CAMPECHE URBAN VEGETABLE GARDENS: THE COLLECTIVE SUBJECT DISCOURSE METHODOLOGY

Júlia Lahm
Soraya Nór

Júlia Teixeira Lahm is Architect, member of Permaculture and Ambiental Analysis and Permaculture Research Group, at Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC). She studies permaculture and bio-construction.

Soraya Nór is Doctor in Geography, Professor of Course of Architecture and Urbanism and at Post Graduation Program in Urbanism, History and Architecture of City, at Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC), member of Permaculture and Ambiental Analysis and Permaculture Research Group. She studies urbanism, cultural heritage, environment and permaculture.

Abstract

This article, which is part of an ongoing research entitled "Urban Gardens: an alternative for sustainability and for the transformation of the urban landscape", is the result of a pilot study carried out with the community members of the Urban Community Gardens in the Campeche neighborhood, in the city of Florianópolis, in order to identify the main benefits, difficulties, predominant public and what is the general perception that users have of the Urban Community Gardens. It is believed that the evaluation of these community spaces by its own regulators and maintainers is of great value because, thereby, it is possible to identify and understand how the process runs, what is being done and what changes are necessary to improve the movement as a whole. The research of qualitative approach involved the accomplishment of 10 interviews with open questions with participants of the Urban Community Gardens, some quite active and others less active, at Campeche neighborhood in the city of Florianópolis. The methodology used to analyze the interviews results was the Collective Subject Discourse (CSD), a method by which Key Expressions, Central Ideas and/or similar Anchors are removed and after that a single discourse is constructed for the whole that answered the interview. Thus, in general, the interviewees' perception was quite heterogeneous: all agree that Urban Community Gardens are much more related to integration - with the community, with nature and with oneself - than with subsistence in food production and other benefits, which are not

few - according to the interviewees themselves - they are consequence of this integration that the rescued contact with nature and origins.

Keywords: Urban community gardens; Collective subject discourse (CSD); Integration.

Introduction

Thinking about development implies respecting, above all, our natural and cultural resources. Therefore, it is necessary to understand landscape and environmental planning in the perspective of seeking the integration of environmental and social rationality to the economic, in the occupation and organization of space, aiming to prioritize good environmental quality and, consequently, life, within a systemic view and historical (Cittadin, 2010).

In recent years the number of people living in large urban centers has increased considerably worldwide. This process of urbanization in most cases occurs in a disorderly way. In addition to this, the increase in poverty and inequality and what we will have will be whole groups without access to minimum conditions of existence. One of these conditions is access to quality food at an affordable price.

In this context, the need for Urban Agriculture arises, which also comes as a tool for reconnecting urban man with nature, which many people unconsciously believe are not part of it. Urban agriculture can thus be considered an action of resistance and resilience of cities, rescuing nature within urban space, reducing inequalities, social and economic, innovating the present while revisiting the past.

The present research was carried out with the community attending community gardens in the Campeche neighborhood in the city of Florianópolis, in order to identify the main benefits, the main difficulties, the predominant public and the general perception that these visitors have of the Urban Community Gardens.

Theoretical Reference

Given the high population concentration and increasing urbanization that we are currently witnessing in cities, it is necessary to improve the living conditions of its inhabitants. Urban Agriculture can represent a strategy for the sustainability of cities in various aspects - socially, environmentally and economically. Food crops should be seen as an important component of urban life in the future (Pinto, 2007).

Urban Agriculture (UA) is a multidimensional concept that includes production, agro extractivism and collection, transformation and service provision to generate agricultural products (vegetables, fruits, medicinal herbs, ornamental plants, etc.) and livestock (small, medium and large animals). These products are aimed for self-consumption, exchanges and donations or commercialization, (re) taking advantage of

local resources and inputs (soil, water, solid waste, labor, knowledge, etc.) in an efficient and sustainable way (Pinto, 2007).

The food produced is destined for self-consumption, supply of popular restaurants, communal kitchens and sale of surpluses in the local market, resulting in social inclusion, improved nutrition, and income generation (Cepagro, 2009).

