

Sociofugal and Sociopetal Spaces in Low Cost Apartment Owned BENHIL II Jakarta

Joni Hardi

Lecturer in the Department of Architecture, Mercu Buana University, Jakarta 11640, Indonesia;
Joni.hardi@mercubuana.ac.id

Abstract

The construction of a low cost apartment owned (Rusunami) aims to further improve the quality of slum neighborhoods in urban areas by paying attention to the preservation of natural resources and creating a complete, harmonious and balanced residential environment. Changes in the form of occupancy from landed housing to slum settlements into a form of low cost apartment owned by the rejuvenation of slums, certainly has an impact on the social and cultural life of its inhabitants. People living in slums have a high sense of belongingness in their daily lives, so that the lifestyle of the village people who are full of togetherness come into the simple flats owned by them. Thus the need to interact socially and socially in accordance with its culture becomes important to be accommodated in simple flats belonging to greetings in the form of communal space. The occurrence of communal space in a low cost apartment owned by Benhil II is inseparable from understanding human interaction with the environment. This study wanted to find out how the communal space was able to push (sociopetal) or inhibit (sociofugal) the occurrence of social interaction in a simple apartment owned by Benhil II. The method used in this study uses a qualitative research approach in grounded theory. Data collection using in-depth interviews and data analysis includes three stages, namely open coding, axial coding and selective coding. The results show that there are several factors that determine the strength and weakness of the occupants' ties with their communal space, namely place parameters, people parameters and activities parameters or a combination of the three parameters.

Keywords: *communal space, sociopetal, sociofugal, place-people-activities parameters*

1. INTRODUCTION

The growth of the city caused the necessity to carry out efforts to rejuvenate slums. The basic concept of the rejuvenation of slums developed by the government today is to build without evicting them out, let alone experiencing the process of impoverishment because they cannot make good use of the compensation money they receive. The concept of development that saves land in the form of simple flats is the demand for future housing development in urban areas. The community of residents originally was given priority to inhabit these simple flats in the form of the low cost apartment owned (Rusunami). In order for low-income housing to be affordable by the lower

income groups, the government provides subsidized rates and subsidies for advance payments.

Changes in the form of occupancy from landed housing to slum settlements to vertical housing in flat housing certainly have an impact on the social life of its inhabitants. According to Youngentob in Barliana (2010: 102), low-income groups tend to maintain a sense of community in the community, relationships and interactions that occur are based more on social transactions than economic motives, and have a loose privacy space. Thus, sense of community is a very important aspect for residents of the low cost apartment owned. The low cost apartment owned (Rusunami) must be able to act as a

place to accommodate interaction and social transactions to increase the social capital of its inhabitants (Barliana, 2010).

Thus the need to interact socially and socially in accordance with its culture becomes important to be accommodated in simple flats, so that the sense of community is the most prominent social structure to be considered further in order to improve the quality of life of the low cost apartment owned in a better direction. Community space is a forum for social interaction that accommodates the need to meet, interact and carry out activities together. Communal space facilities take the biggest role in the low cost apartment owned environment in increasing heterogeneity among residents and in the end a strong social bond will be formed. These conditions will make the housing environment safe, free from social problems, and create a satisfying environment and increase ownership among residents so that they will not move to other housing estates.

Community space provides an opportunity for residents to meet one another. The occurrence of community space in the low cost apartment owned (Rusunami) is inseparable from understanding human interaction with the environment. The strength of these community bonds depends on the number of similarities (unifying traits) between them, the intensity of the interactions that occur between them, the meaning of community for each member, space (bonds can change with changing unifying spaces) and time (bonds can change with as time goes by). This study wanted to find out how communal space is able to encourage (sociofugal) or inhibit (sociopetal) the occurrence of social interaction in the low cost apartment owned Benhil II.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Grounded theory merupakan teknik induktif yang dikembangkan sebagai pendekatan dalam penelitian ini. Pendekatan ini digunakan untuk menghasilkan dan mengembangkan teori

tentang ruang sociopetal dan ruang sociofugal pada Rusunami Benhil II dengan menggunakan orientasi pengembangan atau construct oriented (kategori). Data terutama dikumpulkan melalui wawancara secara mendalam kepada penghuni pemilik dan penghuni pendatang. Prosedur pengumpulan data dilakukan secara sistematis dan analisis dikembangkan dari prosedur seperti coding tertentu yang meliputi open coding, axial coding dan selective coding.

