

PERSONALIZATION OF SPACE IN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SETTING WITHIN VERTICAL HOUSING AS SUSTAINABLE LIVING

Susy Budi Astuti¹, Purwanita Setijanti², Ispurwono Soemarno³

^{1,2,3} Department of Architecture, Institute of Technology Sepuluh Nopember
Jl. Arief Rahman Hakim, Surabaya, INDONESIA

Emails: ¹susy@interior.its.ac.id, ²setijanti@arch.its.ac.id, ³isp4251@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Personalization is an individual or group's ownership of a place or object, initially as physical and non-physical. The quality of housing which is influenced by the social environment, economy, culture, defines the life of the inhabitant. Welfare, security, assuredness of infrastructure, housing quality, environment quality and the human resources are the elements that should be sustainable living. Housing as a physical function, is a shelter that is designed with physical building quality. While housing as a social function is reviewed based on the inhabitant's behavior (both individually and socially) within environment. The process of personalization aims to meet the needs and achievements that suits the user group's character to generate sustainable living. Personalization in personal/private territory includes individual or a group's participation, whereas in communal territory the participants are constantly changing. The phenomenon of ownership and involvement in different settings, is an interesting subject to obtain a deeper understanding of, on the different concepts of personalization. This research aims to formulate personalization based on ownership and involvement of vertical apartment residence in private and public setting. Several researches state that vertical apartment residences tend to pay less attention to social/public factors, despite the presence of a public space with shared ownership. This research is conducted with a qualitative method which is initiated with literature review on the realm of study of Environment Behavior Studies along with questionnaire and observation to represent results of field data. Within this research, the results of discussion regarding personalization of space behavior is a study concept of the sustainability living of community in apartment residence that suits the user group's character, which is in private and public setting. So expect this study may be considered for housing planning policy in urban apartments which not only the physical factors of structural but also character of its occupants..

Keywords: Behavior; personalization; sustainable living.

INTRODUCTION

Altman (1976) elaborated that environment behavior studies consists of 3 components, which are environment-behavior phenomena, user group and settings. Behavior phenomena to the environment will vary, due to the difference of meaning, symbol and also the way human make use of the environment as self-representation. For example is privacy, is a personal behavior phenomena that is related to the individual behavior pattern, rules and the social system within the environment. The difference within the user group will bring out different needs and activity pattern, while setting according to Altman is the scale of the environment in which the activity takes place.

According to Altman (1976), personalization is an individual or group's ownership of a place or object, through concrete (physical) or symbolic (non-physical) self-initial signs. According to Brower (1976) the physical is noticeable by occupancy, and the non-physical is marked by attachment to the place. Occupancy is marked by object placement, for instance wall partition, fence, vase, nameplate, fish

pond, etc. Whereas attachment is observed by the user's attachment to a place or object, for example the frequent visit to a park due to its easiness of reach, the relaxed manner of sitting in a lobby because of feeling familiar in that situation, etc. Saruwono (2007) stated that personalization can be reviewed as positive (phenomenon) and negative (problem), because personalization is a process that adapts the needs of a certain individual or group.

Personalization as occupancy. Occupancy is a temporary ownership, because it is also a part of ownership to others. So that is a form of behavior of effort in order to own territorial ownership. Altman (1980) stated as a territorial claim, territorial expression in relation with residence. There are 4 types of occupancy, personal, community, public and free. Personal Occupancy is done by an individual or a group that has a strong relation due to kinship, marriage, family or high loyalty. The ownership is controlled and permission is limited to others, because it is the greatest freedom territory of its occupant. The personal ownership sign shows its occupant's identity, it is private. Community Occupancy, is done by a group/community in which the participants are

constantly changeable through a determined selection process mechanism. Sign or community claim of a place is established through sharing physical setting and value/belief system. This means that ownership signs of community is in the practice of activity and symbols of the participants' interest/importance. So there are 3 basic elements in understanding of occupancy, i.e. sustainability of space usage, the person who make use of the space and display/sign of space.

Personalization as preference. The personalization is suited with the needs and habits of each family member which reflects their own personality and also suited with the environment surrounding them. Moreover, personalization at the side parts of the house are more to add esthetics to the house (garden, living room expansion, terrace). Szally (2012) explained that house changes and renovation occurs due to individual preference aspect or family needs. The renovation mostly occurs on the front side of the house, than the back or the sides.

