



Knowing urban informalities

Journal:	<i>Urban Studies</i>
Manuscript ID	CUS-134-17-02.R2
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue
Discipline: Please select a keyword from the following list that best describes the discipline used in your paper.:	Geography
World Region: Please select the region(s) that best reflect the focus of your paper. Names of individual countries, cities & economic groupings should appear in the title where appropriate.:	Not Applicable
Major Topic: Please identify up to 5 topics that best identify the subject of your article.:	Theory, Development, Informality, Planning, Poverty/Exclusion
You may add up to 2 further relevant keywords of your choosing below::	urban informality, urban theory

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Knowing urban informalities

Abstract

How do Anglo-phone urban scholars know urban informalities? This essay reviews three dominant ways of knowing urban informality noting that, despite the profoundly rich insights they each provide, two critiques of the overall concept endure. These are that the concept is often imprecise and that the contribution to knowing 'the urban' more generally, remains clearly circumscribed to the 'urban non-west'. In our view, these limitations curtail the possibilities of sharpening our understanding of the relationship to inequalities and injustices. We work with these critiques, suggesting they represent two sides of the same problem, associated with binaries. In doing so, we build on the existing emphasis on practices and work across the three dominant ways of knowing urban informalities. This reveals that binaries are not held together magically and transparently so that each is the mirror opposite. Instead, the difference is constituted through unnamed aspects of common denominators – two of which we highlight (property rights and aesthetics) and may be intrinsic to the way urban informality has come to develop. It is through the latent power relations that inhere in these common denominators that urban scholars can achieve greater conceptual precision and make different contributions to broader urban theory committed to challenging injustices.

Keywords: Development, planning, poverty/exclusion, theory, urban informality, urban theory

Introduction

This article improves the effectiveness of the concept of urban informality to analyse urban dynamics and challenge injustices. We are clearly not alone in this endeavour. Others have focused on informality as the 'negotiability of value' (Roy & AlSayyad, 2004) 'assemblages'

1
2
3 (Dovey, 2012; McFarlane, 2012), 'interfaces' (Schindler, 2014, 2017), and the 'relational'
4
5 (Boudreau & Davis, 2017) to afford key insights into the creation and perpetuation of urban
6
7 injustices. We seek to build on this work, but what distinguishes this article is that we work
8
9 with two enduring critiques of the concept of urban informality to investigate the potential
10
11 for improvements.
12
13

14
15
16 The first critique relates to the imprecision of the concept. Urban informality can be just
17
18 about anything to anyone. An important source for this imprecision is traced back to the
19
20 characterisation of the relationship between in/formality as a binary. As Rakowski (1994a)
21
22 and Peattie (1987) note, the difficulties inherent in binaries have defined studies of
23
24 informality since the beginning. In principle, the problems with binaries – that they rely on
25
26 singularities, are mutually exclusive and hierarchical – are well rehearsed and we do not
27
28 dwell on them here. In practice, however, they continue to drive research and urban policy
29
30 that is out of kilter with a world, in which most people think that they live in a formal world
31
32 (Benton, 1994, p. 225). Consequently, the concept seems blunt, imprecise and vague –
33
34 consistently unable to grasp the intricacies of urban dynamics.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41
42 The second critique relates to the difficulties of applying the concept of urban informality to
43
44 the well-established sites of Anglo-phone urban theory – the paradigmatic cities of 'the
45
46 west'.¹ A well-established focus on how urban informality can/not work across many
47
48
49
50

51
52 ¹ In line with Robinson's (2002) argument that such categories misconstrue our
53
54 understanding of the world, we refer to them only insofar as their currency is directly linked
55
56 to our argument about informality. We use 'west' and 'non-west' (with the quotation marks
57
58 indicating our distance) instead of south-north or developing-developed because the
59
60 pedestal of 'western' urban theory is the most troubling element of our critique. While

1
2
3 different countries has offered a productive vein of theoretical and practical insights
4
5 (Robinson, 2006; Roy, 2005; Roy & AlSayyad, 2004; Song, 2016; Varley, 2013a; Watson,
6
7 2011). Through this work, and that of others, it is widely accepted that 'urban informality'
8
9 has become a key way in which 'the urban' beyond 'the west' is known (Edensor & Jayne,
10
11 2012; Roy, 2012). Nevertheless, it is also clear that knowing the urban 'non-west' in this way
12
13 ensures that any insights contribute to broader urban theories in particular, circumscribed
14
15 ways (Roy, 2015). In short, what we know about 'the non-west' remains tethered to 'the
16
17 west' in relationships that are generally not assumed to trouble the production of 'western'
18
19 Anglo-phone urban theory (Chattopadhyay, 2012a)². As a result, it is difficult to analyse
20
21 urban informality as a constituent process of cities beyond the local of cities in the 'non-
22
23 west' and to find a place for urban informality in broader urban theory.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 We argue that these two critiques are related, as two aspects of the same problem, and that
31
32 it is in examining the presence and operation of what we call *common denominators*, which
33
34 hold these dichotomies together, that yields insights into ways of addressing this problem.
35
36 Our view is that the emplacement of urban informality in urban theory is entangled with
37
38 current ways of knowing 'the local' – insofar as 'the local' of urban informality is always
39
40 limited by the persistent dualism between 'west'/'non-west'. Due to this double bind
41
42 ('west'/'non-west' and 'urban theory'/development studies and similar), the discourse(s) on
43
44 urban informality is (are) frustrated in achieving greater precision and wider contributions.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 using these categories runs the risk of reproducing them, we have no alternative when
52
53 addressing their implications as a core problem of our argument.

54 ². In this article, we focus on Anglo-phone urban theory as the focus of the article and as a
55
56 recognition of the positional limitations of our argument in relation to other canons of
57
58 urban scholarship.
59
60

1
2
3 In addressing this double bind, we identify common denominators as pre-calibrated
4 registers or mechanisms. These registers or mechanisms obscure sets of power relations in
5 the background of debates which currently foreground the well-known problems of working
6 with dichotomies outlined above. In identifying these mechanisms of common
7 denominators, we address a weakness that has long plagued working with informality: that
8 it “offers a way of helping the poor without any major threat to the rich” (Bromley, 1978, p.
9 1036) because it leaves latent power relations untouched.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 We commence by qualifying the context of our argument in order to locate our claims more
22 precisely. We then proceed to characterise three different contemporary approaches –
23 urban informality as *condition*, *laws*, and *currency* – to show how each has valuable
24 characteristics, yet when considered as separate approaches, each in their own way,
25 contribute to the double bind. However, working across the different approaches we
26 identify the operation of common denominators that animate Ann Varley’s (2013b) insight
27 to question how the difference within the binary pair of in/formality is produced *in practice*
28 rather than *in principle*. In this process, we recognise the immense value of existing
29 approaches and propose to work across them; bringing them together in a distinctive way
30 rather than discarding them. Through such means we hope to point to one way to
31 disentangle the concept from its subordinated position in urban theory and improve its
32 analytical precision in practice.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Caveats**

