PLACEMENTMAKING DYNAMICS OF GREEN SPACE PRODUCTION IN URBAN KAMPUNG SETTING: A CASE STUDY IN JAKARTA, INDONESIA

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Bagas Dwipantara Putra
B. Arch (UNTAR), M.UD (ITB)

School of Global Urban and Social Studies
College of Design and Social Context
RMIT University

February 2018
DECLARATION

I certify that except where due acknowledgement has been made, the work is that of the author alone; the work has not been submitted previously, in whole or in part, to qualify for any other academic award; the content of the thesis is the result of work which has been carried out since the official commencement date of the approved research program; any editorial work; paid or unpaid, carried out by a third party is acknowledged; and, ethics procedures and guidelines have been followed.

............................

Bagas Dwipantara PUTRA
Date: 02 February 2018
Great Journey is not to be planned but discovered
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Alhamdulillah, praise to Allah SWT, God the Almighty for all the strength, grace and blessing He has given to me so that I can complete my PhD journey at RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia. Furthermore, praise and prayers continuously addressed to the Prophet Muhammad SAW and His followers until the end of time.

From the deepest of my heart, I sincerely would like to thank all parties that have supported and helped me from the first day for the preparation of my PhD journey in Bandung, Indonesia until I submitted my PhD Thesis in Melbourne, Australia. The peoples involved in this amazing journey, among others:

1. My beloved family (Ayah, Mama, Mbak Retno, Mas Bagus, Mbak Indira & Aisha) for their continuous and endless support and prayer.
2. Family of Mr. Ilham in Mojokerto and East Java.
3. Family of Mr. Gosse in Makassar and South Sulawesi.
4. Mr. Shendy Achmadi from IDP Bandung, for helping with the pre-departure affairs.
5. The Ministry of Education of the Republic of Indonesia, for giving me the opportunity to continue my study abroad through Beasiswa Unggulan (Superior Scholarship) scheme.
7. Consulate General of the Republic of Indonesia in Melbourne; Mrs. Dewi S. Wahab, Mr. Oldrin, Mas Ragil, etc.
8. Institut Teknologi Bandung, as the home institution, especially to ITB’s Deputy Rector Prof. Irawati, MS.
9. School of Architecture, Planning and Policy Development (SAPPD) - ITB; especially to the Dean of the school, Prof. Widjaja Martokusumo.
10. Friends and colleagues from Urban Planning and Design Research Group (UPDRG), ITB; Prof. Haryo Winarso, Prof. Roos Akbar, Dr. Denny Zulkaidi, Dr. Iwan Kustiwan, Dr. Petrus Natalivan, Dr. Niken Prilandita, Dr. Rina Priyani, Mrs. Nia Pontoh, Mbak Mala, Farida, Madel, Oki, Cathy, Maya, Tika, Fran, Rama, etc.
11. Global, Urban and Social Studies (GUSS) and Centre of Urban Research (CUR), RMIT University for giving me the opportunity to deepen my knowledge in urban planning.
12. Prof. Ralph Horne as the first supervisor, thank you very much for the unconditional support, guidance, patience and critical feedback.

13. Dr. Joe Hurley as the second supervisor, thank you very much for being a good friend, despite your hectic timetable and various activities.

14. Dr. Kathry Hegarty for being the examiner during Confirmation of Candidature (CoC), thank you very much for the constructive feedback.

15. Assoc. Prof. Ian Thomas for being the examiner during Mid-Candidature Review, thank you very much for the constructive feedback.

16. Assoc. Prof. Martin Mulligan for being the examiner during Completion Seminar, thank you very much for the constructive feedback.

17. Prof. Pavla Miller, Assoc. Prof. Suellen Murray, Assoc. Prof. Karien Dekker and Dr. Georgina Heydon as GUSS HDR coordinator.

18. All the friendly staff at GUSS; Brian, Amaya, Jenni, Cassie, etc.

19. Friends and colleagues from Fenton 77; Mr. John, Dedi, Patrick, Pipin, Donny, Laksni, Irti, Mirza, Redi, etc.

20. Friends and colleagues from Building 15, RMIT University; Abigail, Septaliana, Wendy, Nicky, David, Rohan, Angela, Jane, Mittul, Fumiko, Hung, Kim, Anita, Kate, Kath, Jharana, Robin, Christian, Viktor, etc.

