

DOWNTOWN COMMUNITY PLAZA AND ITS USERS: A STUDY OF THE URBAN PUBLIC SPACE IN GAINESVILLE/FL

Renata de Godoy

Post-doc research assistant at *Universidade Federal do Pará*,
Brazil (UFPA),
PPGA/PNPD Capes

godoy@ufpa.br

renata.godoy2@gmail.com

Downtown Community Plaza and its users: a study of the urban public space in Gainesville/FL

Renata de Godoy

Historial do artigo:

Recebido a 12 de setembro de 2016

Revisto a 09 de outubro de 2016

Aceite a 30 de outubro de 2016

ABSTRACT

This article presents results from an ethnoarchaeology research that intended to assess current acknowledgement about a battle field site in a public space, today mostly used by homeless people. As hands on experience to learn from urban environment, the Downtown Plaza in Gainesville/FL was a case study for a project that intended to investigate social behavior in a contemporary urban public space. Looking for understanding better results of social interaction from observation and personal interviewing the data were translated into a behavioral mapping. This research made me rethink about the public spaces I always believed to be communal; studying the spaces at the Plaza changed my perspective. As an archaeological study, this research helps as source for understanding the transformation of this space over the centuries, including the dynamics of the urban environment.

Key-words: Urban Archaeology, Ethnoarchaeology, Archaeology in Contemporary Societies.

RESUMO

Este artigo apresenta os resultados de uma pesquisa etnoarqueológica que pretendeu identificar ciência pública acerca de um sítio do tipo campo de batalha em uma praça na cidade de Gainesville, na Flórida/EUA, naquele momento utilizada durante o dia especialmente por pessoas sem teto. Como forma de experiência prática em ambientes urbanos, esta praça foi um estudo de caso interessante para aprender sobre comportamento em espaços públicos contemporâneos. Todos os dados obtidos através de observação e entrevistas pessoais foram interpretados em forma de mapa. Esta pesquisa incentivou a reflexão sobre espaços públicos teoricamente comunais. Como pesquisa arqueológica, esta pesquisa propõe compreender uso e transformações do espaço ao longo de séculos, incluindo as dinâmicas próprias do meio urbano.

Palavras-chave: Arqueologia Urbana, Etnoarqueologia, Arqueologia das Sociedades Contemporâneas

1. Introduction – why and how study the Plaza

As a pilot project for my doctoral research in Brazil, Brasília (1), the project intended to investigate social behavior in a contemporary urban public space. The site chosen for this proposal was the Downtown Plaza, in Gainesville/FL, which is a public urban space day-by-day frequented by homeless grouping, but also used to cultural events, open markets and other entertainment (see Figure 1.). Gainesville is a medium-sized city located at north-central Florida in the United States of America, home of the University of Florida.



Figure 1. Pictures taken of the Plaza in February of 2007. **Source:** Renata de Godoy.

The main goal of this project was to register the every-day life in a plaza, in order to map each activity with its material culture. Using a twofold field methodology, such as observation in different days of the week and in different periods of the day, and interviews, this study proposed to register who are the people, why they chose the Plaza to be at the moment and the frequency of this visitation. Moreover, to register each act that does not leave material remains.

In addition to the remarkable opportunities the archaeologist can find while investigating plazas, the Downtown Community Plaza in Gainesville is also a historic site. This Plaza was a place in which occurred one of the most important historical events of the city. During the United States Civil War, Gainesville served as a major Confederate Commissary and the area that today is known as downtown was the site of one of the many battles. There, one small battle of the American Civil War happened, known as The Battle of Gainesville. The battle itself took place on 1864 (see Figure 2.).



Figure 2. Plaque informing history of the Battle of Gainesville. Source: Renata de Godoy.

The study of the archaeological heritage in the urban environment has always been my personal goal as an archaeologist. I have proposed an archaeological chart for a colonial city for master dissertation, and later investigated a metropolitan area and its assemblage of archaeological sites for my doctoral thesis, always in Brazil where I come from and work. In 2007 I found in Gainesville, FL, conflicted interests regarding the Plaza space, it seemed an excellent timing to investigate its past, present and future. According to Low and Smith (2006) the city has been undertheorized by anthropology, because this line of inquiry has not had a major theoretical impact. Also anthropologists have been hesitant to participate in, if not totally absent from, urban policy debates.