Historically, agriculture and the city have always coexisted maintaining their interdependence relationship. Over time, the advance of urbanization, the increase of population and technology, established a dichotomy between field and city, producer and consumer. But even in difficult times agriculture has always been in the field, as in the period between wars in Europe. The found difficulties encouraged compensations and also "new" researches and solutions to address the food shortage generated by the war and then creating new demands and making urban food production a possible solution. In addition to this, community involvement and collaboration are some of the potential attitudes that develop from difficulties, examples of coming good news despite the crisis.

It is therefore fundamental to promote sustainable actions in which, in the context of urban development, a strategy is adopted to improve infrastructures, minimize displacement and promote social relations and the creation of synergies. It should be noted that the viability of these factors is highly profitable and promotes sustainability.

The Urban Community Gardens here discussed are only one part of urban agriculture and, because of their importance, they are based on innumerable functions that can rescue the origins through (re) contact with the land, being a vehicle of social integration, of having the potential to fight hunger among the poorest and to balance the family budge, besides its the pedagogical function. It also represents another way to better manage and care for our cities in a more participative, democratic and environmentally sustainable way, also function as a strategy for the environmental recovery of idle land, which served only to accumulate weeds and garbage and should be considered in the Municipal Master Plan for Activity is regulated.

The productive urban green spaces also contribute to regularize environmental situations, through their capabilities: term regularization; moisture control; control of solar radiation; cloud control; purification of the atmosphere; absorption of carbon dioxide and increase in oxygen content; wind protection; protection against rain and hail; erosion protection ; noise protection and protection against road traffic.

Although there are several experiences of Urban Agriculture (UA) scattered throughout Brazil and the world, proving all the benefits previously mentioned, there are still a series of limitations to be overcome. Often the UA is not recognized by the agricultural policies and is not contemplated in urban planning. Due to this fact, UA seems invisible to the governments and consequently far from taking part in a Municipal Master Plan. This forces the AU to be conducted informally and, therefore, the producers and collaborators are not entitled to any institutional support, technical assistance and other services necessary for the maintenance and planning of these spaces, so relevant and transforming the landscape and urban society (Valdiones, 2013).

Study area and collective initiatives

The florianopolitan municipality is sectioned in insular and continental part, resulting in an area of 433km² in which 421,240 population are distributed according to the data released by the last census conducted in 2010. The District of Campeche is located in an area corresponding to 35.32 km² of the municipality. The district created by Law 4805/95 covers the localities Morro das Pedras, Praia do Campeche, Campeche and Rio Tavares. In this locality the predominant economic activity is tourism, but the residential occupation increased during last decades (Dias and Schuch, 2013).

Fig. 1: Florianópolis Island and its neighborhoods. Source: www.mobfloripa.com.br [Accessed 01 November 2016].

The urban community gardens of Campeche neighborhood were created by collective initiative by the groups of neighborhood residents with common interests. They shared the desire and need to create public spaces for cultivation, where the neighborhood could share and plant food and knowledge. From this, a movement of occuying idle land began in order to make areas of cultivation of food plants, medicinal, aromatic,

composting, worm farm, seedlings and seedlings. Initially there was a "pilot project" on a private lot, tenderly given by its owner, titled "Quinta do Campeche". After this, there were opportunities to occupy other spaces, public and private.

This collective movement started in mid-May 2015, entitled "Quintais de Floripa". From this, today there are several urban gardens are already scattered throughout the island and continent, among them four communal urban gardens in the neighborhood of Campeche. These are: Pacuca's Garden, located inside the Campeche Cultural Park, Garças' Garden, located on private land assigned to the community, AMOJAC's Garden (Residents Association of Castanheiras Neighborhood), located on the land of AMOJAC and Fazenda Rio Tavares' Garden, located in the Fazenda Rio Tavares Health Post.

Fig. 2: Communal Urban Gardens of the Campeche neighborhood. Source: Carbonari, 2016. Available at: <www.quintaisdefloripa.wordpress.com> [Accessed 01 November 2016].

The Collective Subject Discourse as a research methodology

The Collective Subject Discourse or CSD is a method of processing testimonials to be used in opinion polls, which was developed by Fernando Lefevre and Ana Maria Cavalcanti Lefevre, both from the University of São Paulo. Since the year 2000 the proposal has been applied and tested in all kinds of researches in the knowledge areas such as health, education, administration, communication, computer science and others. Basically, the technique consists of, after the interviews:

1. Select the essentials of the content of each testimony;

2. Associate with these selected contents a brief description of your senses;

3. Group the statements of similar meaning into a category or set;

4. To gather the content of these statements of similar meaning in a single speech, the so-called Collective Subject Discourses, written in the 1st person singular; to add testimonials and get a collective opinion, the CSD uses the following instruments, according to Lefevre and Lefevre (2012).