21. Friends and colleagues from Building 37, RMIT University; Dian, Yuyun, Endro, Diba, Yammam, Monyrrath, Greg, etc.

22. Friends from AIYA; Marcus, Dwi, Mr. Windu, Sam, Daniel, etc.

23. Friends from Saman Melbourne; Artha, Ocha, Jessie, Pipit, Miranti, Miranda, Rangga, Irene, Trie, Yanti, Monalisa, etc.

24. Friends from IndoMelb; Kak Masnijuri, Heri, Mbok Ari, Desiari, Okta, Kak Dharma, Mrs. Ayu, Mrs. Rindang, Mbk Santi, Mr. Thahar (d.), Mr. Bayu, etc.

25. Friends and colleagues from my Bachelor’s year at the Department of Architecture, University of Tarumanagara, Jakarta, Indonesia.


27. My beloved partner Steven Cemil Aquilina and his family (Mrs. Aquilina, Lisa, Tim, Oliver, Jeremy, Isabel), thank you very much for your endless love and support.

28. All the stakeholders that I have interviewed in Mampang Prapatan, Cilandak and Srengseng Sawah.

29. And Mrs. Titits Stebbings for the editorial help.
I fully realise that this thesis is far from perfect, any critic, input and constructive feedback is highly appreciated. Lastly, I hope that this thesis is not only useful for me, but also to other people that have the same passion and interest on low income settlement in the context of the Global South.

Melbourne, 2018
Bagas Dwipantara Putra
TABLES OF CONTENT

DECLARATION........................................................................................................................ II

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT............................................................................................................. IV

TABLES OF CONTENT ........................................................................................................ VII

LIST OF TABLES .................................................................................................................... XI

LIST OF FIGURES .................................................................................................................. XII

ABSTRACT ............................................................................................................................... 1

ABBREVIATIONS ................................................................................................................... 3

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION ................................................................................................. 6

1.1 RESEARCH BACKGROUND ......................................................................................... 6

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT ............................................................................................... 9

1.3 RESEARCH AIMS, OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS ................................. 10

1.4 CONTRIBUTION OF THE RESEARCH ........................................................................ 10

1.5 THESIS STRUCTURE .................................................................................................... 11

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW ..................................................................................... 14

2.1 INTRODUCTION ............................................................................................................ 14

2.2 URBAN SETTLEMENTS IN ASIAN MEGACITIES ......................................................... 15

2.2.1 THE NOTION OF URBAN SETTLEMENTS ................................................................. 15

2.2.2 MEGACITIES IN THE DEVELOPING CONTEXT ......................................................... 17

2.2.3 URBAN KAMPUNG IN INDONESIAN CITIES ......................................................... 19

2.3 URBAN GREEN SPACE IN URBAN DESIGN ............................................................... 24

2.3.1 THE DISCOURSE ON URBAN GREEN SPACE ......................................................... 24

2.3.2 CONTESTED IDEAS ON URBAN GREEN SPACE IN THE GLOBAL SOUTH CONTEXT .... 28

2.3.3 THE PRODUCTION OF GREEN SPACE IN URBAN DESIGN ..................................... 32

2.3.4 IMPLEMENTATING GREEN POLICY IN ASIA ......................................................... 39

2.4 COMMUNITY, SOCIAL CAPITAL AND POST-COLONIALISM .................................... 41

2.4.1 COMMUNITY AND THE URBAN SOCIETY .............................................................. 41

2.4.2 COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL CAPITAL ..................................................................... 43
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY ................................................. 54
  3.1 INTRODUCTION ........................................................................... 54
  3.2 PHILOSOPHICAL APPROACH ......................................................... 54
  3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN .................................................................... 56
  3.3.1 QUALITATIVE APPROACH .......................................................... 56
  3.3.2 CASE STUDY APPROACH ............................................................ 62
  3.3.3 RESEARCH INSTRUMENT ............................................................. 63
  3.4 INTERVIEW METHODS .................................................................. 64
  3.4.1 CONDUCTING SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW ................................ 64
  3.4.2 DATA COLLECTION PHASE ........................................................ 65
  3.4.3 PROFILE OF THE INTERVIEWEES .............................................. 65
  3.5 SUMMARY ................................................................................... 66