Excavating interactions between occupants (people) and their communal space (place) occurs in three dimensions, namely cognitive, behavioral and emotional. Cognitive aspects are related to place parameters (communal space), namely cognitive dimension or spatial perception of the form of environment (communal space). The emotional aspect is related to the parameters of people (occupants), namely emotional dimension towards the meaning of environment (communal space). While the behavioral aspects are related to activity parameters (social interaction), namely behavioral dimension to the function of the environment (communal space).

To show the sense of place relationship with residents of Rusunami Benhil II (people), there are five scales for communal space (place), namely knowledge of being located in a place [at this level residents (people) are familiar with communal space (place), but not have an emotional connection and have not integrated themselves with communal space (place), belonging to a place [at this level occupants (people) are not only familiar with communal space (place), but begin to have an emotional connection with the place], attach to a place [at this level residents (people) have a strong emotional connection with communal space (place), they have developed a unique symbolic identity in that place according to the character of its inhabitants], identifying with a place goals [at this level, residents (people) integrated with communal space (place) in the sense that the purpose of the communal space they know, residents are very satisfied with the purpose of the

communal space created, in they develop a strong attachment to the communal space (place)], involving in a place [at this level, residents have an active role in the communal space (place), they are willing to invest their own resources such as money, time, or else in activities in the communal space (place), sacrifice for a place [at this stage residents (people) want to sacrifice for their shared sense of community for the sake of the communal space (place)].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the interviews are broken down into smaller parts through analysis of phrases and sentences and grouped into sub-categories and categories (open coding), so that the relationship between the categories and axial coding has been done to see the pattern of relationships that occur between categories and look for a puzzle pattern. The next step is to look for this category which is the main concern of the respondent occupant of the owner and respondent occupant or tenant. The core categories that appear have similarities and differences between the occupants of the owners and occupants of the migrant, depending on what relationships are sought between the place, parameter activity, and people parameters.

Respondents of the owner's occupation view their occupancy not only as a place of physical protection (physical shelter), but is a place that can form structures within the dwelling, namely family and non-residential structures, namely neighboring relationships which are their daily activities. This can be seen from the dominance of the house category is the family from the results of interviews with them. The results of the observations also showed that the activities of social interaction carried out by residents of the apartment units were more dominant compared to the occupants of migrants.

Unlike the case with the owner of the occupant, the respondent occupants of "migrants" or tenants tend to view their occupancy as just a place to rest. This can be seen from the dominant category of

places to rest in the results of interviews with them. According to them occupancy is only a place that only functions as a physical function, namely to rest, and does not act as a means of social interaction among residents. Factors busy with their work that generally work eventually require a break in their free time. For some of them social interaction activities are side activities that occur spontaneously when they do other activities in Rusunami Benhil II. Social interaction activities are generally carried out in a casual manner because they tend to close themselves from their environment. In this case, it appears that the profiles of different respondents between occupants and occupants of "migrants" or tenants will influence their views on the role of their occupants in their lives. Personal factors (personal factors) have influenced the views of the occupants and occupants of "migrants" or tenants about the role of their occupancy.