It has been a controversy to conceptualize the city. Some argue it is a physical structured place shared by heterogeneous groups, some relate it to density, or to size. I think none of these

factors matter the most, an urban environment should be understood as a combination of socio-politico-economic structures and the physical apparatus used in their operation.” (LEEDS, 1977: 330) For social scientists, attempts to define city have come later, and until the 1950s it was usual to find urban definitions related to outdated ideas such as levels of evolution, civilization, class hierarchy, and literacy. Among many ways for defining what a city is, the heterogeneity attribute is still one of the most unanimous characteristics of the urban environment. A city is the space where individuals are gathered to share living, regardless of ethnic, religious, political, or economical differences.

Definitions of public space can be very broad, and they also differ in time and place. The most straightforward way of understanding a public space is by contrast to what is private space. This idea is not only overly simplistic and vague, but also questionable. Broader notions of the public space relate on its abstractedness quality, including in this category non-traditional places such as cyber space and political arenas and defining it as “*the range of social locations offered by the street, the park, the media, the Internet, the shopping mall, the United Nations, national governments, and local neighborhoods*” (LOW and SMITH, 2006: 3). Other approaches assume a sort of existential vision of what constitute the public space, as “open spaces in cities as places to celebrate cultural diversity, to engage with natural processes and to conserve memories (...) where one can transcend the crowd and be anonymous or alone (THOMPSON, 2002: 70), which includes at least two very common units in cities worldwide: parks and plazas.

One possible element of this apparatus is the space known as plaza, another controversial concept, commonly related to the model brought to the Americas by European colonizers. Regardless its structure, morphology, or size, the plaza is the major open public space of an urban environment, it is a space where one finds social interaction among different genders, ages, political and economical status individuals. In theory it is a space of heterogeneous relations. According to Low (2000: 32) the plaza provides a physical, social, and metaphorical space for public debate, cultural expression, and artistic interaction.

One can find on the internet diverse sorts of uses for the Plaza. Spring 2007 during the research, it was a major site for cultural festivities of Gainesville. At that time there was an annual schedule publicized by the city of Gainesville Division of Cultural Affairs including art festivals, Jazz festivals, New Year’s Eve countdown, weekly music entertainment, and the ice-skating rink.

I was not able to observe these sorts seasonal uses of the Plaza because the fieldwork happened during February to April of 2007. The Spring Art Festival occurred during my last weekend of field observations, however it was located away from the Plaza and the changes related to this event did not strongly affected the daily life at the Plaza. Nor was my intention to gather secondary data from local publication or journals. My main purpose was to gather additional data directly related to the informants opinions’ vis-à-vis everyday uses of the early XXI Century, which may be used in the future as an ethnographic source for understanding the transformation of this space over the centuries, including the dynamics of the urban environment.

2. Materials and Method

The proposal was conducted using two different approaches throughout the fieldwork: observation and informal interviews. Due to the limited time, the fieldwork was intended to register the usual everyday activities such as: the groups’ period of presence in the Plaza contrasted with what it is performed there; the relations between groups or between

individuals; the variation of activities versus weekdays and weekends; the material cultural remains resulted from each activity.

The first strategy is observation, which concerned the understanding and the registration via sketch map of the daily activity at the Plaza. The goal while performing the observation was to map the various uses of the Plaza. The secondary objectives in this phase was at first to get acquainted with the study object, to try understanding roughly what, how, and why each group or individual is doing in this public space. By using a lay out of the plaza structures (immobile elements like benches, trees, and constructed elements; mobile elements such as food vending), the mapping consisted in locating groups, and pointing the activities performed by them. The result of the mapping is the zoning plant draft that demonstrates the pattern of daily occupation of the plaza, which will be explained later.