CHAPTER 4: CASE STUDY – SOUTH JAKARTA ......................................... 68
  4.1 INTRODUCTION ........................................................................... 68
  4.2 JAKARTA: THE MEGACITY ............................................................... 69
  4.3 URBAN KAMPUNG IN JAKARTA ...................................................... 71
  4.4 OVERVIEW OF THE CASE STUDY ................................................ 71
  4.4.1 DISTRICT OF MAMPANG PRAPATAN ........................................ 73
  4.4.2 DISTRICT OF CILANDAK ............................................................ 75
  4.4.3 DISTRICT OF JAGAKARSA .......................................................... 76
  4.5 SUMMARY ................................................................................... 78

CHAPTER 5: DEFINING GREEN SPACE IN A GLOBAL SOUTH CONTEXT ...... 79
  5.1 INTRODUCTION ........................................................................... 79
  5.2 IMAGE, IDENTITY AND MEMORY .................................................... 80
  5.2.1 FINDINGS – IMAGE, IDENTITY AND MEMORY ............................ 80
  5.2.2 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS – IMAGE, IDENTITY AND MEMORIES .......... 83
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION .................................................................................................................. 138

7.1 CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE ......................................................................................... 139

7.2 CONTRIBUTION TO PRACTICE .............................................................................................. 142

7.3 RESEARCH LIMITATION .......................................................................................................... 143

7.4 FURTHER RESEARCH ............................................................................................................. 143

7.5 CLOSING STATEMENT .............................................................................................................. 144

CHAPTER 6: THE PRODUCTION OF SOCIAL SPACE IN URBAN KAMPUNG .............................................. 107

6.1 INTRODUCTION ..................................................................................................................... 107

6.2 SOCIAL STRUCTURES IN URBAN KAMPUNG ........................................................................ 107

6.2.1 FINDINGS – SOCIAL STRUCTURES IN URBAN KAMPUNG ................................................. 107

6.2.2 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS – SOCIAL STRUCTURES IN URBAN KAMPUNG ................. 110

6.3 SHARED VALUES AND PRINCIPLES IN URBAN KAMPUNG ................................................ 114

6.3.1 FINDINGS – SHARED VALUES AND PRINCIPLES IN URBAN KAMPUNG ........................ 114

6.3.2 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS – SHARED VALUES AND PRINCIPLES IN URBAN KAMPUNG ... 121

6.4 SOCIAL INTERACTION AND NETWORKING IN URBAN KAMPUNG ...................................... 124

6.4.1 FINDINGS – SOCIAL INTERACTION AND NETWORKING IN URBAN KAMPUNG ............ 124

6.4.2 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS – SOCIAL INTERACTION AND NETWORKING IN URBAN KAMPUNG ...................................................................................................... 133

6.5 SUMMARY .............................................................................................................................. 135
REFERENCES .............................................................................................................................................. 145

APPENDICES ........................................................................................................................................... 166

APPENDIX A RESEARCH INSTRUMENT ................................................................................................. 166
APPENDIX B FIELDWORK LOGBOOK ..................................................................................................... 171
APPENDIX C LIST OF INTERVIEWEES ..................................................................................................... 179
APPENDIX D SURVEY HANDBOOK ............................................................................................................. 188
LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1 TYPOLOGY OF URBAN GREEN SPACE ............................................................... 26
TABLE 2 RESEARCH DESIGN ...................................................................................... 61
TABLE 3 PROFILE OF COMMUNITY LEADERS IN MAMPANG PRAPATAN ...................... 179
TABLE 4 PROFILE OF COMMUNITY LEADERS IN CILANDAK .................................... 180
TABLE 5 PROFILE OF COMMUNITY LEADER IN JAKARTA ........................................... 182
TABLE 6 PROFILE OF COMMUNITY MEMBERS IN MAMPANG PRAPATAN ..................... 184
TABLE 7 PROFILE OF COMMUNITY MEMBERS IN CILANDAK ...................................... 185
TABLE 8 PROFILE OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AT PARK & CEMETARY AGENCY ........... 186
TABLE 9 PROFILE OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AT THE MUNICIPALITY OF SOUTH JAKARTA ..... 187
TABLE 10 PROFILE OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AT THE DISTRICT OF MAMPANG PRAPATAN ............................................................................................................ 187
TABLE 11 PROFILE OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AT THE DISTRICT OF CILANDAK .......... 187
TABLE 12 PROFILE OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AT THE DISTRICT OF JAGAKARSA ........ 187
# LIST OF FIGURES

**Figure 1** Definitions of Urban Green Space ................................................................. 25

**Figure 2** Component of Place ......................................................................................... 34