Personalization as experiences. Living in a vertical housing is a new culture for Indonesian people, so that some of the time activities that are executed in horizontal housing are carried to the new housing environment which is the vertical housing. The density of housing unit at a vertical housing contributes to small space for the user, even just in talking or fulfill the needs of listening to a high volume music. So that speaking or using loud audio system will disturb the unit neighbors or even the users overall. Here, the users are to adapt themselves to not to disturb the neighborhood. Kurokawa (1994) emphasizes the importance of having an element and intermediation space within the housing environment. Intermediation space or semi-public space can be very meaningful to the user. The physical housing environment needs to be built upon culture, faith and the user's experience (Ismail, 2012). Cho's (2007) research stating that to create a culture based vertical housing concept, emphasizes on the need of community space for togetherness. Community space a social environment aspect is used by sharing, which the uses are defined by the management. Raman (2010) stated that social relation within vertical housing user are very low, because social interaction mostly occur in the same floor level users.

Public setting is necessary for landed housing, because people tend to move horizontally. Conversely, how the character of the activity in public and privacy space in vertical housing. Vertical housing in these research is apartment. The ownership of public space of apartment is not separated from the individual unit/unit privacy. The activity that occurs in the public space is the continuity and closely linked to activity in the unit privacy. So, how the character of

privacy and public behavior of occupants in the apartment. These research purposed to formulated the sustainable living in apartment through personalisation of space in private and public setting. Because the sustainable living does not only depend on the private setting, but more on the physical and social environment in public setting.

RESEARCH METHODS

Ideally, behavioral research is observed continuously and repeatedly in a certain length of time. A consequence of using the naturalistic qualitative method, the researcher's position is as an instrument in conducting the observation. Bogdan (1982 in Moleong, 1999) stated that research observation is a form of social interaction that requires time between the researcher and the subject in the observed subject environment. Data in the form are constructed systematically, continuously. However within this research data will be obtained with questionnaire technique. The aim is to obtain a common private and public behavior concept. This is a preliminary step to the next research.

Object Selection. Apartment vertical residence is rapidly developing in big cities such as Jakarta, Surabaya, and other big cities in Indonesia. In order to be more focused and look for more depth in character, so another city with a more specific aspects is chosen. Surabaya is seen to be more specific, because it is an industrial, trading and maritime city. Surabaya is also known as a city of education. The rapid growth and development of apartments in Surabaya one of which is due to the number of higher education institutions especially in the eastern area of Surabaya. Apartment is not only seen as an alternative residence, it has also become a part of lifestyle. The selected apartment is not integrated with another public function (i.e. mall, hotels, office, etc). Because this character can affect the specific behavior of the residents.

Respondent Selection. To obtain external validation, the respondent's data and activities are executed naturally without intervention from the researcher, to get general results (Holahan, 1980). The proposed respondents are residents of some apartments in Surabaya. The types of residents are those who are with family/married and single, so the respondents are spread through a few types of unit apartment, studio until one – three bedrooms type.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This research conducted on 68 respondents. The respondents socio-demographic character shows that they are between the age of 20-40, married/single. They occupy the studio type or 1-3 bedrooms (Table

1). So that personalization of space character in private setting in the apartment unit is represented in all types of unit. The length of inhabit are between 2-5 years, by tenant or owner. These aspects can represent the sense of belonging towards a room, both physically (occupancy) or non-physically (attachment).

Personalization of Space in Private Setting

There are difference occupancy in a private setting, for those who are married the kitchen functions a cooking area, so the room is used as it is intended. For those who are single, the kitchen is a part of the living/bedroom. The kitchen is not used as it is intended. A Private setting in apartment unit spreads to corridors, which is when the door is opened to watch over the children playing in the corridor (Figure 1). The corridor, for those who are married (especially with children) is a public/social space (to look over children, chat, interact), whereas for those who are single, it is perceived as a private space because of their individual activity. Attachment to private setting in an apartment unit is by the sense of responsibility to take care of the unit independently, making use of the private space as personal so that it should be kept calm, safe and comfortable. The unit should be in a locked condition whenever the user is out. The following table 2 shows the occupancy of a private setting in an apartment unit.