52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In order to clarify the limits of our contribution, we locate our argument in relation to
4
5 understandings of urban informality and urban theory, both of which are very contested. As
6
7 a consequence, we need to be wary about identifying a singular historical trajectory of
8
9 debate. Prior to the burgeoning interest in an 'urban informality' of cities in 'the non-west'
10
11 that appears to bring together interests in both economic activities and housing (to cite the
12
13 dominant historical strands), older perspectives had a slightly different emphasis. That is,
14
15 early debates about informality were very much focused on informality *in* urban economies
16
17 or *in* housing production systems rather than *urban* informality per se, that is, suggesting a
18
19 particular *urban* quality to informality (Hart, 1973; Moser, 1994; Peattie, 1987; Rakowski,
20
21 1994b).³ It is useful to note that studies of economic informality have been more consistent
22
23 in focusing on informality in typically 'western' countries than those focused on the built
24
25 environment and governance (Gërxhani, 2004; Guha-Khasnabis, Kanbur, & Ostrom, 2007).
26
27 This strand though has remained focused on relatively micro-economic issues and does not
28
29 immediately appear to offer insights to a broader debate. We hazard a guess that this may
30
31 well be to do with the qualities associated with 'urbanness' that concepts of urban
32
33 informality try to develop as we show in our discussion of common denominators below.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Added to this, seminal (Rakowski, 1994a) and recent sentinel contributions (Roy and
43
44 AlSayyad, 2004; McFarlane and Waibel, 2012b) all offer different ways of thinking about
45
46 urban informality.⁴ To repeat, the notion of 'urban informality' is relatively recent (AlSayyad,
47
48
49

50
51 ³ An important early distinction between 'structuralist' and 'legalist' analyses of informality
52
53 can be conceived of as typically *applying* analysis of informality *to* 'the urban' (see Rakowski,
54
55 1994a).

56 ⁴ It is interesting that Laguerre's outstanding analyses of informal San Francisco in *The*
57
58 *informal city* (1994) has had relatively little impact on analyses of broader urban theory and
59
60 appears yet to find a deservedly fuller appreciation in the urban theory canon.

1
2
3 2004). Despite the diversity, there seems to be a provisional consensus that urban
4
5 informality relates to “an organising urban logic...[which]...is a process of structuration that
6
7 constitutes the rules of the game” (AlSayyad & Roy, 2004, p. 5). They go on to argue that
8
9 this logic operates through the fixing and mapping of value/s, which has informed many
10
11 other conceptualisations, including McFarlane and Waibel’s (2012a). We use this as an initial
12
13 entry point, but through considering the three different approaches, we try to reach toward
14
15 something else.
16
17
18
19
20

21 A similar lack of agreement on what constitutes ‘urban theory’ and how this is produced
22
23 (with a specific focus on who and where this production is located), adds another layer of
24
25 difficulty. Inevitably, agreements on ‘urban theory’ are hard to find (Harding & Blokland,
26
27 2014) and current debates continue to unfold (see for example, Brenner & Schmid, 2015;
28
29 Roy, 2015; Scott, 2017; Storper & Scott, 2016). It is also evident that where urban theory is
30
31 produced has consequences for whether it counts as ‘theory’ or ‘empirical evidence’ of
32
33 theory (Robinson, 2006). For the sake of focusing on our argument here, we work with
34
35 ‘urban theory’ as a set of ideas, concepts and practices that relate to the urban as
36
37 ‘multiplex’, as characterised by the dense overlapping multiple networks of times, spaces,
38
39 networks and relations (Amin & Graham, 1997). In so doing, we are drawn to relational
40
41 accounts of the urban that underpin trying to unravel how theorisations of the urban in ‘the
42
43 west’ are tied to those in ‘the non-west’.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Knowing urban informality**

52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 We review three contemporary approaches to the way in which urban scholars and
4
5 policymakers know urban informality – informality as condition, laws and currency.
6
7 Deploying ‘knowing’ as both ways of thinking and acting, our categories emerge from trying
8
9 to make sense of our own work at the interface of theory, policy and practice. We know that
10
11 reducing so many nuances to three approaches introduces many risks of simplification and
12
13 misrepresentation. However, there is some value in presenting these approaches as
14
15 emblematic of common assumptions. Our intention is not to characterise any one scholar’s
16
17 work cited here as solely falling into one categorisation, but merely that an insight they
18
19 offer illustrates an aspect of a broader approach. What we point towards in this section is
20
21 that, despite the rich insights of all three approaches, some of the imprecision relates to the
22
23 consequences of how urban informality is conceptualised and that, individually, all three
24
25 approaches find it difficult to challenge the emplacement in urban theory – that informality
26
27 is predominantly something to understand ‘non-western’ cities. Undoubtedly, our own
28
29 categorisation will have its own limitations associated with ordering knowledge.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 *Informality as condition*