The second approach was the informal interviews, which occurred on March 25, April 1, and April 12 of 2007. After acquiring a sort of familiarity with the study object, which definitely facilitated my approach since most of the users were aware of me using this space, I investigated experiences regarding the individual meanings of this public space. For this stage I decided to apply a method of interview described by Douglas (1985: 25) as creative interviewing, which “involves the use of many strategies and tactics of interaction, largely based on understanding friendly feeling and intimacy, to optimize cooperative, mutual disclosure and a creative search for mutual understanding”, searching for deeply inputs not merely opinions. Also known as person-centered interviews, this method is ideal to assess different points of view. According to Bernard and Hollan (1998), there is no manual or more reliable technique for person-centered interviews, and indeed each interview was unique even though following the same basic structure. Semistructured method contributed to broaden the range of themes included, which varied according to each interviewee.

Since I worked with a very small sample, much more related to qualitative research, I felt it was more efficient if I get to know better each person, if I get to know even why one was willing to dialogue. I established a guideline of the information I was looking for, but I preferred to let each of the informants ask their own questions, exchange opinions, and let them free to talk about any topic. During each conversation, I tried to direct the subject for my goals, sometimes asking directly, sometimes not asking at all. I agree it is a satisfactory and pleasant approach, but it is much better applied for long terms investigations.

The general questions I asked are varied according to the subject each one was eager to discuss with me: some wanted to pour personal and family issues out, some wanted to complain about politics or sports. In general I achieved my goals since 9 of 10 individuals (2 interviewed essentially responded my basic questions: why are you here? Do you like the plaza? Are you acquainted with anybody who frequents the plaza?). For some interviewees, I was able to ask other questions, such as: Where are you from? Where do you live? How long have you used the plaza? Why are you sitting here and not there? Do you know about the history of the plaza? How was the plaza some years ago? Do you think it has changed? Where would you be if you were not here? The interviews outcome will be exposed later.

I experienced some problems during the fieldwork in both stages of the proposal. The most important is related to the restricted time I had to achieve my goals. I believe I was able to perform most of the objectives, but to really understand the dynamics of this public place I would have to experience the environment in everyday basis, moreover I would need to spend whole periods there. Because of that all the results presented in this paper are preliminary.

The other major methodological problem was the photograph register. One of the observation phase strategies was to record some those activities in pictures as well. However, I felt uncomfortable to do it before I introduced myself and explained my purposes to the users. After 5 visits, including one day of interviews, I felt it was about time to start taking the pictures on April 1st, which I did. I received three hostile reactions related to the photographing, even after I explained nobody would be identifiable. Because of that I decided to photograph again only during my last visit.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Results from the observation stage

I performed this stage during 11 visits in 2007, in which I was able to differentiate everyday occupation and activities in weekdays and weekends patterns (3). Doing so I tried to understand how social exchanges and daily uses of the material setting actually transforms the public space into a meaningful reality, key to recognize human activities as a whole at the Plaza and its surrounding spaces. These processes leave material evidences in the urban space, conveying information that can be analyzed in order to understand human behavior. They translate physically, historically and conceptually social relations and social practice in space, showing “people as agents constructing their own realities and symbolic meanings”, also defined as the social production of space (LOW, 2000: 127).

My original goal was to distinguish the use also in relation to periods of the day. Unfortunately I could not visit the Plaza in such a varied manner in order to confirm continuity, but I was able to observe the spaces during late mornings, noon periods, afternoons, and in evenings. In two occasions I observed the Plaza in distinguish situations: March 29th late at night (after 10pm), and April 10th I did it early in the morning, which was a cold rainy morning. The density level presented remarkable variation, it is much more related to specific situations such as the time the Salvation Army serves meals, or the time the buses are stopped there, so the differences I made are roughly based on what I experienced during my visit hours.

The constructed space is very symmetric, even benches and vegetation follow a symmetric pattern. The only asymmetrical structure is the RTS unit. I have also noticed physical changes regarding the substitution of woodchip mulch for grass of the middle of the Plaza (where months before there was the ice-skating rink), which according to one of my respondents was replanted on March 30th; and vases of flowers all over the place, again according to the same respondent, someone brought the flowers on April 9th.

Considering the limited sample I gathered, the results of this stage are exposed at the zoning map, which demonstrates such similarities and differences in the use of the space. I divided the Plaza in zones regarding occupational density, which is one of the main differences of weekdays and weekends, activities, level of heterogeneity, and internal and external transitory spaces. The heterogeneity is due to relations among individuals: it is homogeneous the space where one knows others, where one interacts with others, and where the group performs the same activity.