**Figure 3** Component of a 'Sense of Place' ..................................................................... 36

**Figure 4** Urban Design Process ...................................................................................... 37

**Figure 5** Population of Jabodetabek ............................................................................... 70

**Figure 6** Map of Special Capital Region of Jakarta ......................................................... 72

**Figure 7** Map of the Municipality of South Jakarta ......................................................... 73

**Figure 8** Kampung in the District of Mampang Prapatan ................................................ 74

**Figure 9** Built Environment in the District of Mampang Prapatan .................................. 75

**Figure 10** Kampung in the District of Cilandak ............................................................ 76

**Figure 11** Built Environment in the District of Cilandak ................................................ 76

**Figure 12** Kampung in the District of Jagakarsa ........................................................... 77

**Figure 13** Built Environment in the District of Jagakarsa ................................................ 77

**Figure 14** Various Green Initiatives in Urban Kampung .................................................. 88

**Figure 15** Community Interaction in Urban Kampung .................................................... 96

**Figure 16** Interaction and Networking in Urban Kampung ............................................ 132

**Figure 17** Community Leaders in Mampang Prapatan .................................................. 180

**Figure 18** Community Leaders in Cilandak .................................................................... 182

**Figure 19** Community Leaders in Jagakarsa ................................................................. 183

**Figure 20** Members of the Community in Mampang Prapatan ......................................... 183

**Figure 21** Community Activity in RW 002, Cilandak .................................................... 184

**Figure 22** Community Activity in RW 003, Cilandak .................................................... 185

**Figure 23** Community Activity in RW 008, Cilandak .................................................... 185
ABSTRACT

Urban development in many Global South countries including across Asia has shown rapid growth. Rapid urban growth brings numerous consequences both to the urban fabric and to city dwellers, one of which is pressure on green and open space in the city caused by increasing demand for this space to be used for built up areas. This phenomenon can greatly affect community living in densely populated settlements where access to green and open space is very much limited. There has been growing awareness in some local communities living in urban kampung to preserve and protect green space in their neighbourhoods. Through these initiatives, they have succeeded in reclaiming, providing and managing greenery for their community that contributes to the quality of living in their neighbourhoods.

By using a case study of urban kampung in South Jakarta, Indonesia, this research investigates the provision and creation of green space by communities living in densely populated settlements in one of Asia’s megacities, with an objective to understand the placemaking process and the social elements supporting those processes. Qualitative methods are appropriate to understand these community engagement processes. The research design employs semi-structured interview and observation; and applies an analytical framework derived from a review and analysis of literatures.

Building on the existing understanding of open green space which is mostly derived from cases of cities in the developed nations, this research reveals that low income communities in the context of Global South have different perceptions in defining open green space that is essentially based on culture, customs, views, needs and constraints they face daily in their settlements. In further investigation of placemaking theory in the context of Global South, the thesis argues that the process of green placemaking in urban kampung is influenced by three significant social aspects, which consist of the community’s social structure, community’s embedded values, norms and principles and also the social interaction and networking between members of the community and supporting stakeholders.

In addition, this thesis contributes to the improvement of the current policy framework on the kampung improvement programme, which is heavily focused on physical and infrastructure improvement of urban kampung and often neglects the importance of social aspects in the
community; which can be understood by revealing the social dynamics happening between members of the community during communal activity.

**Keywords:** Open Green Space, Placemaking, Urban Kampung
ABBREVIATIONS
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research Background
Urban development in many metropolitan areas in developing countries has shown rapid growth; this is particularly evident in emerging global cities such as Beijing, Jakarta, Istanbul, Mexico City, Sao Paulo and Johannesburg. In line with rapid urban development, the demand for built-up spaces in these cities has risen dramatically causing green space and other forms of vacant land to be converted into hard development. Numerous cases in developing countries indicate that the loss of urban green space has reached an alarming level with an average rate of 10-35% over the past four decades (Arifin & Nakagoshi 2011). If this trend continues, many scholars and practitioners predict that in the future many cities in the developing world, especially in Asian region will face mounting environmental problems (Jago-on et al. 2009).