38
39

40
41 The first approach works principally by naming and categorising bounded entities as
42
43 ‘informal’ to have powerful political effects. This set of analyses is recognisable in the
44
45 labelling of spaces, people or organisations as ‘informal’; the category of the informal is
46
47 used as a descriptive qualifier for such ‘conditions’. Thinking from informality as condition,
48
49 policymakers, scholars and people ‘living informally’ can identify, and importantly describe,
50
51 a condition of ‘informality’ according to a particular set of criteria. For example, a seminal
52
53 ILO report mentions the following criteria to identify informal enterprises: whether they are
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 registered or not, the number of employees, barriers to entry for that activity, and so on
4
5 (ILO, 1972; Jhabvala, Sudarshan, & Unni, 2003). Similarly, in this approach it is presumed
6
7 that settlements can be identified as 'formal' or 'informal' according to criteria such as the
8
9 nature of property rights, levels of infrastructure and services and planning, or forms of
10
11 construction and types of construction of dwelling units (UN Habitat, 2003, 2004). Indeed,
12
13 the problem with these criteria is that they often lead to extended debates about their
14
15 reliability and precision rather than how and why they apply. When the dichotomy is clearly
16
17 overstated, which is particularly so when considering tenure security, some variations of this
18
19 approach do try to introduce notions of a spectrum of informality (GLTN, 2012). These
20
21 gradations are important and we will return to this issue when discussing common
22
23 denominators below. For now, we point out that what tends to happen in this approach is
24
25 that far fewer questions are asked about *why* the label is being applied in the first place.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 Informality as condition is perhaps the most common way of thinking about urban
34
35 informality. To situate this within other classifications in the debate, informality as condition
36
37 resonates with the first three of the four conceptualisations identified by McFarlane and
38
39 Waibel (2012b): informality as spatial categorisation, organisational form and governmental
40
41 tool. Examples abound and we would place most of our own work within this approach (see
42
43 for example, Boano and Kelling, 2013; Marx, 2003, 2009). Other examples include Bayat's
44
45 (1997, p. 10) slogan of the "informal people" or expressions such as "the informals"
46
47 (Rakowski, 1994a, p. 3). Within the policy circuits of institutions focused on housing and
48
49 land, such as UN Habitat, the categorisation is ubiquitous and has served to inform many
50
51 interventions by international agencies, NGOs, governments, and movements of residents
52
53 living in such parts of cities thought of as 'informal'.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Indeed, the strategic element of the labels 'formal'/'informal' for policy interventions is the
6
7 main focus of the branch of research that McFarlane and Waibel (2012b, p. 4) have called
8
9 "informal-formal as a *governmental tool*". These analyses focus on the technologies of
10
11 categorisation, including mapping or statistics, as well as the ways in which they are applied
12
13 (Elyachar, 2003). Amongst other possible interventions, a key enablement through labelling
14
15 is seen to lie in that those entities which are tagged as 'informal' can easily be evicted and
16
17 destroyed (Cabannes, Guimarães Yafai, & Johnson, 2010; Menon-Sen & Bhan, 2008).
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 Critical analyses of processes of using the label strategically for the purposes of legalisation
25
26 and criminalisation, have been highly influential in the field of urban and planning studies
27
28 focused on 'the non-west'. One reason for this is that it allows scholars to understand
29
30 informality as central to contemporary mechanisms of wealth distribution, and thus as a
31
32 central means through which inequality is performed. It decouples informality from poverty,
33
34 and affords an opportunity to recognise how powerful actors can deploy the mechanism of
35
36 labelling to their advantage (Elyachar, Steinmetz, & Adams, 2005). Whether this is by
37
38 retrospectively legalising the constructions of wealthy urbanites or state agencies that
39
40 are/were in breach of the law, or by delaying the moment of criminalisation of the
41
42 constructs of the poor as long as their presence and proximity is useful (Roy, 2009; Yiftachel,
43
44 2009).
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Indeed, it is here that the famous phrase of Roy finds its meaning: "If formality operates
53
54 through the fixing of value, including the mapping of spatial value, then informality operates
55
56 through the constant negotiability of value" (AlSayyad & Roy, 2004, p. 5). In this sense, it is
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 an 'organising logic' of governance, as referred to above in our initial definition. However,
4
5 the view of informality as a mode of governance operates with a labelling logic itself. This is
6
7 not only insofar as modes of governance are identified as either 'formal'/'informal' but also
8
9 insofar as the condition of settlements as 'formal'/'informal' is conceptually accepted, even
10
11 if it is understood as a category usually applied by the state. As a result, such critical
12
13 analyses remain within the broader approach of informality as condition.
14
15
16
17
18

19 Despite its common-sense nature, it is interesting to reflect on what it means to work with
20
21 informality as condition. That is, to be able to speak with, for, or about, people living or
22
23 working in this assumed condition. The first reflection is that 'informality' becomes a state
24
25 of being that has already been achieved. And, if the condition that is labelled informal is the
26
27 result of prior social processes, they may no longer exist in the ever-changing space-times of
28
29 cities and towns. Here, the emergence of informality can easily be reified and is read off
30
31 from the current condition, creating the potential to misconstrue the dynamics of how the
32
33 activities and spatial forms in question initially came into being.
34
35
36
37
38

39 We hazard a guess that for most scholars and practitioners the motivation for working with
40
41 informality as a condition is captured within an impulse of a strand of subaltern studies.
42
43 That is, to make 'visible and sayable' the conditions of life that obtain in such resource poor
44
45 urban environments (Roy, 2011). In a sense, it is to counteract the dominant tendency to
46
47 consider what is conceptualised as 'informal economies' and/or 'informal settlements' as
48
49 invisible. Naming a condition allows activist-scholars to shed light on what this condition
50
51 implies for those living 'in it', and in the best cases, to empower them (Peattie, 1987). Thus,
52
53 informality as condition offers a powerful way to make informality visible. It must do so in
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 terms of formality but maybe that is not always a problem. There might be times when
4
5 talking back to formality offers opportunities for meaningful change. In other instances, as
6
7 Roy (2011) argues, there are limits to this strategy: thinking of informal settlements or
8
9 economies as that which must be spoken for, we lose a sense in which that which is labelled
10
11 informal cannot be understood through only what we know about it. For example, we lose
12
13 an ability to know how it is constituted by relationality, processes, and practices.
14
15
16
17
18

19 If urban informality is a (descriptive) condition then a key issue is: how and why do
20
21 in/formality distinctions emerge? In our view, informality as condition must seek the
22
23 emergence and origin of the condition elsewhere – typically in the practices of categorising
24
25 by the state and/or planning, and, for some, there within neoliberalism. Thus, while often
26
27 powerful in locating informality (of all types) in a universal logic of neoliberalism and in
28
29 identifying the mechanisms of this labelling, this approach is less useful in analysing the
30
31 actual social processes that context-specifically make up what comes to be identified – and
32
33 identifiable – as ‘urban informality’.
34
35
36
37
38

39 *Informality as laws*

40
41
42

43 A second dominant way, in which urban in/formality in ‘non-western’ cities is known, draws
44
45 on legal scholarship, particularly that strand associated with legal pluralism. From this
46
47 perspective, urban informality in ‘the non-west’ is strongly related to laws and norms and is
48
49 often finely nuanced (Merry, 1988; de Sousa Santos, 1977). In such situations, legal
50
51 pluralism offers its own view on some of the mechanisms through which, for example,
52
53 contested claims on urban property rights, and with it in/formality, are negotiated (Azuela
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 de la Cueva, 1987; Fernandes & Varley, 1998). In short, legal pluralism holds that a plurality
4
5 of legal systems co-exists. In this work, it is recognised that there are many different
6
7 'sources' of law – including state law, religious law, indigenous laws, customary laws and
8
9 local conventions and norms that function as 'laws' (Benda-Beckman, 2002). In such a legal
10
11 pluralist view, state law is not necessarily always the dominant referent in the activities of
12
13 people, and indeed, the state may not have the capacity to enforce state law (McAuslan,
14
15 2005). Moreover, such views also break an automatic link between state law and formality.
16
17 From this perspective, customary law can be just as 'formal' as state law and state law can
18
19 operate 'informally' (Benton, 1994, p. 225). They also break any automatic links between
20
21 formality and regulation so that what counts as 'informal' in a given context can be just as
22
23 regulated as that which counts as 'formal'.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 This approach is rich in local empirical detail as it sets out to analyse how 'laws' or 'legal
34
35 orders' – understood more capaciously – emerge, operate, are transformed, and change
36
37 from being considered 'formal' to 'informal' and *vice versa*. Such work starts out from what
38
39 is conventionally taken as 'formal' or 'informal', with their respective bases in or outside of
40
41 state law, but tries not to work with these as predetermined categorisations. Instead, it
42
43 analyses how different legal systems co-exist and how this relates to the constitution of
44
45 political authority. A key theme within such work focuses on tenure and property rights and
46
47 how different tenures offer different levels of security for their users and holders – as well
48
49 as expressing a range of other processes such as citizenship and economic development
50
51 (McAuslan, 2003). The power relations between different legal systems is always central as
52
53 each provides its particular set of rights and obligations (Chiodelli & Moroni, 2014). The
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 informalisation of a specific 'legal order' of regulating property relations, for instance,
4
5 usually means a significant shift in peoples' access to and control over resources.
6
7