1. **Key Expressions:** Continuous or discontinuous segments of speech which should be highlighted and reveal more clearly the content of a response to a research question.
2. **Central Ideas:** Name or linguistic expression that describes in the most syntactic and precise manner possible the meaning(s) present in Key Expressions.
3. **Anchors:** Anchors are, like the Central Ideas, synthetic formulas that no longer describe the senses, but the ideologies, values, beliefs, present in the individual responses, when the statements appear in Key Expressions in the form of generic statements intended to fit particular situations, when such statements present linguistic marks of generality, they are considered, by the methodology of the CSD, as Anchors.
4. **Collective Subject Discourse**: gather it in a single homogeneous sythesis of speech made of discourses' key expressions which have the same central idea or the same anchorage.

Collective Subject Discourse is a research technique that lends itself to approaching all kinds of topics that involve the vast field of thoughts, feelings, beliefs, attitudes, values, and social representations when expressed in the form of verbal discourse (Lefevre and Lefevre, 2012).

The CSD proposal for the rescue and description of the opinions of collectivities is, thus, quantitative and qualitative, since in the same research process it qualifies and quantifies the opinions of collectivities.

This double task is necessary since a collective opinion is always a quality (opinion / testimony) and a quantity (the collectivity or its segments). The final result of a research using the CSD will consist of a panel of different qualities (collective testimonies with different meanings) each with their respective weight and distribution in the social fabric, which express the opinions that exist in a collectivity, at the time of the research, about The subject searched. (Lefevre and Lefevre, 2005).

The authors of this methodology developed, also at USP, a software, Qualiquantisoft, in partnership with Sales & Paschoal Informatics, in order to facilitate the conduction of qualitative researches in which the Collective Subject Discourse (CSD) technique is used. However, in the present approach there was no need to use it, since it would be a very small sample of interviewees where the analyzes could be done manually with ease.

Materials and Methods

As a participant in the gardens activities, the author previously communicated possible interviewees that she would make an interview, and everyone agreed that they preferred to respond in writing to the issues, with more time at home due to time, space and circumstance (almost all meetings are carried out in the joint efforts). Thus, a questionnaire was prepared with four open questions so then the interested parties could freely express their opinions. Part of the questionnaires were distributed and sent online to the participants, between April 5 and 30, 2016, and after that, the questionnaires were returned or returned to the author duly answered by the interviewees until May 5, 2016. Few questionnaires were distributed, approximately 15, of which 10 were answered and returned in a timely manner. A smaller number of respondents were chosen because the intention was for the people actually involved and / or involved in the movement to answer the questions.

The participation of people of different ages, sex, schooling and social class was intended in order to avoid distortions. The answers were treated as anonymous, without distinction of gender, race, color, age or schooling, either for an ethical question or to have no influence on the research.

The questions to be answered in the interview were as follows:

1 - In your opinion, what are the main benefits of urban community gardens in the Campeche neighborhood?

2 - In your opinion, what are the main difficulties of urban community gardens in the Campeche neighborhood?

3 - In your opinion, what is the profile of the main participants / users of urban community gardens in the Campeche neighborhood? (age, gender, social condition, frequency of participation).

4 - Give your opinion, in general, about the urban gardens.

Data Analysis

As previously stated, responses were analyzed according to Collective Subject Discourse (CSD) technique proposed by Lefevre, Lefevre and Teixeira (2000), which seeks to identify the following methodological figures or operators: key expressions, central ideas and anchoring.

After a deltailed reading of the responses, the key expressions (ECH) and the central ideas (CI) were identified, bringing together the similar ones in the same category and finally forming the CSD with the union of the statements in a same category, added of connective elements and excluding repeated expressions in order to guarantee the textual cohesion of the discourse.

Results

Of a total of 15 questionnaires distributed, 10 returned in a timely manner for the survey, totaling 66.6% of acceptance. There were more responses by the digital questionnaire (approximately 60%) than by handwriting.