Occupancy personal in private setting occurs within the apartment unit (privacy intimacy) with the power of control by each individual or group who has

Tabel 1. Respondents Data

No	Variables	Attribute	Prosentage
1	Ages	20 – 40 age	94 %
2	Sex	female	74%
3	Job/Profession	Student and entrepreneur	63%
4	The ownership status of unit	tenant owner	53 % 47 %
5	Unit Type	1 - 3 Bedrooms	59 %
6	Conditions	Own with family	87 % 13%
7	Children age	Under 7 years	53 %
8	Status	Married single	23 % 77 %
9	Stay	2 - 5 years	66 %
10	Experiences of living in apartment	Never ever	47 % 53 %
11	Culture background	Java others	67 % 33 %

Source: Questionnaire (2016)

Tabel 2. Personalization of Space in Private Setting

No	Behavior	Personalization space in the unit apartment			
		Family		single	
1	Place of babysitting	Playground 100%	High social interaction		
2	Time of babysitting outside the unit	On Holiday, there are no pepole	Privasi = time for activity		
3	cooking	seldom	The kitchen is rarely used	seldom	The kitchen is rarely used
4	Playground in room unit	bedroom and living room	All is private space for children		
5	Kitchen as a apart of the livingroom	no	All space is usage as their function	yes	All room as livingroom
6	Maintaning the room unit	independent	High privacy related to ownership	yes	High privacy equal with the ownership
7	spare time activity	Go outside, shopping, swimming, etc	Privacy occurs to share place	Watching tv, sleep	The unit as privacy
8	Identity on the room unit door	none 63% interested 37%	68% never stay at apartment, they want but it is restricted	None 85% interested 9% present 6%	More Activity in outside
9	Corridor usage	Social space	interaction	Private space	Not disturb
10	Open door the room unit	agree	Corridor as a part of unit, expancy privacy	disagree	Keep privacy
11	The sense of belonging of corridor	yes	Corridor as a expansion of	yes	Corridor as a intermediary space
12	Guest in the room unit	yes	The room unit is the public space	yes	The room unit is the public space
13	A place to take Guests	lobby	Lobby as a public space that privacy	lobby	Lobby as a public space that privacy

Source: Questionnaire (2016)

attachment (friend /family). Ownership sign physical/ in private unit suits the intended occupants. 1-3 bedroom unit type is occupied by singles with roommates or family. In private setting is more personal for single occupants, whereas for those married/with family private setting spreads to community occupancy in public setting. Physical ownership sign at apartment unit as personal is not marked with identity that is permanent. There are no or not seen any occupant's identity on the corridor walls, except signs that are provided by the apartment's management (number on door or corridor). Occupant's attachment to private setting in the apartment unit is due to the need of high privacy.



Fig. 1. Occupancy Behavior in the Unit Apartment (researcher documentation, 2016)

Personalisazation of Space in Public Setting:

Corridor as a public setting is facility of access to units or other public facilities (lift, playground, swimming pool, etc.). Corridor as Public setting because it can be accessed by all the occupants (of the same floor) or by visitors with security pass. Corridor becomes a meeting point of the private and the public setting. Due to the constant change in residents, the personalization in corridor are much more of a nonverbal behavior. Social interaction in corridor as a public setting because of the shared sense of belonging, however without or not necessarily acquainted. Visual contact, smiling and greeting is temporary as they pass each other while doing their

own activities in the morning, afternoon and evening (Figure 2). Lobby as a public setting is a facility of meeting point to the residents with visitors. The lobby is seen through the activity of sitting on a chair and talk with other occupants or visitor. Lobby can be a private aspect's extension to the public setting (waiting for guest, checking the mailbox, catering, laundry). Those things occur because visitors are prohibited from accessing the apartment units (Figure 3). Table 3 shows the level of occupancy in public setting.