I could identify a very distinguished space among the entire Plaza because it is the one always occupied regardless the period of the day, or even the weather conditions. This space is always related to social interaction; it is a place of acquainted individuals who gather round to talk, or to play cards, to spend the day. I categorized this space as ‘deviant social space’ for several reasons more clearly explained on the interview stage results. It is clearly a space an outsider is

not welcomed to, where everybody knows each other. For this reason I classified it as homogeneous.

The 'social space' is the place I felt comfortable to sit at, and where I performed my fieldwork. It is also a place of social interaction, of acquainted individuals, but one can see different persons performing other activities there, such as studying or eating alone (it is right next to the hot dog vendor). For this matter I classified it as heterogeneous. The 'social space' is not as crowded, nor is its occupation as continuous as the 'deviant social space'. In a rainy day, late at night or early in the morning it is usually empty.

The 'benches area' received the same classification as the 'social space', since it is not occupied by a big homogeneous group, nor it is occupied all the time. I observed there several times individuals by themselves, or small groups of three persons, sharing the same area but with different reasons. The major differences of this two space categories is the density and activities, being the 'social space' more densely, more frequently occupied, and with larger variety of activities.

The 'corner areas' are very similar to each other: they have periods of occupancy highly dependable of the time of the day, or the motivation, but in general they are used by homogeneous groups. I register two distinguished occupancies, both ephemeral: the left corner is used to serve lunch on Sundays, so its use is related to this activity, by individuals sharing the same motivation. The left corner is a space where small groups gather round to talk, during the weekdays I noticed persons with work uniforms who use the public transportation just grouped by the stage gossiping, laughing, very comfortably; during the weekends I noticed small groups assemble just hanging out (during my very first visit in February there were three men rapping).

The RTS building unit is frequented by the company's users and workers during weekdays, it is also a social space for this group and it represents a place where coworkers meet each other and chat during breaks. On weekends it is mostly empty, such as it happens at the bus stops, the amount of people drastically drops.

The bus stops are the most heterogeneous spaces of frequent stay at the Plaza. The transitory paths are also heterogeneous, but I was able to note an important difference related to the internal and external location of both categories. Both bus stops and transitory paths presented a distinction between publics: who chooses to sit at the internal areas of the bus stop or to cross the Plaza using the paths between benches and grass feel less uncomfortable with the Plaza environment, on the other hand the ones at the external boundaries demonstrated clear discomfort, some by choosing to turn around and not interacting with others at all while waiting for the bus, some by walking fast without even looking at the Plaza environment. And on a simple map I show my perceptions for this specific space, the Plaza in Gainesville (see **Figure 3.**).



Figure 3. Behavioral mapping of the Downtown Community Plaza during 2007 winter, Gainesville, Florida, USA. **Source:** Renata de Godoy.

4. Results from the informal interviews stage

During three visits I was able to directly query 10 males. Some of them were more willing to dialogue and answer my questions; the majority was also interested in learning about my research and about my motivations to be there. Many of them were opened to tell me personal information, opinions related to different subjects, even though it was never my inquiry. Two of the informants were unsatisfied with my presence.

The first and the second visits occurred in Sunday (March 25th and April 1st), both around the same period (12:00pm), during the communal lunch. I didn't find the same individuals during these days, but the activities and the occupation were very similar. The third visit occurred in a Thursday afternoon, and again I observed different individuals but the activities were very

similar to those I noticed during the observation phase over weekdays. The following is a summary of the three days.

On Sunday March 25th I interviewed four individuals. It was 12:15pm, all the people at the Plaza received food at that time. Basically I was the only one with other purposes there. First person who approached me claimed not to hang out there at all. He said he was in the military, he lives close to the Plaza, and he was there waiting for the bus to go to the gym. He also went to the stage and got some food, because (according to him) the bus took too long to arrive and he started to feel hungry. He gave me food. He said he didn't know the people there, which can't be completely true since he was there chatting with others. I felt he didn't want to admit he frequents the Plaza.