The partial result of the key expressions and central ideas of each interview question is presented below. Therefore, the essential content of each response was selected and this was associated with a central idea. The similar sense responses were grouped into categories (A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H), which are created as different responses appear to differentiate the responses so that all Valued and not repeated. Thus the content of the responses of similar sense was collected, without repetition, in a single speech, written in the first person singular, representing a single Collective Subject.

Question 1: In your opinion, what are the main benefits of Urban Community Gardens in the Campeche neighborhood?

Nº	Key Expressions	Central Idea	Category
1.	• Socialization among residents • Quality of life • Organic food consumption; • Love and dedication.	• Healthy life • Social interaction	A
2.	• Space to plant communion • Union of families • Collective awareness • Quality of life, community.	• Healthy life • Interaction.	A
3.	• Healthy eating • Events • Knowledge of food, plants, nature. • Look at yourself.	• Integration • Look at yourself.	B
4.	• Quality food (organic) • Awakening of consciousness • Nutrition • Encouraging local and family production.	• Incentive to local and family production.	C
5.	• Community relations • Neighborhood Autonomy • Healthy food • Strengthens human bonds with nature.	• Integration • Strengthening of ties.	D

6.	• Community empowerment • Organic, low cost. • Team work • Connection with nature • Networking • Strengthening of gardens privadas • Food diversification • Exchanges of seedlings • Use of public spaces • Community takes responsibilities that it generally requires or delegates to the State.	• Use of public spaces • Responsible community.	E
7.	• Fruit and vegetable production • Leisure • Integration among residents.	• Healthy life • Community integration.	A
8.	• Integrative • Healthy mind and body.	• Integration • Healthy life	A
9.	• Community integration • Food resilience	• Community integration • Healthy life	A
10.	• Integration • Community empowerment • Collaborative action • Exchange of experiences and ideas • Awareness of waste destiny • Organic production • Distribution of seedlings • Occupational therapy • Permaculture Disclosure • Occupation of public spaces.	• Integration • Waste destination, • Occupational therapy • Permaculture	E

Note that the word INTEGRATION is repeated in almost all the answers, but it will only be mentioned once in the CSD, so that the text does not become repetitive. So it too was not considered a category.

Question 2: In your opinion, what are the main difficulties of the Urban Community Gardens of the Campeche neighborhood?

Nº	Key Expressions	Central Idea	Category
1.	• Mobilization • Sufficient volunteers for required demand.	• **Mobilization, labor**	A
2.	• Space for the gardens • No disclosure and motivation to know and collaborate.	• **No Disclosure**	B
3.	• Community membership • No communication, dissemination (many do not even know it exists)	• **No Disclosure**	B
4.	• No incentive (government), • Dissemination, motivation and volunteers.	• **No government incentive**	C
5.	• No time to participate because of current life • Low adherence.	• **Free time to participate.**	D
6.	• Lack of time and commitment • Permanent rotation of the participants • Little knowledge of the land. (Technique)	• **Little technical knowledge.**	E
7.	• Do not participate directly, do not know.	__	__
8.	• Lack of advertising • Lack of organization • Lack of availability for vegetable garden.	• **Free time to participate - a matter of habit.**	D
9.	• Support from the municipality • Lack of integration • Lack of knowledge of the real demands and needs of each region for the implementation of the gardens.	• **Lack of incentive (support)**	C
10.	• Raise awareness of the need for volunteer work in the garden • Availability of time and knowledge • Many excuses and reasons not to participate.	• **Free time to participate, many excuses**	D

Question 3: In your opinion, what is the profile of the main participants / goers of the Urban Community Gardens of Campeche neighborhood (age, gender, social status, attendance frequency)?