Both occupants and occupants of "migrants" or tenants have a tendency to be dissatisfied with their current occupancy. This can be seen from the dominant category not satisfied with the results of their interviews. This condition is encouraged because of the dissatisfaction with existing places, their inability to adapt to their new environment in Benhil II Rusunami, and the occurrence of social barriers among them in daily life. Factors of memories and past experiences (memories and experiences factors) are also the driving factors for their dissatisfaction with their place of residence. They have strong experience with their place in the past where life is so good among them. This condition is very different from what they experienced while living in Rusunami Benhil II. They already have a dwelling culture, which is a strong sense of community before moving to Rusunami Benhil II. The factors of memories and past experiences (factors and memories) and dwelling culture that they have had before living in Benhil II Rusunami have affected place attachment that occurs between residents of Rusunami Benhil II (people) and their place.

Respondents' views of places to interact socially differ between occupants of owners and occupants of "migrants" or tenants. This can be seen from the differences in the dominant categories of the two groups of respondents. Occupants tend to choose places in the form of corridors and halls (communal spaces) as places for social interaction, while residents of "migrants" or tenants tend to choose places in the form of communal space halls to interact socially, while others do not have a special place to interact socially. The factor that drives owners to use the corridor as a place to interact socially is because it is located adjacent to their apartment units, the size of the corridor is quite adequate for social interaction, and the availability of benches in the corridor provided by each occupant is increasingly encourage the use of the area as a place to interact socially. In this case the corridor lay out (physical factor) in Rusunami Benhil II has encouraged the occupants of the owner to use the place as a means of social interaction. While the use of communal halls or spaces as places of social interaction only when there are formal activities or large events, so in everyday conditions it looks lonely like it is not used. Here it can be seen that the physical building of Rusunami Benhil II (physical factor) has influenced place attachment between the occupants (people) and their communal space (place).

Unlike the case with occupants "migrants" or tenants, they are more likely to choose a hall or communal space as a place to interact socially. However, unlike the case with occupants, migrant residents tend to use communal spaces that have stalls in the hall or communal space, so that social interaction activities are a side activity while they shop at the stall. The existence of stalls in communal space becomes a sociopetal space or a driving space for occupants of "migrants" or tenants to carry out social interactions in Benhil II Rusunami (physical factor). Some residents of "migrants" or other tenants tend not to have a special place to interact socially because they do not feel the need to interact socially with their environment because of the many activities in their daily

lives. Individualist nature has influenced their social orientation in fostering intimate social communication with their environment. Personal factors (personal factors) affect the occupants of "migrants" or tenants in using a place to interact socially in Rusunami Benhil II. Here it can be seen that the physical building of Rusunami Benhil II (physical factors) and personal factors (personal factors) have influenced place attachments between occupants of "migrants" or tenants (people) with their communal space (place).

Both groups of residents, both occupants and residents of "migrants" or tenants do not have a specific time to interact socially. This can be seen from the dominance of the category not having a specific time to interact socially with the occupants of the owner. Occupants who do not have this special time are generally housewives who do have a lot of time to interact with their neighbors and do it whenever they have time, generally in the form of chatting with neighbors. Whereas formal social interaction activities are carried out routinely and periodically at certain times in the weekly and monthly timeframes and carried out in the hall or communal space or on the ground floor of Rusunami Benhil II. The diversity of social interaction activities carried out by the occupants of the owners in Benhil II Rusunami in akhis can cultivate the bond of residents with places of social interaction (place attachment). In this case the activities of social interaction and social interaction (interaction and activity features), as well as the time of social interaction activities (time factors) have influenced the place attachment that occurs between the occupants of the people (people) and their communal space (place).

As with the respondent occupants of "migrants" or tenants, social interaction activities tend to be less patterned because they are busy working in the formal sector so there is not much time to interact socially. The course category is more dominant, so that social interaction activities are side activities that are carried out simultaneously with other activities such as time to go home and go to work,

when shopping to stalls, and time is vacant. Time factor (time factor) has influenced place attachment that occurs between occupants of people (people) with their communal space (place).