One of the significant causes of rapid urban growth is the high level of migration from rural areas to cities. The pull factor for many migrants moving to big cities is the lure of economic opportunities; this is compounded by the push factor from rural areas where incomes are often low. The urbanisation process happening in the Global South is dominated by low income households as economic migrants, and has been associated with a proliferation of slum settlements in cities (Ooi 2007a). Many of these settlements are encroaching on urban green space (Baviskar 2003). The study of green space in rapidly developing cities in the Global South is thus important – as is the context of urbanisation and of local community dynamics and engagement processes.

An ontological starting point for this research is that safeguarding urban green space in major cities in the Global South is a problematic issue, given the pressure created by urbanisation and population growth faced by many cities (Tan et al. 2013). Urban green space in developing countries has to compete with the ever growing demand for built-up space. When compared to green space, buildings are often valued more and considered a tangible economic benefit to the city by both governments and landowners. In city states like Singapore and Hong Kong, where land is scarce and in high demand, its utilisation as green space or as a developed environment is a matter of on-going debate (Yuen et al. 1999). For example, land development is an important source of income to finance urban infrastructure
and social services through value capture schemes (Hui 2004). These schemes typically undervalue green space and make green space vulnerable to land use conversion.

The presence of urban green space provides intangible long-term benefits for urban dwellers. These benefits include health (Godbey et al. 1992), economic (Luttik 2000), social (Coley et al. 1997) and biodiversity (Arifin & Nakagoshi 2011). In the Global South, responsibility for providing and managing urban green space increasingly involves the government, public-private partnerships (Gowda et al. 2008), and community engagement (Grobicki 2001; Holmer 2011) in an inevitably uneven contest of ideas and power. Meanwhile, in low income settlements such as urban kampung, access to open green space is increasingly limited or even unavailable, preventing kampung dwellers from getting the benefits that green space has to offer.

Various measures to address this inequality have been introduced by the Indonesian government since the early 1970s, through the introduction of the Kampung Improvement Programme (KIP) which originally aimed to improve the quality of built-up environment in kampung neighbourhood, such as the provision of drainage, sewerage and other basic urban amenities (Winayanti & Lang 2004). Gradually the programme has widened from just focusing on the physical aspect of built-up environment to also include greenspace through a recognition of the socio-economic benefits of community empowerment, such as Community Based Initiatives for Housing and Local Development (Co-BILD) and urban poverty reduction programmes, such as P2KP Program Pengentasan Kemiskinan Perkotaan (Urban Poverty Alleviation Programme) (Minnery et al. 2013). However, the issues facing low income community living in urban kampung has continued to worsen in many regards, with changing climate, food security concerns, urban heat island effects, social change and increasing inequality.

Recently in many Asian cities, there has been a growing awareness by local communities to preserve and protect green space in their neighbourhood. Community engagement in the provision of green space exists for various reasons, including the following; self-provisioning which leads to the creation of community-based vegetable gardens (Holmer 2011), prevention of natural disasters such as flooding and erosion of river bank (Widhi 2013), and the creation of green and healthier environments for densely populated urban communities.
Attempts by local community to provide green environments are a particular challenge in low income neighbourhoods where political and economic capacities are low.

Community engagement in green space initiatives is becoming crucial especially for cities in the Global South. This is because cities in the Global South are facing great challenges both internally and externally. Internal challenges include lack of development control by the government and poor public consultation during the planning process, which sometimes undermines input from communities (Sanyal 2005). Meanwhile, external challenges include the high influx of in-migration which creates pockets of unplanned settlements, and also global warming and climate change which affect the urban landscape. Based on these challenges, communities could play a larger role as the agents of change to create better living conditions in their neighbourhoods, especially in the low income settlement.

The principal aim of my research is to better understand the phenomenon of community-based action on green space in the context of emerging Asian megacities. I employ a case study methodology focused on one city, Jakarta, with all three sites of the study located in that city. This approach is appropriate to enable a deep analysis of context, community and processes. More than 60% of the increase in the world’s urban population over the next three decades will be in Asia (Ooi 2007a). Jakarta is chosen for the case study, as an example of a rapidly emerging megacity facing growing pains associated with land pressure on green and open space.