8
9
10 This approach shows how taken-for-granted assumptions between laws, formality, and
11
12 regulation are flawed. Moreover, it highlights the link between informality, power, and
13
14 injustices. The focus on property rights is rarely picked up in other approaches with notable
15
16 exceptions being Roy (2003), Krueckeberg (1995, 2004) and Porter et al (2011). What it is
17
18 less useful at doing is transcending the 'local' of the 'non-west' and thus contributing to
19
20 broader urban theory. In its rich specificity of the 'local', there are echoes of labelling (and
21
22 the associated issues) discussed above in relation to informality as condition. This is because
23
24 it tends to work on the inherited positivist categorical assumption that the different legal
25
26 systems that operate in a specific context are internally coherent and separate from each
27
28 other (Melissaris, 2004). It is entire legal systems that are thought of as formal or informal.
29
30
31

32 33 34 35 *Informality as currency*

36
37
38 This approach primarily refers to contexts that might ordinarily be described as 'informal'.
39
40 However, the research interest is not on that in/formality but on the activities of residents
41
42 of cities that are essential for the way in which the cities work, and on an understanding of
43
44 why they follow these activities (Guyer, 2011). In short, it is an interest in the social and
45
46 spatial organisation of how people make the city (de Boeck & Plissart, 2004). We call this
47
48 way of knowing 'informality as currency' because it acknowledges that actors in the field
49
50 consider some activities, people, or spaces as 'informal', and that this consideration has a
51
52 meaningful social effect – it has a socio-political 'currency' that can be mobilised. Thus,
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 informality as currency approaches the topic with sufficient nuance to understand the social
4
5 effect of how we (as in, everyone) recognise and interpret our practices and those of others
6
7 – without buying into these interpretations (Guibrunet, 2017).
8
9

10
11
12 In contrast to the approach of informality as condition which works with ‘informal-formal as
13
14 a governmental tool’, the label is understood as more than a tool of the state for enabling
15
16 desired interventions; it is understood as one of multiple factors structuring the social and
17
18 spatial organisation of the city (Meagher, 2010). In informality as currency, the term has
19
20 currency for/in how residents, other scholars, and policymakers know a given city and cities
21
22 in general and is not taken as a reason to define these or any other activities, people or
23
24 spaces as essentially informal.
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 This way of knowing informality, and indeed of doing urban research more generally,
32
33 presents a rich analysis of the construction of social relations and their spatiality, and offers
34
35 a complementary perspective to the previous two approaches. Informality as currency
36
37 suggests that many other issues are more relevant to people’s lives than state law and
38
39 policy categorisations. Even if the categories of formality and informality have spread wide
40
41 and gained a firm foothold in the reflexive understanding of the world of many people in
42
43 the ‘non-west’, it is not the only framing through which people understand their lives, and
44
45 may indeed often be of peripheral importance (Chattopadhyay, 2012b). Here, we are firmly
46
47 into a relational perspective that emphasises flux and changes, while still recognising
48
49 regularity.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The basis for this view is drawn from long standing sociological insights and is usefully
4
5 captured by Tonkiss (2013, p. 93): "...informality is something of a non-concept. A lack of
6
7 legal 'formality' does not mean either an absence of form or a lack of organization." In
8
9 contrast to informality as laws, this perspective acknowledges that practices are socially
10
11 organised – whether by formal or informal norms/rules/routines. The idea of organisation is
12
13 different from the broad conception of 'laws' of informality as laws, which, even if
14
15 extending beyond state law, still refers to codified sets of legal rules, whether set by a
16
17 religious, customary, or any other authority. Instead of seeing one legal system as informal
18
19 and the other as formal, informality as currency is able to recognise that some ways of
20
21 doing things have been codified into a legal rule with formal status, and others not – within
22
23 the same context of social organisation. Indeed, the crucial novelty of informality as
24
25 currency is its implicit ability to see the element of active social organisation in those
26
27 practices and activities that are ordinarily understood as 'informal', but that within the
28
29 other perspectives are conventionally and more passively considered as spontaneous and
30
31 unorganised.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39
40 Informed by the view that, by nature, humans need some form of regularity and stability in
41
42 their social fields of interaction, Simone (2012), for instance, argues for a need to move
43
44 away from searching for large institutional sedimentations, based on bounded categories
45
46 that are characteristic to the era of nation-states. Instead, in precarious living situations
47
48 people find regularity in provisionality through an open attitude toward collaborative
49
50 practice with others, through the ability to become easily familiar with new arrangements
51
52 (Simone, 2001). In this approach, the focus falls on analysing the dynamics that are active in
53
54 assumedly formal and predictable institutions (Kudva, 2009), and to recognise the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 regularities in that which scholars have come to know as informal – and which we
4
5 concomitantly think as rather fluid and volatile.
6
7

8
9
10 Informality as currency is useful for showing how informality is constituted from a range of
11
12 practices, categorisations, and places. It starts to demonstrate how many of the informal
13
14 activities are composed of relations that extend well beyond the ‘local’ and ties places
15
16 together in ways that are not anticipated by urban theory (Simone, 2003). While the focus
17
18 remains on the ‘local’ it is powerful at detailing how cross-scalar relations emerge and
19
20 constitute the local. Through this, it offers more purchase on, and substance to, local
21
22 dynamics rather than just assuming that these relations are those of neoliberal impulses.
23
24 Overall, informality as currency is closer to contemporary urban theory and folds the notion
25
26 of the informal into it. However, it still remains within the regional dualism of ‘the west’ and
27
28 ‘the non-west’ currently due its choice of case studies, and its (legitimate) priority of
29
30 conceptualising ‘the urban’ rather than informality itself.
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Discussion**