Fig. 2. Occupancy behavior in corridor (researcher documentation, 2016)



Fig. 3. Occupancy Behavior in Lobby (researcher documentation, 2016)

Tabel 3. Personalization of Space in Public Setting

Personalization of Space in Public Setting			
No	Behavior	Questionnaire	Occupancy and Attachment
1	Corridor's function	Public 39% Privat 37%	Private meets Public
2	Level of acquaintance between occupants on the the floor	Just know 39% Not acquainted 34% Know 27%	occupant of a changing
3	Meeting other occupants in the corridor	Smile 56% Greet 15% Silent 29%	Non verbal behaviour
4	Making use of corridor to call	No 56% Sometimes 44%	Verbal behavior for theprivacy needs
5	Opening the unit's door as children are playing in the corridor	Yes, to watch over them 59% Yes, it is a habit 7% No, not safe 24%	Privacy of moving to a public space Open social interaction
6	Should there be a corridor for the children?	Yes, there should 73%	Private meets public Social interaction with spacial
7	When there is garbage in the lobby	Take and put it in the garbage 44% Marginalized 32% Allowed 24%	Abandon it Private meets public Spatial and non-spatial ownership. (awareness of hygiene)
8	Position of walking circulation in the corridor	In the middle, on the sides if coming across another 81% Always in the middle 19%	High spatial ownership, private/individual
9	Freedom to perform activity in the corridor Private meets public High ownership but temporary	Yes, when there are no/not many people 68% No 32%	Yes, when there are no/not many people 59% No 32%
10	Is talking loudly in the corridor disturbing?	Yes, Especially in the evening 49% Yes, when coming across other occupants 42% No problem 9%	Corridor as public space Nonverbal personalization (audio) High ownership but temporary familiar area, privacy
11	Manner of walking in the corridor	Walk relaxedly 93% Walk fast 7%	
12	Other behavioral gesture in the corridor	Chatting/calling 68% Smoking 32%	Verbal behavior, privacy
13	Activity time in the corridor	Morning and between afternoon and evening 49% Evening 36% Afternoon 15%	Spatial behavior in corridor is related to time morning, afternoon and evening: sharing spatial corridor and social interaction daytime: Private activities (shop, baby sitting,
14	Signage on unit's door	Not interested 54% Interested but prohibited 25% None 21%	Corridor as public setting, privacy should be maintained
15	Feeling familiar with the corridor in front of the unit.	Yes 64% No 36%	Private setting
16	The need to change clothes when going out to the lobby	No need 80 % Yes 20%	Attachment on shared ownership, feels private
17	The freedom in the lobby	Yes, when not crowded 61% No, when crowded 39%	Private, non Verbal
18	Coming across other occupants in the lobby	Smile 52% Nothing 17% Silent 31%	Visual behavior Non verbal
19	Preferred position sitting in the lobby	In front of other occupants and nonverbal contact 46% Next to other occupants, nonverbal contact 37% In front of / the next , verbal contact 17%	Non verbal and visual behavior
20	Familiarity with the lobby officer	Yes, greet often 53% Just Know 42% Not know 5%	Verbal behavior, visual
21	Making use of sport facilities in the apartment	Yes, not routinely 51% Yes, routine 30% Yes, for refreshing 19%	High ownership Community and refreshing
22	Changing clothes location for sport	unit privacy 61% toilet in sport area 39%	Privacy from unit to sport facility (public)
23	Duration of sport	30–60 minutes 66% >60 minutes 34%	High ownership
24	Making use of laundry service, shop and café of the apartment	Yes 90% No 10%	Community space

Tabel 4. Occupancy in Public Setting

Time	Sharing spasial %	Behavior	Activity	Occupancy
Morning	49%	Public behavior	- Go to school/campus or work	Social interaction with verbal, non verbal and visual
afternoon		Social interaction	- Greet, smile	
evening	36%		- Short time	
daytime	15%	Privacy behavior	- shopping	Social interaction for privacy
			- parenting	
			- Refreshing	
			- A lot of time	

Tabel 5. Physical and non Physical Sharing in Public Setting

Sharing physical/spasial		Sharing non physical/non spasial	
Attached Variabel	Free variable	Attached variable	Free variable
Proxemics (physical distance > between human)	Keeping privacy space in corridor and lobby > Dynamic personal space, which is from the personal to public area	> Behavioral adjustment with the public	> Non verbal behavior: Smiling, nodding > Visual behavior: Eye contact, staring > Audio: Walking relaxed, voice volume.
Privacy needs in public setting	> Privacy facility in public setting, or example: Laundry, food/ catering, mail, ATM	> Safety > Comfort	> Access cards for occupants, so there is clarity in access and boundary in private and public setting. > The suitability of facility use