Respondents of occupants and occupants of "migrants" or tenants tend to have different social interaction activities. This is due to the background (background) of different respondents, especially from the background of the type of work. Most of the occupants are housewives, so they have plenty of time to chat with other residents. The dominant chat activities that they do when there is time is vacant and are done at any time. The other dominant category of social interaction activities of the owner of the occupants is PKK activities. This is because most of the occupants of the owners are housewives, so that PKK activities are activities that are of interest to them. Positive social relations between them (social factors) have facilitated the meaningfulness of communal space or place in Rusunami Benhil II.

Unlike the case with "migrant" or tenant occupants, chatting activities are also the dominant category in their social interaction activities, but have different characters from the occupants of the owners. The chatting activities that they do are generally done only with other residents, not because of their own encouragement or desire from the occupants of "migrants" or managers. They generally have no interest in conducting social interactions and awareness to carry out very low social interaction activities (awarenessless). This can be seen from the emergence of the category of no activity as the second dominant category. Thus social factors (social factors) and personal factors (personal factors) have influenced the occupants of the owners and occupants of "migrants" or tenants to conduct social interactions in Rusunami Benhil II.

The two respondents viewed the inhibition of social interaction activities in Benhil II Rusunami generally due to the busyness of the occupants of "migrants" or tenants. Busyness with his work in the

formal sector outside Rusunami Benhil II causes them not to have much time to interact socially with other residents. This can be seen from the dominant category of busyness in the two groups of respondents. This condition is contrary to the condition of the owners of owners who have a lot of time to interact socially because most of them are housewives. Here, it can be seen that social interaction between occupants and occupants of immigrants is strongly influenced by the behavior of withdrawal from the social environment carried out by immigrants. The owner of the owner finally changes their behavior towards the occupants of "migrants" by imitating the ignorance of the occupants of "migrants" or tenants. This can be seen from the emergence of other dominant categories of occupants "migrants" or tenants and occupants of the owner, namely the factor of self-closure and shame of the occupants of "migrants" or tenants as inhibitors of social interaction between the two groups of residents. The term "migrant" is given by the owner of the occupant to the occupants of "migrants" or tenants because they consider the occupants of "migrants" or tenants not to be part of their social life. In this case the behavior of residents of "migrants" or tenants has changed the social behavior of the occupants of the owners towards them, this is in accordance with his opinion Setiadi (2013). Thus personal factors (personal factors) have hampered the occurrence of social interaction among the occupants of the "migrant" owners and tenants, so that place attachments in Benhil II Rusunami between occupants (people) and places of social interaction or communal space (place) also become hampered.

The two groups of respondents namely the occupants and occupants of "migrants" or tenants see the importance of the existence of communal space (place) as social interaction, although the communal space is generally not used for social interaction in their daily lives. The owner of the owner tends to use the communal space at certain times if he needs a large room for celebration and so on. Whereas residents of "migrants" or owners see the importance of communal

space because there are stalls as a place to shop for their daily needs. Social interaction activities are carried out together with shopping activities in the shop. Both of these groups view the existence of communal space as important, but the point of view of its use is different between the two groups of residents. The existence of social interaction activities that they do in the communal space in a certain period of time (not everyday) has fostered a place attachment of residents to the communal space. Thus the interaction factors and activities (interaction and activity features factors) have influenced the place attachment between residents (place) and their communal space (place).

Factors that inhibit the occurrence of social interaction in the communal space (place) according to occupants' view is that there are no routine events or activities in the communal space. The category of no events or activities in communal space is the dominant category for occupants of the owner. Though the existence of social interaction activities in the communal space increasingly increases the place attachment between residents (people) with the communal space (place). The physical factor of communal space, which is the position of being too open and lacking in privacy, is a non-dominant category that inhibits the occurrence of social interaction in the communal space of Rusunami Benhil II.