38
39
40

41 In this section, we reach toward a different understanding to address the double bind of the
42
43 concept of urban informality lacking precision and contributing to broader urban theory in
44
45 circumscribed ways. That is, separately, all of the three approaches offer specific insights on
46
47 the ‘local’ that, we go on to argue, are constrained by the emplacement of the concept as
48
49 referring to ‘the non-west’ and, through this, in contributing to broader urban theory. None
50
51 of the three approaches really challenge this emplacement of urban informality although
52
53 they all, in one way or another, seek to do so. We suggest that working with common
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 denominators of urban informality it is possible to simultaneously do (at least) two things in
4
5 order to start disentangling the double-bind: 1) provide a more precise grasp of what is
6
7 going on locally, and 2) address the structural inequalities in urban theories. In doing this,
8
9 scholars may finally come up with an understanding of urban informality that can ‘trouble
10
11 the rich’.
12
13
14
15

16 We propose a way of addressing this double bind that may animate Ann Varley’s (2013b)
17
18 advice to work with ‘difference in practice rather than in principle’. This means that instead
19
20 of sustaining an initial assumption that a bounded entity like a settlement is informal or
21
22 formal, we should focus on a more relational approach (Boudreau & Davis, 2017) and *the*
23
24 *practices* that make it possible to think these bounded entities in terms of being in/formal.
25
26 This, we argue, offers the possibilities to be attentive to a wider set of power relations and
27
28 to escape the double bind that besets the current usage of the concept. *In principle*, many
29
30 of these *practices* are well documented by well-established critiques of binary thinking –
31
32 that binaries rely on singularities, are mutually exclusive and hierarchical – and these
33
34 critiques are well-rehearsed in the urban informality debate and across our three
35
36 approaches. *In practice*, however, we have identified through the review that the distinction
37
38 between the formal and the informal as a binary is sustained by implicit common
39
40 assumptions that hold the pair together. We call this a common denominator.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Common denominators are specific registers or mechanisms which, without being
50
51 addressed explicitly, allows scholars or policymakers to name two entities as a coherent
52
53 binary pair that ‘makes sense’. For example, ‘informal settlement’ makes sense in
54
55 opposition to ‘formal settlement’ because it is held together by assumptions about, for
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 instance, property rights. It makes little sense as an opposition to 'refugee settlement', for
4
5 example. In the following, we illustrate this idea by elaborating on two common
6
7 denominators – property rights systems and urban aesthetics. These examples are
8
9 indicative and suggestive. Others are likely to exist and wait to be explored. Before
10
11 illustrating these two, though, we make a few more general statements about common
12
13 denominators and how they work to suppress latent power inequalities.
14
15
16
17
18

19 We identify three aspects to how common denominators practically facilitate the
20
21 construction of the binary formal/informal. The first aspect to note – drawing from
22
23 informality as currency – is that people actively construct the binary oppositions of
24
25 in/formality. However, there are two points to make about these constructions. First, if
26
27 these constructions are to 'make sense' they must tend towards the well-worn tracks of
28
29 existing constructions. Second, although people are in multiple relationships with others,
30
31 these multiple relations present different affordances to exercise (naming) agency around
32
33 informality. Both the existing constructions and the differing abilities to escape the existing
34
35 constructions are already the result of unequal power relations. Therefore, analysing how
36
37 people are constructing binary oppositions to 'make sense' and who is able to do/contest
38
39 this should provide insights into what contexts, activities, and understandings support
40
41 current (unequal) framings of urban informality.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 The second aspect to note about how common denominators work is that they conceal
50
51 latent power relations by appearing so obvious. The calibrations within the common
52
53 denominator dovetail with existing binary distinctions making the binaries seem natural.
54
55 What is key here is that the 'fit' between common denominators and binary distinctions is
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 only 'natural' because the common denominator is itself already reflective of binary
4
5 distinctions and gradations between these. This makes it extremely difficult to challenge the
6
7 binary distinctions and also to challenge how the common denominator is operating. This
8
9 observation is even more troubling when accounting for the ways that common
10
11 denominators tend to be expressions of (existing) power relations.
12
13
14
15

16
17 The third aspect is that common denominators must appear to be kept stable and coherent
18
19 to allow movement within the binary pairing. That is, either granting interventions the
20
21 potential of 'closing the gap' between the opposites (through mixing or hybridising) or
22
23 through promoting the transformation of one into the other (typically converting the
24
25 'informal' into the 'formal') – for better or worse. These movements cannot be promoted
26
27 and measured if the yard stick represented in the common denominator is itself moving.
28
29 This means that scholars and policymakers aiming for such transformation are implicitly
30
31 encouraged to accept the (predetermined) coherence of common denominators with their
32
33 already existing power relations at play. Seen in combination, these three aspects are
34
35 suggestive of the latent power of common denominators at work.
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 We demonstrate the latent working of common denominators with the example of property
43
44 rights. These are frequently used as a common denominator in analyses of in/formal
45
46 settlements within cities in 'the non-west'. One of the most common associations with
47
48 property rights is land values. This particular association is made in practice despite the
49
50 multiple options that exist to relate property rights to different legal systems, histories,
51
52 gender relations and so on. It is also evident that gradations of security of tenure
53
54 correspond in predetermined ways to the binary distinctions between in/formality (GLTN,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2010) that serve to 'naturally' reinforce the self-evident nature of the binaries. Urban
4
5 property rights (and their associated markets, see for example Wallace and Williamson
6
7 (2006)) are also generally considered to be evolving through specific gradations towards
8
9 clearer forms of private property (Fitzpatrick, 2006). In this techno-market understanding,
10
11 deviations from this evolution (such as persistent informality) are considered anomalies that
12
13 need to be corrected but the gradations themselves are rarely questioned.
14
15
16
17
18

19 Thus, using this view of property rights as a common denominator unintentionally already
20
21 locks in assumptions about where on the spectrum an asset or practice fits, what value it
22
23 has and which registers of value count, how they should change, and who can legitimately
24
25 participate in naming any changes. More importantly, these assumptions remain
26
27 unexamined because the focus of debate falls on challenging the power relations that are
28
29 associated with binaries themselves. In effect, such debates about informality are rarely a
30
31 'threat to the rich' insofar as the unquestioned common denominator confirms that the
32
33 assets of the rich are on the 'safe' (i.e. formal) side of the binary.
34
35
36
37
38

39 In a similar way, we now explore how theorisations of informality in cities in 'the non-west'
40
41 rarely trouble the formulation of broader urban theory emerging from cities in 'the west'.
42
43 Here we take another example of a frequently used common denominator – that of urban
44
45 aesthetics. Ghertner (2015) has deployed the concept to great effect within Delhi to reveal
46
47 how power relations inhere in an aesthetic register of urban governance. Now, we
48
49 demonstrate how this might apply across a 'west – non-west' binary within urban theory. At
50
51 a very obvious level, the point is often made that analyses of informality have little
52
53 relevance for 'western' cities because we just do not see it in the urban form and quality of
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 urban spaces produced in these cities. The debate begins and ends on the presence of
4
5 urban spaces of informality in 'non-western' cities, and their absence or at best marginal
6
7 and exceptional presence in 'western' cities.
8
9