With rapid economic growth, cities in the South East Asia region have transformed themselves to become engines of growth and the national development focus of their respective countries (Ooi 2007b). Moreover, cities like Singapore, Kuala Lumpur, Bangkok, Manila and Jakarta are competing to become the economic and financial hub of the region and for foreign investment. Jakarta has played an important role in Indonesia’s economy, history, culture and politics for centuries. Nowadays Jakarta’s role is not exclusively limited to Indonesia but has widened to the greater South East Asian region with its appointment as the diplomatic capital of ASEAN (Djonoputro 2011). Similar to other metropolitan cities in the region, Jakarta is facing rapid urbanisation and overpopulation – its population expanded by 4% from 1950 to 2000, while the population in the fringe areas grew by 18% each year (Silver 2007).
The high influx of in-migration to Jakarta has created considerable urban problems for the city; one of which is the conversion and encroachment of green space in the urban areas for development purposes. This has left Jakarta with only 9% of its total land mass for green space (Jakarta 2010). Most of this residual accessible green space is located in the old quarter or within upper-class neighbourhoods, leaving low income and densely populated settlements, known across Indonesia as kampung, with declining contact to accessible green space. With the growing awareness of local communities living in urban kampung of the importance of green space in their neighbourhoods, various green action programmes have sprung from communities, creating numerous instances of informal green spaces. The initiative could eventually help Jakarta’s provincial government programme in adding to and providing arguably much needed green space in the city.

1.2 Problem Statement
UNFPA (2007) predicted that by 2030, 81% of the world’s urban population will reside in urban centres of the Global South, with average urban population growth estimated at 2.6% per year (UNEP 1999). This phenomenon will mostly happen in Asian megacities, where it is estimated that 60% of the increase in urban population will occur over the next three decades (Ooi 2007a). As one of Asia’s megacities, Jakarta is also experiencing rapid urbanisation. The influx of thousands of people has influenced and shaped the city development. This phenomenon is highly visible in urban kampung, which is often used by the new migrants to find temporary and affordable shelter.

Due to high urbanisation in Jakarta, the need for urban infrastructure and built up areas such as housing, commercial areas and transportation, has risen drastically, often resulting in the sacrifice of natural land and habitat, which ultimately causes reduction of urban green space (Kong & Nakagoshi 2006; Swanwick et al. 2003). Currently only 9% of Jakarta’s land mass is dedicated for open green space, whereas according to the new Indonesian Spatial Planning Law, issued by the Indonesian Ministry of Public Work (2007), the ideal proportion for urban green space is at around 20% from the total urban area. Existing green space is not equally distributed throughout the city, where it is most likely located in, or easily accessible from planned areas of affluent neighbourhoods. Meanwhile, access for people living in urban kampung is very much limited.
The process of creating green environments in urban kampung not only shapes the built environment but also influences the social construction happening in the community. Studies and research related to open green space and social learning process in urban kampung are limited. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to understand the process of green placemaking and how it is influencing and shaping the community’s social capital in urban kampung.

1.3 Research Aims, Objectives and Research Questions
This research looks at the way community living in urban kampung creates and provides green space in their neighbourhood with a focus on green placemaking and the way the community’s social construct influences the placemaking process. The objective of this research is to examine green placemaking processes in urban kampung and its social impact to the community; this objective has guided the literature review and formation of research questions. By selecting urban kampung in Jakarta, this research adopts case study approach in order to understand the social phenomenon happening during the placemaking process.

Based on the research background, research objectives and the immediate problems faced by the case study, the overarching research question for this research is:

“How and why is urban green space shaped and maintained in urban kampung?”

Two secondary research questions are set out to help answer the main question. The following are the supporting research questions:
- What is the meaning and significance of open green space for the community living in urban kampung?
- What factors influence the creation of open green space by the community in urban kampung?

1.4 Contribution of the Research
With a focus on the provision of green space, this research improves our understanding of communities residing in urban kampung. The emphasis of this research is upon the processes of community engagement in green placemaking, situated as they are within physical space and social structures. Placemaking processes are thus dynamic and contested. The research
contribution can be categorised into two main aspects, namely theoretical and practical contributions.

(i) Theoretical contribution; this research contributes to the body of knowledge in the realm of urban design by focusing on placemaking in the developing context through an examination of the green placemaking process in low income settlements. Social theories, such as Gidden’s structuration theory and Bourdieu’s social capital are used to understand social phenomena in the placemaking process. In addition, post-colonial studies are utilised in the discussion chapter to explain the position of the knowledge which is originated and rooted in the local context.

(ii) Practical contribution: There are implications for policy and community action regarding urban kampung in Jakarta. The policy framework is situated around the Spatial Planning Law No.27 Year 2007 which stipulates that every city in Indonesia has to at least have 30% of their area dedicated for green space, which consists of 20% public and 10% private. This research provides input on the utilization of community-based green space to adhere to such framework. In addition, community action serves as the energy and resources for urban kampung and the observations of processes of production and maintenance have implications for community practice, as explained in Chapters 6 and 7.