Then I talked to three people as a group. One of them also gave me some food and was the most opinionated and jumped to answer all my questions. All of them know people from the other side (the 'deviant social space'), they clearly demonstrated some negative attitude related to them, claiming they are too noisy. All three of them claimed to know about the history of the Plaza. All of them are really aware about they not being welcome there because of the growing business around, and the hotel construction, and they claimed even if the Plaza remains opened, it will change anyways.

On Sunday April 1st I interviewed six individuals. It was 12:30pm, again all the people at the Plaza received food at that time, but I could not recognize the crowd as being the same from last Sunday. There were about five police officers there, gathered round the RTS building unit, just talking among each other. They left after 30 minutes I was there. This time I decided to take general pictures from the beginning: of the food line next to the stage, of the 'deviant social space', and of the grass in the middle, which was the biggest physical change I have experienced in the Plaza surroundings so far. It wasn't the best idea to take pictures on that day. There were three young males sited down next to the table I am used to stay in, they were chatting, not eating, and I have never seen them before. One of them demonstrated a clear dissatisfaction with the photographing, and sort of threat if one takes a picture of him. I immediately stopped taking pictures. I couldn't recognize any person from this point, and I felt very uncomfortable there. No one I talked a week before was there yet.

I found out the Plaza "closes" at 11 or 11:30pm. Two people I talked with said that it happens because of the other group "abused the privilege" to have a public space and that because of fights and illegal activities, the police closes the Plaza late at night. This was by far the most chocking revelation I had so far, I never heard about one officially closing a public space.

Thursday April 12th, 3:30PM. At this time the Plaza was full of people, it was definitely the most crowded day I experienced there. It was sunny day, and now there are flowers all over the Plaza. Besides the general public I noticed some different people there, it seems they were at the Court House, and a young man, well dressed with sun glasses, was interacting with people from both social spaces, but I didn't think it was respectful, it seemed more like a dull joke.

Right away I arrived there I started talking to one of my informants. I noticed the same staring feeling I had felt before during weekdays, it is not a comfortable situation to be there during some weekdays. The 'deviant social space' was very noisy and crowded. On the other hand my conversation with him was nice, he told me about his family, mostly to tell me he does not relate to any. He stated he lives in a tent in the "woods". Suddenly the Plaza cleared.

As I have noticed before, in addition to the various subgroups related to being homeless, there are at least two unrelated persons frequenting the Plaza who interact with them: the social service woman I saw there in three different occasions and the hot dog vendor. Both were interacting with all the individuals sat at the 'social space' tables.

5. Discussion

The urban space was always an obvious place in my mind, basically a combination of public and private places. Being from a developing country I learned how to use public places in relation to possible hostility, but these sorts of avoidable places always were related to secluded urban forms, such as shantytowns or unknown alleys. Some parks are also spaces of segregation.

On contrast, to me a plaza was always an authentic expression of public space, especially because there are all sorts of individuals sharing the same open space, a strictly heterogeneous urban social reflex of the city. My intention doing this investigation was never to diminish the users, or the environment of the Downtown Community Plaza. The results were far from the anticipated.

This study served to me as an eye opener situation, to turn down my own theoretical utopian insider's stereotypes. In the same way I experienced the Downtown Community Plaza in Gainesville to be socially appropriated by some groups, roughly recognized as homeless, it made me think about the public spaces I always believed to be communal, and opened to everybody. Studying that Plaza changed my perspective.

As an archaeologist, at the time anthropology PhD student, the approach was strictly related to ethnoarchaeology, even though I was not interacting with an obvious ethnic group. In the literature it is not usual to find examples of this sort. On the other hand, the objectives are the same, as McNiven (2016:1) recently pointed out about the indigenous group he studies in Australia, I find no difference from what I intended to achieve as we both looked for "people's relationships with, and conceptualizations of, the past, but also how people relate to objects, sites and places in the present in the construction of contemporary identity." Or else, as Chirikure (2016) suggests, as a 'native' of the Western world would it be best for me to do ethnoarchaeology with western grouping?

Many might question this research was not ethoarchaeological, or at least not traditionally so. By using ethnography as a primary method, and a living community as subject, what I intended with this research was to read "formation process that could be applied to relate the statics of the archaeological record to the dynamics of the systemic context" (DAVID, KRAMER, 2001: 92), as any ethnoarchaeologist would do in any circumstance, of course using different research-questions.