10
11
12 In order to address this marginality in 'western' cities, scholars have pointed to informalities
13
14 of different kinds, for example, the "informality of the rich" (Tonkiss, 2013, pp. 94–95), the
15
16 association of migrants with informality, that is, informality being brought to 'the west' from
17
18 elsewhere (see the discussion of Durst and Wegmann (2017)), or the phenomenon of 'pop-
19
20 up urbanism' and 'do-it-yourself urbanism' (Tonkiss, 2013), which have little to do with the
21
22 severity of inadequate provisioning of urban goods. As before, attending to the operation of
23
24 the common denominators reveals a series of power relations that inhere in common
25
26 assumptions, and that have the effect of making it difficult to question the emplacement of
27
28 'non-western' ways of knowing informality in broader urban theory. Associated with
29
30 aesthetics are assumptions about scale, poverty and modernity and the role they play in
31
32 constituting urban theory.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39
40 One aspect is how informality is associated with a particular scale of agglomeration so that
41
42 the (relatively) dispersed backyard sheds offering accommodation in London cannot be
43
44 related to the backyard shacks offering accommodation in cities like Johannesburg. A
45
46 second is how poverty is assumed to be part of informality so that poverty and informality
47
48 work together. But, only certain types of poverty – the kind that is found in non-western
49
50 cities. 'Western' cities with extensive poverty, such as London (CPAG, 2017), are not
51
52 considered to relate to informality. A third aspect is that the dominant aesthetic
53
54 conceptions of the city already lock in place, what looks valuable, pleasing, 'modern' and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 what is not – the lower value messiness of informality so that the discussions of informality
4
5 in ‘non-western’ cities already have a common-sensical location in an aesthetic common
6
7 denominator.
8
9

10
11
12 Thus, discussions about scale, poverty and the constitution of aesthetic registers and the
13
14 power relations that already inhere in them are not for discussion in relation to urban
15
16 theory. Across cities, it invites questions about why scale, poverty and modernity make a
17
18 difference to how we think about urban informality and what relaxing some of our
19
20 assumptions about these interlocking phenomena might do to how we understand how
21
22 cities are produced and how inequalities are understood.
23
24
25

26 27 28 **Conclusion** 29

30
31
32 We have argued that two of the enduring critiques of urban informality, that it lacks enough
33
34 precision in studying events, relations and processes in place and that it is circumscribed in
35
36 contributing to broader urban theory, are two aspects of the same problem – an inability to
37
38 recognise and account for the effects of common denominators. It is only by working across
39
40 the three approaches that we can show how the common denominators emerge in the
41
42 practices of constituting urban informality.
43
44
45

46
47
48 In relation to improving the analytical precision at a city level, we drew on the example of
49
50 property rights as a common denominator. We showed that if the common denominator is
51
52 questioned, then scholars gain an ability to question an important aspect of the power
53
54 relations that hold binaries together. For example, we gain an ability to question why it is
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 that distinctions between in/formal property rights are automatically discussed in terms of
4
5 land values. We are afforded an opportunity to question how calibrated distinctions in
6
7 property rights already incorporate binary distinctions between in/formality. And, we gain
8
9 an ability to question why challenging calibrations of property rights must be thought
10
11 through the stages identified in evolutionary theories of property rights (which themselves
12
13 reinforce specific notions of land value). Overall, we gain an ability to identify the latent
14
15 power relations that already inhere in these specific understandings of land value,
16
17 predetermined calibrations and changes that are already set out as logical. Attending to the
18
19 practices, spaces, processes and agents and the inequalities that inhere or which are
20
21 performed through them offers the potential to be more analytically precise about what
22
23 constitutes urban informality and how such understandings are sustained. It helps us
24
25 analyse the ways that urban informality emerges, is sustained and the effects it has.
26
27
28
29
30

31
32
33 With respect to the emplacement of urban informality in contributing to broader urban
34
35 theory, the common denominator of urban aesthetics affords possibilities to question why it
36
37 is that scholars are actively only able to discuss urban informality in cities in 'the west' in
38
39 terms of the lack of scale of the phenomena. It offers the chance to question how
40
41 understandings of poverty already dovetail with notions of urban informality. And, it affords
42
43 questions about the fixed distinctions between what is aesthetically modern and pleasing
44
45 and what is aesthetically unappealing about urban informality. Attending to these questions
46
47 enables us to question the processes and assumptions that currently emplace urban
48
49 informality as primarily a non-western city phenomena.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The examples of common denominators explored here are indicative and suggestive. It is
4
5 clear that there will be many more to identify and challenge and that we could think how an
6
7 aesthetic common denominator could be operating within cities and a common
8
9 denominator of property rights could be operating between cities in relation to urban
10
11 theory. What they draw our attention to is their necessarily relational character and ways in
12
13 which they must continually be achieved in practice. Herein lies the potential to hold open
14
15 the possibilities to develop notions of urban informality that can more precisely identify and
16
17 challenge the latent power relations that remain unquestioned in analysing urban
18
19 inequalities within cities and distinctions across urban theories.
20
21
22
23
24

25 26 **Acknowledgements**

27
28
29
30 The authors are extremely grateful to the Editors, referees and Guest Editors of the special
31
32 issue, for extensive and insightful comments. We also thank Vanesa Castàn-Broto for
33
34 valuable comments on our first submission. Any errors remain ours alone.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **References**

