to become the arena of kinds of action that can no longer be confined to the traditional locations of the factory or office floor. The city and the urban sphere are thus the setting of struggle; they are also, however, the stakes of that struggle. (Lefebvre 1991: 386)

The city was perceived not only as the scene of a struggle between social classes, but the space itself became the stake of that struggle. According to Lefebvre's theory, social and capitalist relations come about via the social production of space. In addition to Lefebvre, sociologists and geographers influenced by him, including David Harvey, Edward Soja, and to some extent Manuel Castells, emphasized the reproduction of unequal political, economic, and social relationships in the late-twentieth century city and investigated how this inequality might be resolved.

The City as an Arena

Lefebvre used the analytical distinction between lived, perceived, and conceived space to pave the way for a layered view of the contemporary city. His theory, however, is abstract and complex and is difficult to apply in ethnographic research. Based on Lefebvre's triptych, Setha Low (2000) introduced the dual concept of "social production" and "social construction" of space. That dual concept enables anthropological identification of the urban space as a social-symbolic arena. Low defines social production of space as "all those factors—social, economic, ideological, and technological—that result, or seek to result, in the physical creation of the material setting" (Low 2000: 127–28). Physical space arises from this process. She reserves the social construction concept of space for "the phenomenological and symbolic experience of space as mediated by social processes such as exchange, conflict, and control" (Low 2000: 128). These are the experiences of users who make physical space a meaningful place in daily life. According to her definition, social production thus basically reflects the macro processes determining physical space, while social construction denotes space as perceived in everyday use. These two concepts allow us to analyze the city as an arena and architecture as a social medium and outcome.

The built environment expresses identifications and generates social interactions. Richardson has asserted that "material culture is our intersubjective world expressed in physical substance" (Richardson 1982: 422). For a long time, theories on social interactions and identity theories were two separate disciplines that were considered incompatible. Early theories about social interaction primarily highlighted the strategic aspects of social action, whereas the identity theories related mainly to cognitive aspects and attribution of meaning. Ervin Goffman, as an exponent of the former group, analyzed the dramaturgical aspects of social interactions, revealing how individuals in interactions, despite social conventions, accommodate improvisation (Goffman 1990 [1959]; see also Biddle 1986; Holstein and Gubrium 2000: 35–37). As an eminent scholar of identity theories, Anthony Cohen formulated the following critique of Goffman's theory:

> Goffman's legacy to identity studies was intellectually seductive and profoundly damaging, because it overstated … the extent to which individuals and groups can control their own destinies. … It ignores self-consciousness, and the commitment made by individuals and, perhaps, groups to views of themselves which, contrary to another horrendously overused term in identity studies, they do *not* regard as "negotiable." (Cohen 2000b: 5, emphasis in original)

By highlighting social interactions, as Goffman does, Cohen argues that people are regarded too much as strategic operators and not enough as purposeful beings.

Other critics have noted the unclear definitions of concepts such as role, consensus, conformism, and role conflict. Lack of consideration for the contextual limitations of the theory, and the failure to make the links explicit between cause and consequence, between expectations, role, and conduct have elicited criticism as well (Biddle 1986). Giddens (1984) has noted Goffman's major contribution to understanding how "discursive consciousness" relates to "practical consciousness" but has argued that he insufficiently addresses subconscious and unexpected aspects of human action. Giddens emphasizes that people, despite being "knowledgeable agents" are not always in control of the consequences of their activities. The course of history is made up in part of these unintended consequences of human action. I agree with this line of reasoning. Although I regard my informants as people who know how to cope with ordinary situations, this does not mean that they are in control of the outcome of their actions. Nor does it mean that they can always explain their conduct in words.

But even though actions may have unintended consequences, people always retain a certain measure of agency, leeway, and opportunities for self-determination. By verbalizing the intentions and outcomes of actions, they tend, for example, to state their self-images or images of the Other verbally in firm and essentialist terms. They use essentialist language, as if a reality exists outside social constructs. This enables them to control social differences. According to authors such as Baumann (1999) and Eriksen (2002), this does not compromise the constructivist nature of the processes mediating perceptions and mutual positions. Baumann mentions a "dual discursive competence," where an essentialist discourse that informants use and the procedural nature of their identity constructs may converge analytically, assuming that "people know when to reify one of their identities, and they know when to question their own reifications" (Baumann 1999: 139). According to Baumann, we therefore need to take care not to depict our informants as victims of static impressions.