The language was foreign to me, as their reality as homeless is very different from the one I find in Brazil. But the relationship they have established with that space and the links they did not create with that archaeological heritage are very similar to what one can find elsewhere, even while dealing with traditional communities given that we are all products of the globalization, with few exceptions worldwide. This research helped me to understand another reality I have studied in central Brazil over the last decade (GODOY, 2012), and the unique dynamics of public urban space.

6. Conclusions

The public attribute of the Plaza itself is questionable. First of all due to its reduced heterogeneity; the Plaza is a space with uses very well distinguished regarding different publics for different activities. If hypothetically one considers that seasonal events may even not change the Plaza daily life, which is extremely hard to believe, the presence of different groups would reinforce this Plaza as a public space. However this situation would not necessarily mean that these different groups are actually going to interact with each other. From what I have experienced, the heterogeneity is not an attribute to consider, the everyday life is very well spatially delimited, and the probability a different group use causes the actual group to move away during special events is very likely to happen. The second problem is the prohibition of use during night time, which already critically take away of citizens the right of coming and going, pattern that basically differentiate private from public places. That being said, I question if one should really study this space as a public one.

The issue related to downtown architecture heritage revitalization is a hot topic worldwide, and Gainesville is not an exception. Real estate investors and city hall administrations have recently found this rich constructed marketplace to explore, where buildings receive new functions, and high prices services establish a new clientele. It is easy to recognize this pattern in Gainesville, and the rumor of closing the Plaza is just a part of this business puzzle that began to appear in a local level. Back in 2007 I thought unfortunately it is just a matter of time for the Community Plaza daily life to be changed for good, if it is not now with the hotel construction, sooner or later another action will finally re-appropriate the Plaza. It is too much money involved, a space of power now openly disputed by different interests.

The answers related to all questions were not as varied as I expected (see table summary attached). The question “where would you be if you were not here?” was the most controversial of the bunch, I suppose the majority of the informants were not expecting it, or have never really thought about it. In general I believe the informants enjoy the Plaza, but definitely it is not a place they voluntarily choose to be. Since it is such a small environment, the vast majority of the individuals know each other, and the space they choose to be at represents the activity they want to perform, or the activity they seek to avoid. All the nine opportunities I observed one of my informants at the Plaza, he was never at the ‘deviant social space’, but he switched between the ‘benches area’ and the ‘social space’. The same situation I noticed regarding the social services woman. Depending on who is using each space, or what activity one wants to do, the groups circulate around the Plaza.

The statements related to pejorative attributes of the ‘deviant social space’ users are unanimous. Even though I didn’t have the opportunity to interview anyone of this group, I also felt uncomfortable to approach this space. I didn’t notice any illegal activity there; on the other hand I also didn’t observe them closely. I decided to use the term deviant because it is very clear that the activities performed there are different of the ones I observed in all the other parts of the Plaza, therefore I related them to be opposite to the social norm.

Moreover it was also very clear to me that during weekdays some individuals openly use the Plaza to pursuit some sort of deviant action and that the presence of outsiders is not at all welcomed. These individuals seem not to frequent the Plaza in a fixed schedule, and even though they use all the spaces including the ‘corners’, and the ‘benches area’, it was from the ‘deviant social space’ where I felt the most obvious threatening controlling staring.

Regarding all the fails and difficulties I have experienced, I can conclude with assurance that many of the zones categorized in my research are delimited by a social practice known as the appropriation of the space, cited by Smith and David (1995: 441) as one of the strategies of social production or social construction of the space. According to them “through the establishment of particular relations in physical space, meanings and resources are appropriated. Physical space is thus interpreted as social space. This is often achieved by management of proximity and distance.” And it is for sure a social practice one can experience universally, especially in communal places.

One of the hypotheses I proposed was indeed confirmed: there is no material remains left at the Plaza currently. One will find structures, it will be easily recognizable that it is a public space, but no vestiges of the social relations, or behavioral patterns, or any sort of legal and illegal activities will remain. Is this due to individual purposes, since the ones conducting illegal activities won't leave proves behind? Is this because of today's urban sanitation practices? Is this an obvious pattern of all paved spaces, therefore in the future one won't be able to access urban archaeological remains outside of communal dumpsters? Is this a result of shameful memory? Perhaps it is a result of all these factors. But without a doubt there are some kinds of occupancies chosen to be forgotten. The Battle of Gainesville is not one of them.