- 43
44 AlSayyad, N. (2004). Urban informality as a “new” way of life, in: A. Roy & N. AlSayyad (Eds.),
45
46 *Urban informality: Transnational perspectives from the Middle East, Latin America, and*
47
48 *South Asia*, pp. 7–30. Oxford: Lexington Books.
49
50
51 AlSayyad, N., & Roy, A. (2004). Prologue/dialogue. Urban informality: Crossing borders, in:
52
53 A. Roy & N. AlSayyad (Eds.), *Urban informality: Transnational perspectives from the*
54
55 *Middle East, Latin America, and South Asia*, pp. 1–6. Oxford: Lexington Books.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Amin, A., & Graham, S. (1997). The ordinary city. *Trans Inst Br Geogr*, 22, pp. 411–429.
4
5 Azuela de la Cueva, A. (1987). Low income settlement and the law in Mexico City.
6
7 *International journal of urban and regional research*, 11(4), pp. 522–541.
8
9 Bayat, A. (1997). Un-civil society: the politics of the “informal people.” *Third World*
10
11 *Quarterly*, 18(1), pp. 53–72.
12
13 Benda-Beckman, F. v. (2002). Who’s afraid of legal pluralism? *Journal of legal pluralism*, 47,
14
15 pp. 37–82.
16
17 Benton, L. A. (1994). Beyond legal pluralism: Towards a new approach to law in the informal
18
19 sector. *Social and legal studies*, 3(2), pp. 223–242.
20
21 de Boeck, F., & Plissart, M. F. (2004). *Kinshasa. Tales of the invisible city*. Amsterdam:
22
23 Ludion.
24
25 Boano, C & Kelling, E (2013). Toward an Architecture of Dissensus: Participatory Urbanism in
26
27 South-East Asia. *Footprint Issue 13*, pp.41-62. DOI:
28
29 <http://dx.doi.org/10.7480/footprint.7.2.769>.
30
31 Boudreau, J.-A., & Davis, D. E. (2017). Introduction: A processual approach to
32
33 informalization. *Current sociology*, 65(2), pp. 151–166.
34
35 Brenner, N., & Schmid, C. (2015). Towards a new epistemology of the urban? *City*, 19(2–3),
36
37 pp. 151–182.
38
39 Bromley, R. (1978). Introduction - the urban informal sector: Why is it worth discussing?
40
41 *World Development*, 6(9–10), pp. 1033–1039.
42
43 Cabannes, Y., Guimarães Yafai, S., & Johnson, C. (2010). *How the poor face evictions*.
44
45 London: Development Planning Unit, UCL.
46
47 Chattopadhyay, S. (2012a). Urbanism, colonialism and subalternity, in: T. Edensor & M.
48
49 Jayne (Eds.), *Urban theory beyond the west*, pp. 75–92. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Chattopadhyay, S. (2012b). *Unlearning the city: infrastructure in a new optical field*.
4
5 Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
6
7 Chiodelli, F., & Moroni, S. (2014). The complex nexus between informality and the law:
8
9 Reconsidering unauthorised settlements in light of the concept of nomotropism.
10
11 *Geoforum*, 51, pp. 161–168.
12
13
14 CPAG. (2017). *Poverty: The facts*. London.
15
16 Dovey, K. (2012). Informal urbanism and complex adaptive assemblage. *International*
17
18 *development planning review*, 34(4), pp. 349–368.
19
20
21 Durst, N. J., & Wegmann, J. (2017). Informal housing in the United States. *International*
22
23 *Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 2, 41(2), pp. 282–297.
24
25
26 Edensor, T., & Jayne, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Urban theory beyond the west. A world of cities*.
27
28 Abingdon: Routledge.
29
30 Elyachar, J. (2003). Mappings of power: the state, NGOs, and international organisations in
31
32 the informal economy of Cairo. *Comparative studies in society and history*, 45(3), pp.
33
34 571–605.
35
36
37 Elyachar, J., Steinmetz, G., & Adams, J. (2005). *Markets of dispossession. NGOs, economic*
38
39 *development and the state in Cairo*. Durham: Duke University Press.
40
41
42 Fernandes, E., & Varley, A. (1998). Law, the city and citizenship in developing countries: An
43
44 introduction, in: E. Fernandes & A. Varley (Eds.), *Illegal cities. Law and urban change in*
45
46 *developing countries*, pp. 3–17. London: Zed Books.
47
48
49 Fitzpatrick, D. (2006). Evolution and chaos in property rights systems: the Third World
50
51 tragedy of contested access. *The Yale law journal*, 115(5), pp. 996–1048.
52
53
54 Gërkhani, K. (2004). The informal sector in developed and less developed countries: a
55
56 literature survey. *Public choice*, 120, pp. 267–300.
57
58
59

- 1
2
3 Ghertner, D. A. (2015). *Rule by aesthetics. World-class city making in Delhi*. New York:
4
5 Oxford University Press.
6
7 GLTN. (2010). *Count me in. Surveying for tenure security and urban land management*.
8
9 Nairobi: UN-Habitat.
10
11
12 GLTN. (2012). *Handling land. Innovative tools for land governance and secure tenure*.
13
14 Nairobi: UN-Habitat, Global Land Tools Network and IIRR.
15
16 Guha-Khasnobis, B., Kanbur, R., & Ostrom, E. (2007). Linking the formal and informal
17
18 economy. Concepts and issues. *UNU-Wider studies in development economics*.
19
20
21 Guibrunet, L. (2017). The contribution of the informal economy to urban sustainability - case
22
23 study of waste management in Tepito, Mexico City. PhD Thesis, University College
24
25 London.
26
27
28 Guyer, J. I. (2011). Describing urban “no man’s land’ in Africa. *Africa*, 81(3), pp. 474–492.
29
30
31 Harding, A., & Blokland, T. (2014). *Urban theory. A critical introduction to power, cities and*
32
33 *urbanism in the 21st century*. London: Sage Publications.
34
35
36 Hart, K. (1973). Informal income opportunities and urban employment in Ghana. *Journal of*
37
38 *modern African studies*, 11(1), pp. 61–89.
39
40
41 ILO. (1972). Employment, income and equality: a strategy for increasing productivity in
42
43 Kenya.
44
45
46 Jhabvala, R., Sudarshan, R. M., & Unni, J. (2003). Informal economy centrestage. New
47
48 structures of employment. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
49
50
51 Krueckeberg, D. . (1995). The difficult character of property. *Journal of the American*
52
53 *Planning Association*, 61(3), pp. 301–309.
54
55
56 Krueckeberg, D. A. (2004). The lessons of John Locke or Hernando de Soto: What if your
57
58 dreams come true? *Housing policy debate*, 15(1), pp. 1–24.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kudva, N. (2009). The everyday and the episodic: the spatial and political impacts of urban
4
5 informality. *Environment & Planning A*, 41(7), pp. 1614–1629.
6
7
8 Laguerre, M. S. (1994). *The informal city*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
9
10 Marx, C. (2009). Conceptualising the potential of informal land markets to reduce poverty.
11
12 *International Development Planning Review*, 31(4), pp. 335–353.
13
14 Marx, C. (2003). Supporting informal settlements, in: F. Khan & P. Thring (Eds.), *Housing*
15
16 *policy and practice in post-Apartheid South Africa*, pp. 299–320. Sandown: Heinemann.
17
18
19 McAuslan, P. (2003). *Bringing the law back in: essays in land, law and development*.
20
21 Aldershot: Ashgate.
22
23 McAuslan, P. (2005). Legal pluralism as a policy option: is it desirable, is it doable?
24
25
26 McFarlane, C. (2012). Rethinking informality : politics, crisis, and the city. *Planning theory*
27
28 *and practice*, 13(1), pp. 89–108.
29
30 McFarlane, C., & Waibel, M. (Eds.). (2012a). *Urban Informalities: Reflections on the Formal*
31
32 *and Informal*. London: Routledge.
33
34
35 McFarlane, C., & Waibel, M. (2012b). Introduction: the informal-formal divide in context, in:
36
37 C. McFarlane & M. Waibel (Eds.), *Urban informalities. Reflections on the formal and*
38
39 *informal*, p. 1-. London: Routledge.
40
41
42 Meagher, K. (2010). The tangled web of associational life: urban governance and the politics
43
44 of popular livelihoods in Nigeria. *Urban forum*, 21(3), pp. 299–313.
45
46
47 Melissaris, E. (2004). The More the Merrier? A New Take on Legal Pluralism. *Social & Legal*
48
49 *Studies*, 13(1), pp. 57–79.
50
51 Menon-Sen, K., & Bhan, G. (2008). *Swept off the map. Surviving eviction and resettlement in*
52
53 *Delhi*. New Delhi: Yoda Press.
54
55
56 Merry, S. E. (1988). Legal Pluralism. *Law & society review*1, 22(5), pp. 869–896.
57
58
59