The problem with the constructivist approach is its excessive emphasis on narrative discourses and the consequent reduction of the culture concept to language and identity constructs (Bader 2001). Another question is whether informants are always aware of their reifications, as Baumann states. The Modernist discourse in architecture is an example of subconscious reification. Here, an architectural object is attributed a transcendental and autonomous status. The object takes on an inherent significance that is disassociated from its cultural and historic context (Lefebvre 1991; Ellin 1996; Crysler 2003: 58). A self-affirming discourse thus arises, in which architects and architecture critics associate the meanings they construct as autonomous qualities with artifacts. Such approaches are commonplace among architecture profes-

sionals, even though they are unable to justify in words why they subscribe to this view.

In this study I juxtapose the experiences of two different groups of informants (professionals and residents of working-class neighborhoods) to have them comment on each other's interpretations in the ethnography, so to speak. I describe the identification underlying their actions, their role in a given situation (for example as a designer, a builder, a resident, or a user), and how they perceive themselves there. What professionals view within their conceptual framework as an "inherent" spatial quality is often perceived by residents of working-class neighborhoods as constructed power symbols. The city is thus visualized as an arena, where residents of working-class neighborhoods and professionals operate from various backgrounds and in various capacities. This approach reflects consideration for both the strategic aspects of social action and processes intended to attribute meaning. Perceiving the city as an arena allows us to analyze how actors influence social patterns in the Ecuadorian provincial city. Architecture and use of space allows us to mediate and challenge social positions, self-perceptions, and images of the Other.

Viewing informants according to their roles in the social hierarchy of the city and the groups they identify with depicts the professionals in this study not merely as experts and residents of working-class neighborhoods not merely as indigent citizens but presents them as "knowledgeable agents," with an understanding of housing construction. In some cases professionals speak in their occupational capacity as architects, while in others they express themselves as members of the elite, as instructors, as residents of the city, and so forth. Residents of working-class neighborhoods are not exclusively (or primarily) poor citizens: they are also designers and builders with their own ideas and ideals, heads of households, spouses, urbanites, and rural or transnational migrants. In the chapters ahead I will describe several specific situations that I consider typical of the course of neighborhood and urban development.

Studying two groups in two different locations simultaneously compels researchers to engage in self-reflection. During my various stays between 1999 and 2009, the houses where I lived were between the geographic and social spheres of both groups of informants. In Riobamba I rented a room in the home of a Dutch acquaintance in a northern part of town, approximately ten minutes by bus from Cooperativa Santa Anita and a twenty-minute walk from the downtown area. In Cuenca I rented a small studio on the patio of a middle-class Cuencan family close to the northern ring road, also a ten-minute bus ride from Ciudadela Carlos Crespi and a twenty-minute walk from the Alcaldía or the University of Cuenca. These arrangements facilitated my mobility and personal safety while at the same time enabling me to invite neighborhood residents and architects to my home (see Appendix for the methodology).

In the preface I have explained that my contacts with architects differed from those with residents of working-class neighborhoods. Basically, my interactions with residents of working-class neighborhoods were more straightforward, precisely because our lives were so different. In addition to relating to professionals as a researcher would to study subjects, I addressed them as friends and colleagues. In Cuenca my contacts with professionals and residents of working-class neighborhoods alike were closer than with the two groups in Riobamba. The difference made me more sensitive to my own position and preferences. Interacting with architects—people whose education was similar to mine but had a different cultural background—confronted me with the similarities and differences in our ideas about architecture. Research among elite groups, according to Shore and Nugent (2002: 2), "obliges us to position ourselves more self-consciously in relation to the wider systems of power and hierarchy within which anthropological knowledge is constructed." The different ways that Ecuadorian professionals, self-builders, and I evaluate architecture are attributable in part to the knowledge systems in which we have been raised. Disciplinary differences between architects, artisans, and anthropologists, as well as differences between the academic traditions in Ecuador and the Netherlands, permeate our respective approaches.