Nº	Key Expressions	Central Idea	Category
1.	● Benefit-aware middle class families ● Men, ● Women ● Children.	● **Middle class, families.**	A
2.	● All ages ● People already attached to the movement, who believe in organic and sustainable ● Hippies; alternative people ● Some lost too.	● **All ages - sustainable profile.**	B
3.	● Diverse, people concerned about the sustainability of the planet and think that this format of life no longer serves.	● **All ages - sustainable profile.**	B
4.	● All genres and classes ● People involved with the common interest of food.	● **All ages - sustainable profile.**	B
5.	● Diverse men and women from different professions ● Older adults and adults (older adults) ● The participation of children and adolescents is lacking.	● **No participation of children and adolescents.**	C
6.	● 20 to 40 years old, of both genders ● Middle class, college or university students.	● **20-40 years old, middle class, advanced study.**	D
7.	● Varied age ● Usually you already have more contact with nature. I do not actively participate so I can not say for sure.	● **All ages - sustainable profile.**	B

8.	● From 30 to 50 years, most women with a college education, middle class, occasional attendance.	● **30 to 50 years old, women with college education, middle class.**	E
9.	● Very young people between the ages of 18 and 25 ● From 35 to 45 years who have rethought the current processes that we live.	● **All ages - sustainable profile.**	B
10.	● Women of various ages who go with their children ● Young and older couples ● Few average members ● Social class "the face of the neighborhood" ● Many with academic and professional backgrounds.	● **Women of all ages with children, young couples.**	F

Here are some quite different answers, but all will be considered in the CSD, considering the whole range of ages cited.

Question 4: Give your opinion, in general, about the Urban Gardens.

Nº	Key Expressions	Central Idea	Category
1.	● Enable the search for quality of life of the urban population.	● **Quality of life**	A
2.	● A very good initiative for the neighborhood, families and community, needs a strong incentive to maintain and establish itself in society.	● **Need incentive to maintain.**	B
3.	● I find these initiatives incredible. ● Super fan and supporter of the cause.	● **Amazing**	C
4.	● They are important source of food ● Deserve encouragement ● Must be from the local community so that everyone can practice in an organized way ● If everyone has access to quality food we will shift	● **Need incentive to maintain.**	

	our social issue to health.		B
5.	• Wonderful, a drop of hope in a country of socio-environmental degradation. • They are a path to sustainability.	• **Very beneficial**	D
6.	• I really like the idea and the benefits to the community.	• **Very beneficial**	D
7.	• Empowerment movement • Good way of combating poverty, self-sufficiency • It lacks a more productive character, only recreational will not bring a greater popular movement.	• **Empowerment[1]** • **Self-sufficiency** • **Combating poverty** • **There is a lack of a more productive character for greater incentive and adherence.**	E
8.	• At this stage note 0.1. • Much lack to grow, peculiar, is maintained by the movement of the "Quintais de Floripa"	• **There is still much to grow.**	F
9.	• One of the only exits we have today so that the cities continue to exist. • Break the market logistics • Connection with the spirit • Care of the earth with affection • Community integration • Only a trigger for real revolutions, both personally and socially.	• **Alternative for the continuity of the existence of cities.** • **Real, personal and social revolution.**	G
10.	• It is a proposal for a healthier attitude for people and sustainable for nature, organic food production, collective work and volunteer.	• **Healthy and sustainable living** • **Healthy Eating, cooperation, community, integration,**	

		awareness.	
	● Community integration and transformation of the consciousness of all.		
			H

Collective Subject Discourse applied in the research

The methodology used to analyze the interviews made it possible to value all the answers, from the most cited and repeated ones to those that were mentioned only once, but no less important. The Collective Subject Discourse allows to have a general idea of what a collective thinks, without leaving any opinions aside and valuing the most recurrent opinions. In Collective Subject Discourses the first three or four answers to the text are always the most recurrent, that is, they were cited several times by the interviewees. As the discourse progresses, the less recurring answers are put or even that only one person has mentioned, but not disregarding that answer, which is part of the collective and is very important to be valued. It is believed that this model of analysis is a very democratic way of valuing opinions, and it is very valid when implemented mainly in community matters, where no opinion should be lost or overlooked. Being the discourse of a collective subject, a first-person singular speech is made, considering all the answers given, according to the central ideas, as if, in fact, it was a single subject. The following is the Collective Subject Discourse of Urban Gardens in the Campeche neighborhood.

"I believe that interaction and social integration are the main benefits of the Urban Gardens of the Campeche Neighborhood, because they are a space to plant and we can share food and knowledge in fellowship, providing more life quality for all involved. The gardens bring me into connection with nature and with a look at myself. They awaken the collective consciousness. They are an incentive to local and family production, being a space of union among families. The strengthening ties is also a fact the Urban Gardens rescue. I believe that the gardens can empower the community by making them reflect more about the fate of their waste, making us feel responsible for it. I believe it to be an occupational therapy, and a very worthwhile experience because it is spreading the principles of Permaculture and occupying public spaces. In my view it is a necessary practice for sustainability and encouraging healthy eating.