Personalization in public setting starts from the lobby facility to corridor. On a wider scale, lobby and corridor could mean as private setting because it is part of apartment occupant's facility, however looking from the perspective of the internal circumstance, lobby and corridor is place where occupants and visitors meet or even between occupants. Therefore lobby and corridor is as a public setting to the internal of the apartment environment. As a meeting point of occupants and visitors, so based on table 3 above, lobby and corridor is a place for physical/spatial and non physical/spatial sharing. Physical sharing spatially is linked to time variable, in this case the occupants of apartment tend to meet to socially interact in the morning, afternoon and evening. That is as they are going to work/campus and coming home from work/campus. Due to the varied characters of occupants within the apartment's public setting every day, spatial sharing organizes the physical closure between occupants (Table 4). When coming across each other in the corridor, occupants will take the position on the side, when walking alongside they tend to not overtake. That also counts in spatial sharing in lobby, they tend to take closer positions when sitting in the lobby. But the importance of privacy is facilitated with lobby. Meaning that there is a place to entrust laundry, catering, mail, etc. The need of privacy in public setting becomes a facility for occupants to interact each other and with the officers. The togetherness because of the importance of privacy in public setting becomes a continuity value to the occupants.

Non-spatial sharing in public setting is non-verbal interaction behavior (smiling, nodding), visual (staring at each other without greeting because not well acquainted but knows that they are occupants as well) and audio (not talking loudly/shouting carelessly, using appropriate language). Physical/non-physical sharing that occur in public setting as occupancy of community (Table 5).

CONCLUSIONS

Personalization space in a private setting related to the character of occupants. Corridors is also a privacy setting for families with children. Not so for the single, that the privacy setting is just in unit apartments. Personalization space in a public setting is a sharing spatial and non-spatial. Sharing Spatial as social interaction between occupants, occupants with visitors or officer, realized by using the space together. Sharing non-spatial, is a sharing that is characterized by the presence of an access card. The existence of the access card sign gives a sense of security and comfort for occupants.

REFERENCES

- Altman, I. (1976). *The Environment and Social Behavior*, Monterey, CA, Wadsworth.
- Altman, I. & Chemers, M. (1980). *Culture and Environment*, Monterey, California.

- Altman, I., Rapoport, A. & Wohlwill (1980). *Human Behavior and Environment: Advances in Theory and Research*, Plenary Press, New York.
- Brower, S.N. (1976). *Territory in Urban Settings*, dalam *Human Behavior and Environment*, Plenary Press, New York.
- Francescato, G., Weidemann, S. & Anderson, J. R. (1987). "Residential satisfaction: Its uses and limitations in housing research, in *Housing and Neighbourhoods: Theoretical and Empirical Contributions*. Vliet, W. V., Choldin, H., Michelson, W. and Popenoe, D (eds.). Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Holahan, J.C. (1980). *Environmental Psychology*, Random House, New York.
- Kurokawa, K. (1994). *The Philosophy of Symbiosis*: Academy Editions, Limited.
- Lang, J. & Moleski, W. (2010). *Functionalism Revisited*, Ashgate Publishing Limited, England.
- Moleong, J. L. (1999). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*, PT. Remaja Rosdakarya, Bandung.
- Onibokun, A.G. (1974). "Evaluating Consumers' Satisfaction with Housing: An Application of a System Approach", *Journal of American Institute of Planners*, **40**(3), pp. 189-200.
- Sazally et al. (2012). "Personalization of Terrace Houses in Section 7, Shah Alam, Selangor", *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, **49**, pp. 319-327.
- Saruwono, M. (2007). *An Analysis of Plans of Modified Houses in an Urbanised Housing Area of Malaysia*, the University of Sheffield.
- Scanell, L. & Giffort, R. (2010). "Defining Place Attachment: A Tripartite Organizing Framework", *Journal of Environmental Ps.*