Some authors emphasize that ethnography embodies an inherently unequal balance of power between subject and object, and that this imbalance manifests in relations with fellow intellectuals. They are easily reduced to informants, rather than being regarded as partners in a scholarly or social dialogue (Mato 2003; Mosse 2006). Other authors postulate that relations between Western researchers and their counterparts in other countries are not by definition hierarchical (Hendry 1997; Martinez 1997). Intellectuals, wherever they are, these authors argue, are "representatives of the system of epistemic domination. Location, here, is always crossed, and crisscrossed" (Moreiras cited in Baud 2003: 73, n.56). European and American intellectuals studying Latin America should therefore not automatically be differentiated from Latin American intellectuals examining their own society (Baud 2003). In all cases, the positions of those concerned relate to the people who are the subjects of their statements.

This takes me back to the relationship between researchers, professionals, and residents of working-class neighborhoods, between representation and self-representation. Anthropologists have long assumed that researchers empower socially more vulnerable informants by giving them a "voice" in ethnography. Conversely, anthropologists conducting research among elite groups often encounter filtering and self-censorship, in an effort to exclude undesirable information from the research (see Mosse 2006). In this study my fundamental principle has been to give equivalent representation to residents of working-class neighborhoods and professionals. As explained in note

1 in the Preface, I have applied this principle by anonymizing informants from both groups in the text wherever possible, except where official statements on record were concerned. The ethical and epistemological problem with conducting research among architects, however, is that authorship of their buildings is an important professional value. Refuting this value in an ethnography would be unethical. I have therefore attributed double identities to some architects in this book. As authors of a building or an article, they appear in their own name, whereas in all other cases I have given them an alias. I have made my own roles and views explicit wherever possible.

Although I will not discuss exhaustively different theoretical debates on role and identity theories in anthropology, sociology, and psychology, a few basic concepts require brief explanations. In this study I have used these concepts to disclose the nature of the social interactions. Roles are alternately regarded as representations of standards, attitudes, and social positions. A role is defined in general terms as a certain conduct by an actor in a specific situation and the expectation of this actor regarding the conduct of others. An actor's conduct is indeed related to his or her social identity. The role concept is defined in the literature as behavior actually exhibited; as a script for appropriate conduct; or as the figurative act in the metaphorical play, in which the actors perform (Hannerz 1980: 101–2; Biddle 1986: 71; Goffman 1990 [1959]). In this study I define the role concept as exercising rights and obligations compatible with a certain position during a social interaction. A role comprises different components and is carried out through verbal and non-verbal cues. Individuals do not passively perform the roles they are assigned but add substance to their roles during the interaction (Holstein and Gubrium 2000: 36).

The script of a role is the routine pattern of action the actor is presumed to follow (see Goffman 1990 [1959]: 27). Deviating from the routine of the script may give rise to false expectations, and conflicts may ensue. In some cases conflicts are resolved verbally, without leading to any activities. In other cases, those concerned pay lip service to a prevailing routine, although their actions differ in practice. To disclose the social production and social construction of space, I discuss the social and cultural identifications of those concerned, the roles they play, the routines they are expected to follow, their actual performance, and its consequences for the built environment. The city thus becomes a symbolic stage (Goffman) or an arena (Lefebvre, Low), where the actors continuously seek out new positions, depending on their role, and on how they view themselves and the Other.

My interpretation of the social production and construction of space concepts differs from the one originally proposed by Setha Low. This is because I focus not on inner-city public space but on the residential function of the city and on the process of developing homes. Another difference is that rather

than focusing primarily on the verbal facets of the struggle for space (Low 2000: 37), I also address attitudes and modes of action. Precisely because people's words often differ from their actions and vice versa, verbal aspects need to be related to non-verbal ones in an urban culture. The substantive areas I emphasize are different as well. In my view, Low regards social production of space too much in terms of abstraction and structure; in her definition, for example, she refers to "factors" rather than to "actors." She considers social construct to be the side where the actors become visible and refers to "experiences" there (Low 2000: 127–28).