However there are many difficulties, and I believe that mainly the lack of manpower for the maintenance of spaces, which results from the lack of mobilization and also from the scarce disclosure that happens. I think there are also physical spaces available for the gardens. I believe that there is a lack of incentive from the government and therefore the participants end up giving up, besides not having enough spare time to dedicate to the gardens. The lack of technical knowledge also makes the progress of the gardens somewhat difficult, but mainly the lack of commitment of the involved ones to follow the firm initiative.

I believe that the profile of most of the participants in the joint efforts are middle-class, educated families of all ages, but the vast majority share

the profile of a person already aware of sustainability. I believe that there is a lack of participation of young people and adolescents, the average

number of participants is between 20 and 50 years, many women with children participate.

In general, I believe that the Urban Gardens are a great initiative, because they provide quality of life, healthy food, empower the community, promote the concept of self-sufficiency and fight against poverty. I believe it is an alternative for the continuity of the existence of cities. It promotes connection, care, integration, real, personal and social revolution, cooperation, collectivity and consciousness. However, they need encouragement to maintain themselves. I think there's necessary more productive touch to encourage people to join in."

Conclusion

The accomplishment of this pilot research with the collective that participates in the urban gardens of the Campeche neighborhood allowed to extract different perceptions of the interviewees regarding the benefits, difficulties, profile of regulars and general opinion about such spaces. In general, everyone agrees that the gardens have several benefits and also several difficulties being faced. Among the benefits one of the most cited was integration - with nature, with other people and with oneself, showing that urban gardens go far beyond food production, recreation and sustainability. The main difficulty is certainly the lack of people working, since there are few people who are seriously compromised with the gardens, causing the process not to be able to keep going forward and to progress. The lack of incentives and the lack of dissemination of the proposal are also factors that need to be observed and worked to increase community participation in the gardens. The profile of users is quite diverse and the predominant age of participants varies from 20 to 50 years, but according to the interviews, the participation of young people and adolescents (from 14 to 20 years) is a bit lacking. In general, the community believes in initiative and in the project as a tool to encourage healthy eating, sustainability and quality of life, emphasizing that more encouragement is needed from the community that already participates and mainly from the institutional side. It is important that the government supports this initiative so that a minimum of resources can be obtained so that the initiative can be maintained and that it continues transforming the neighborhood and the whole community around it. The inclusion of urban agriculture in the Municipal Master Plan is one of these means of support that we follow in the struggle to achieve.

Notes

[1] The word empowerment here is used to empower the community, as a collective social action to encourage participation, socialization of power among citizens.

References

Cepagro, 2009. *Cartilha de Agricultura urbana.* Florianópolis:Cepagro.

Cittadin, A. P., 2010. *Laguna, Paisagem e Preservação: o patrimônio cultural e natural do município.* Master Federal University of Santa Catarina.

Dias, E. S.; Shuch, F. S., 2015. A ocupação do distrito do Campeche: Plano Diretor versus características do solo. In: *15th Simpósio de Geografia da UDESC*. Florianópolis, Brazil 2015. Florianópolis: UDESC.

Lefevre, F.; Lefevre, A. M. C., 2005. *Depoimentos e Discursos: Uma nova proposta de análise em pesquisa social.* Brasília. Liberlivro.

Lefevre, F.; Lefevre, A. M. C., 2012. *Pesquisa de Representação Social: Um enfoque qualiquantitativo.* Brasília. Liberlivro.

Lefevre, F.; Lefevre, A. M. C., Teixeira, J. J. V., 2000. *O Discurso do Sujeito Coletivo: Uma nova abordagem metodológica em pesquisa qualitativa.* Caxias do Sul: EDUCS.

Pinto, R. S. B. F. F., 2007. *Hortas urbanas: espaços para o desenvolvimento sustentável em Braga.* Portugal: Universidade do Minho.

Valdiones, A. P. G., 2013. *Panorama da Agricultura Urbana e Periurbana no município de São Paulo.* Master University of São Paulo.