- 1
2
3 Moser, C. O. N. (1994). The informal sector debate, Part 1: 1970-1983, in: C. A. Rakowski
4
5 (Ed.), *Contrapunto: The informal sector debate in Latin America*, pp. 11–29. Albany:
6
7 State University of New York Press.
8
9
10 Peattie, L. (1987). An idea in good currency and how it grew: The informal sector. *World*
11
12 *Development*, 15(7), pp. 851–860.
13
14 Porter, L. (2011). Informality, the Commons and the paradoxes for Planning: Concepts and
15
16 debates for Informality and Planning. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 12(1), pp. 115–153.
17
18
19 Rakowski, C. . (1994a). *Contrapunto: The informal sector debate in Latin America*. Albany:
20
21 State University of New York Press.
22
23
24 Rakowski, C. . (1994b). The informal sector debate, Part 2: 1984-1993, in: C. A. Rakowski
25
26 (Ed.), *Contrapunto: The informal sector debate in Latin America*, pp. 31–50. Albany:
27
28 State University of New York Press.
29
30
31 Robinson, J. (2002). Global and world cities: A view from off the map. *International journal*
32
33 *of urban and regional research*, 26(3), pp. 531–554.
34
35
36 Robinson, J. (2006). *Ordinary cities*. London: Routledge.
37
38
39 Roy, A. (2003). Paradigms of propertied citizenship. Transnational techniques of analysis.
40
41 *Urban affairs review*, 38(4), pp. 463–491.
42
43
44 Roy, A. (2005). Urban informality. Towards an epistemology of planning. *Journal of the*
45
46 *American Planning Association*, 71(2), pp. 147–158.
47
48
49 Roy, A. (2009). Strangely familiar: planning and the worlds of insurgence and informality.
50
51 *Planning Theory*, 8(1), pp. 7–11.
52
53
54 Roy, A. (2011). Slumdog Cities: Rethinking Subaltern Urbanism - IJURR. *International journal*
55
56 *of urban and regional research*, 35(2), pp. 223–238.
57
58
59 Roy, A. (2012). Urban informality: the production of space and practice of planning, in: R.

1
2
3 Crane & R. Weber (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Urban Planning*. Abingdon: Oxford
4
5 Handbooks Online. Retrieved from
6
7 <http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195374995.001.0001>
8
9
10 /oxfordhb-9780195374995-e-33

11
12 Roy, A. (2015). Who's Afraid of Postcolonial Theory? *International Journal of Urban and*
13
14 *Regional Research*, 40(1), pp. 200-209.

15
16 Roy, A., & AlSayyad, N. (2004). Urban informality. Transnational perspectives from the
17
18 Middle East, Latin America and South Asia.

19
20
21 Schindler, S. (2014). Producing and contesting the formal/informal divide: Regulating street
22
23 hawking in Delhi, India. *Urban Studies*, 51(12), pp. 2596–2612.

24
25
26 Schindler, S. (2017). Beyond a state-centric approach to urban informality: Interactions
27
28 between Delhi's middle class and the informal service sector. *Current sociology*, 65(2),
29
30 pp. 248–259.

31
32
33 Scott, A. J. (2017). *The constitution of the city*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

34
35 Simone, A. (2001). Straddling the divides: Remaking associational life in the informal African
36
37 city. *International journal of urban and regional research*, 25(1), pp. 102–117.

38
39
40 Simone, A. (2003). Reaching the Larger World: New Forms of Social Collaboration in Pikine,
41
42 Senegal. *Africa*, 73(2), pp. 226–250.

43
44 Simone, A. (2012). Screen, in: C. Lury & N. Wakeford (Eds.), *Inventive methods: the*
45
46 *happening of the social*, pp. 202–218. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

47
48
49 Song, L. K. (2016). Planning with urban informality: a case for inclusion, co-production and
50
51 reiteration. *International development planning review*, 38(4), pp. 359–381.

52
53 de Soto, H. (1989). *The other path: The invisible revolution in the third world*. New York: I.B.
54
55 Tauris.

- 1
2
3 de Sousa Santos, B. (1977). The law of the oppressed: The construction and reproduction of
4
5 legality in Pasargada. *Law and society review*, 12(1), pp. 5–126.
6
7
8 Storper, M., & Scott, A. J. (2016). Current debates in urban theory: A critical assessment.
9
10 *Urban Studies*, 53(6), pp. 1114–1136.
11
12 Tonkiss, F. (2013). *Cities by design: the social life of urban form*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
13
14 Tsenkova, S. (2009). *Selfmade cities. In search of sustainable solutions for informal*
15
16 *settlements in the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Region*. Geneva:
17
18 United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.
19
20
21 UN Habitat. (2003). *The challenge of slums. Global report on human settlements*. London:
22
23 Earthscan Publications.
24
25
26 UN Habitat. (2004). *Pro poor land management: integrating slums into city planning*
27
28 *approaches*. Nairobi.
29
30
31 Varley, A. (2013a). Postcolonialising informality? *Environment & Planning D: Society and*
32
33 *Space*, 31(1), pp. 4–22.
34
35
36 Varley, A. (2013b). Feminist perspectives on urban poverty: de-essentialising difference, in:
37
38 L. Peake & M. Rieker (Eds.), *Rethinking feminist interventions into the urban*, pp. 125–
39
40 141. Abingdon: Routledge.
41
42
43 Watson, V. (2011). Engaging with citizenship and urban struggle through an informality lens.
44
45 *Planning theory & practice*, 12(1), pp. 150–153.
46
47
48 Yeo, S.-J., & Heng, C. K. (2013). An (Extra)ordinary Night Out: Urban Informality, Social
49
50 Sustainability and the Night-time Economy. *Urban Studies*, 51(4), pp. 712–726.
51
52
53 Yiftachel, O. (2009). Theoretical Notes On `Gray Cities': the Coming of Urban Apartheid?
54
55
56
57
58
59
60