My approach depicts interactions between those concerned during both the social production of physical space and its social construction. The difference between the two concepts in this study does not lie in the level of abstraction of the forces (macro/micro, structure/actor) but in the role they assume at that moment or the identity from which they operate. The ideas and intentions projected onto a physical space or building during the design and construction process by professional designers and by lay people and self-builders are the sphere of influence of the social production. The reactions of the surrounding residents and users to an architectural design, possible adjustments to the space used, and different meanings attributed to space figure in the social construction of space.

Structure of the Book

In the following chapter I review the history of the heydays and growth of cities in Ecuador and begin my exploration of the cities of Riobamba and Cuenca. That chapter is followed by five empirical ones. The sequence of the empirical chapters starts at the lowest scale, consisting of homes and public spaces in the two neighborhoods, and progresses to a higher scale, at which the neighborhoods are considered in their urban context. First, I describe life in the working-class neighborhoods and the opinions and attitudes of the residents. I then focus on the operational sphere of the professionals: the municipal scale. This sequence arises from my conceptual decision to start close to daily life, homes, and residential environment. But it also results from the course of my fieldwork. My insight into the goings on behind the scenes among the professionals came later than my insight into the course of events in the neighborhoods. The structure of the book therefore basically parallels the course of my research. The process extends from the emphasis on making space to thinking and depicting the city and living; from social production by self-builders and professionals to the social construction of space by members of both groups.

In chapters 2, 3, and 4, I review the origins of the two neighborhoods and describe how neighborhood residents build and view their residential surroundings. Chapter 2 is about the physical and social development of Co-operativa Santa Anita and Ciudadela Carlos Crespi. I relate how individual households, the residents as a collective, and external concerned parties influence that process. Patterns of cooperation and resistance determine the social and legal consolidation of the neighborhoods. This consolidation is not always progressive, as my reconstruction of neighborhood histories reveals. Cooperation and togetherness are important values in the social production and social construction of residential neighborhoods. Ceremonies and neighborhood festivals figure in constructing a group spirit. Because residents of working-class neighborhoods are concerned primarily with building their individual accommodations, however, and because individual interests may at times conflict with collective interests, the symbolic cohesive forces were challenged in both neighborhoods as well.

In chapters 3 and 4 I describe how neighborhood residents build their houses, and how they view the physical surroundings of their home. Chapter 3 is about the social production of houses. I describe the virtually continuous process of building and rebuilding and the rituals that attribute meaning to the process at certain stages of construction. In Chapter 4 I highlight the social construction of a comfortable and respectable home, addressing architecture as a vehicle of communication and representation. I describe how neighborhood residents assess each other's houses, and how they use the design to make their home and their immediate residential surroundings a meaningful composite. I convey diagrammatically how architectural components are generally appreciated, and which architectural styles are in fashion.

In chapters 5 and 6 I describe the debates that engaged the professionals in Cuenca and Riobamba. These debates shed light on prevailing views about the city and about housing. Chapter 5 features the debate about what is known as "migrant architecture" in the Cuenca region. I relate the opinions and manner of the debate to the two hats professionals wear as experts and as members of the cultural elite. Their idealized impression of the city and of the social-geographical distinction between city and countryside is changing rapidly due to globalization. In the outlying areas of the city, emancipated transnational migrants have built comfortable and in many cases striking houses, which the professionals believe compromise the landscape attributes. At the same time, professionals view this practice as eroding their monopoly on architectural representations. They propagate a different architecture. In Chapter 6 I address professional debates in Riobamba about the disordered city. The quest for an urban form that represents the multicultural society coincides with the fear of rising visibility of indigenous groups in the city. I relate the lack of clear spatial policy to the ideological and political divisions

among the professionals. In the final chapter I revisit the theoretical debates. In conclusion, I elaborate on the construction of local identities and the relation to the urban territory and residential architecture. I summarize how the relationship between professionals and residents of working-class neighborhoods furthers the development of provincial cities as residential ones, and which opportunities are available to poor groups of residents there.