NOTES

(1) Adapted from a paper project for Ethnoarchaeology, a class at the University of Florida lectured by dr. Peter Schmidt, in Spring of 2007.

(2) Informants are described using the code M, differentiated from each other by numbers.

(3) Weekday visits: March 13th, 14th, March 29th, April 10th, 12th. Weekend visits: February 3rd, March 24th, 25th, April 1st, 14th, 15th. All happened in 2007.

(4) In this paper I use the word heterogeneity with two meanings. While proposing the differentiation of zones I consider that a space where persons are not interacting, or performing the same activities, is heterogeneous. Here I use this word to group individuals who relate to each other regardless performing a common activity, or being acquaintances, meaning the ones who identify with each other due to same educational background, or religious belief, ethnicity, cultural identity, among others.

(5) Adapted from a paper project for Ethnoarchaeology, a class at the University of Florida lectured by dr. Peter Schmidt, in Spring of 2007.

(6) Informants are described using the code M, differentiated from each other by numbers.

(7) Weekday visits: March 13th, 14th, March 29th, April 10th, 12th. Weekend visits: February 3rd, March 24th, 25th, April 1st, 14th, 15th. All happened in 2007.

(8) In this paper I use the word heterogeneity with two meanings. While proposing the differentiation of zones I consider that a space where persons are not interacting, or performing the same activities, is heterogeneous. Here I use this word to group individuals who relate to each other regardless performing a common activity, or being acquaintances, meaning the ones

who identify with each other due to same educational background, or religious belief, ethnicity, cultural identity, among others.

REFERENCES

BERNARD, H. Russell; HOLLAN, Douglas W. (1998) - Person-Centered Interviewing and Observation. In BERNARD, H. Russell (ed.) - **Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology**, p. 333-64. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press. ISBN-13 9780742504325. ISBN-10: 0742504328.

CHIRIKURE, Shadreck. 'Ethno' Plus 'Archaeology': What's in There for Africa(Ns)? **World Archaeology**. ISSN 0043-8243. (2016), p. 1-7.

DAVID, Nicholas; KRAMER, Carol (2001) - **Ethnoarchaeology in Action, Cambridge World Archaeology**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN -13: 9780521667791 ISBN-10: 0521667798.

DOUGLAS, Jack D. **Creative Interviewing** (1985). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. ISBN-13: 9780803924086 ISBN-10: 0803924089.

GODOY, Renata de. **Assessing Heritage Values: Public Archaeology in Brasília** (2012). Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing. ISBN-13: 9783659138539 ISBN-10: 3659138533.

LEEDS, Anthony (1977) - Housing-Settlement Types, Arrangements for Living, Proletarianization, and the Social Structure of the City. In ABU-LUGHOD, Janet (ed.) - **Third World Urbanization**, p. 330-337. Chicago: Maaroufa Press. ISBN-13: 9780884250050 ISBN-10: 0884250059

LOW, Setha M (2000) - **On the Plaza: The Politics of Public Space and Culture**. Austin: University of Texas Press. ISBN-13: 9780292747142 ISBN-10: 0292747144

LOW, Setha M.; SMITH, Neil (2006) - Introduction: The Imperative of Public Space. In LOW, Setha M.; SMITH, Neil (ed.) - **The Politics of Public Space**, p. 1-16. New York: Routledge. ISBN-13: 9780415951395 ISBN-10: 0415951399.

MCNIVEN, Ian J. "Ethnoarchaeology, Epistemology, Ethics." **World Archaeology**. ISSN 0043-8243. (2016), p. 1-4.

SMITH, A.; DAVID, N. The Production of Space and the House of Xidi Sukur. **Current Anthropology**. ISSN 0011-3204. Vol. 36, n° 3 (1995), p. 441-56.

THOMPSON, Catharine Ward. Urban Open Space in the 21st Century. **Landscape and Urban Planning**. ISSN 0169-2046. N° 60 (2002), p. 59-72.