For residents of "migrants" or tenants, the factors that inhibit the occurrence of social interaction in communal space are the lack of social interaction activities in the communal space because occupants of "migrants" or tenants are busy with their daily work routines as employees and entrepreneurs. They also view children's play activities in communal spaces as interfering with their wives in their spare time and the existence of occupant goods in shared space areas including communal space also makes communal space difficult to use. Thus the interaction factors and forms of interaction and features as well as the entry of private space into the public space (territory factor) are the inhibiting factors for occupants of "migrants" or

tenants in using communal space, so that the bond between occupants of "migrants" or tenants with space communal is weak.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of this study, it can be concluded that the dialectic between occupants of people (communal) and communal space or place is more determined by the parameters of occupants (people) or 50% of the overall parameters formed, then followed by parameters of the communal space itself (25 % of all parameters formed) and the parameters of activities for social interaction that occur in the communal space (25% of all parameters formed). The role of the personal factor occupants, memories and experiences and dwelling culture in the past (people) is very large in the place attachment formation between communal space (place) and its inhabitants (people). The relationship of sense of place that occurs between communal space (place) and its occupants is at the level of belonging to a place (residents are not only familiar with communal space, but they have an emotional connection with the communal space). Some owner occupants have a sense of place relationship to the level of attachment to a place (the owner of the owner has a strong emotional connection with his communal space, communal space is meaningful to them by developing unique characters).

Whereas in "migrant" or tenant occupants, place attachment that is formed between the communal space (place) and its occupants (people) is also determined by the personal factor of the "migrant" occupants (50% of the overall parameters formed) that tend to close themselves to the environment. memories and experiences of their past residence and the social factors that occurred during their stay in Rusunami Benhil II. Another parameter that determines place attachment that occurs is the place parameter (20% of all parameters formed) and parameter activities (20% of all parameters formed). The relationship of sense of place that occurs between

communal space (place) and its occupants is only limited to the knowledge of being located in a place (occupants of "migrants" or tenants are familiar with their communal space but do not have an emotional connection with the communal space)

Pamungkas. *Kriteria Kepuasan Tinggal Berdasarkan Respon Penghuni Rusunawa Cokrodirdjan Kota Yogyakarta*, (Semarang: Tesis Universitas Diponegoro). (2010).
Rapoport, A. *House, Form and Culture*. London: Prentice Hall, inc. (1969).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to dweller Rusunami Benhil II who was willing to give time and opportunity to field observations and interviews.

REFERENCES

- Habraken, N. J. *The Structure of the Ordinary*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press. (1998).
- Habraken, N. J. *Transformation of the Site*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: A Water Press. (1983).
- Habraken, N., Boekholt, J., Thyssen, A., & Dinjens, P. *Variations, The Systematic Design of Support*. MIT Press. (1976).
- Hatch, C. Richard., *The Scope of Social Architecture*, (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold). (1984).
- Ischak, Mohammad. *Desain Rumah Susun Sederhana Dengan Pendekatan Perilaku Penghuni Untuk Meminimalkan Terjadinya Penurunan Kualitas Bangunan*. Dalam Seminar Nasional – Menuju Arsitektur Berempati. (2012).
- Kurniati, Feni dan Hanson E. Kusuma. *Adaptasi Perilaku dan Modifikasi Sebagai Proses Menciptakan Hunian Ideal Bagi Penghuni Perumahan Massal*. Dalam Temu Ilmiah IPLBI. (2014).
- Laurens, J. M. *Arsitektur dan Perilaku Manusia*. Jakarta: Grasindo. (2004).
- Luthfiah. *Perubahan Bentuk Dan Fungsi Hunian Pada Rumah Susun Pasca Penghunian*. Dalam *Ruang*, Vol.2, No.2. (2010).
- Nasution, Riza Ananta. *Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Penghuni Baru Untuk Memilih Tinggal Di Rumah Susun Klender Jakarta Timur*, (Semarang: Tesis Universitas Diponegoro). (2004).