1.5 Thesis Structure

This thesis will be divided into seven chapters.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION
This chapter explains the rationale of conducting research on green space in urban kampung and briefly sets out the contributions of this research, both to theoretical and practical purposes.

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW
This chapter critically engages with literature on key issues and theory for the research. The first part of this chapter examines the basic notion of human settlement, particularly on the discourse of low income
settlement in the context of emerging Asian megacities (Abrams & Jurist 1964; Doxiadis 1970; Turner 1976; Silas 1992; Silver 2007). The second part explores the ideas and concepts of open green space within the realm of urban design, and critical examination of placemaking theory within the context of developed and Global South cities (Lynch 1960; Jacobs 1961; Carr et al. 1992; Swanwick et al. 2003; Carmona 2014b; Oranratmanee & Sachakul 2014). The last part of this chapter examines relevant social theories related to the notion of community and social capital, where theory such as structuration, social capital and post-colonial approaches are extensively discussed (Quijano 1972; Said 1978; Giddens 1979; Bourdieu 1985; Delanty 2003).

CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
This chapter explains and justifies the research paradigm and methodological framework incorporated in the research, including the type of data needed, data collection, and data analysis process.

CHAPTER 4 CASE STUDY: SOUTH JAKARTA
In this chapter, the rationale for choosing Jakarta as the case study is explained in depth. To understand the phenomenon investigated in this research, three urban kampung are chosen for further exploration. The justification of the three sites is also discussed in this chapter.

CHAPTER 5 DEFINING GREEN SPACE IN A GLOBAL SOUTH CONTEXT
This chapter discusses the urban kampung dweller’s perspective and perception on green space in their settlement, and how significant its presence impacts their livelihood and the community.

CHAPTER 6 THE PRODUCTION OF SOCIAL SPACE IN URBAN KAMPUNG
In this chapter, the discussion is situated around the process of green placemaking in urban kampung. The first part explores the setting of the physical urban space; the social structures within the communities in urban kampung and their influence on placemaking processes. The
role of community values and principles, in sustaining social interaction and networking is then invoked to explain the shaping of spaces in urban kampung.

CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSION
This chapter delivers thesis summary based on the discussion chapters. In addition, research contribution, research limitation and the need for further research is also discussed here.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction
This chapter reviews theories and relevant debates to underpin the theoretical and empirical basis of this research, with an objective to understand how and why urban green space is shaped and maintained in urban kampung. This research is conducted in Jakarta, the capital of the Republic of Indonesia which is also one of the biggest metropolitan area in the southern hemisphere, with more than 30 million people living in Greater Jakarta. However, the literature review draws upon knowledge and practice across the globe and seeks to locate it within the context of this study.

The literature investigation is situated around three main issues derived from the research aim and objectives (Chapter 1, page 21): urban settlement processes in asian megacities; green space in urban design, and the relation between community and social capital in the Global South/Jakarta context. Each underpins the theoretical framework which is drawn upon in the analysis and discussion in Chapters 5 and 6.

Accordingly, the first part of this chapter reviews the literature on urban settlement in Asian megacities, particular on low income settlements, and the presence of urban kampung in Indonesian cities. Immediately relevant issues concerning the presence of urban kampung are urbanisation, provision of formal housing, and megacities which will be discussed briefly in this section, including by drawing upon the work of the following key scholars; Abrams (1964), Doxiadis (1970), Turner (1976), Silas (1990; 1992), Firman (1994; 1998; 2000), Dovey (1999; 2009; 2011; 2012; 2013), Winarso (2002; 2011), Silver (2007), and Hudalah (2007; 2010; 2012; 2013). In so doing, it is important to note that several related disciplines contribute here, including Architecture, Urban Planning and Urban Geography.

Hong et al. (2010), Oranratmanee (2012; 2014) and Moudon (2015). The debate and discussion within the framework of urban green space draws upon several related disciplines including Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning.


These issues are chosen to be the core of this research due to their importance and role for metropolitan cities in the Global South. Although there are areas of conceptual overlap and cross-fertilization among this literature, they are often analysed separately.

2.2. Urban Settlements in Asian Megacities

2.2.1 The Notion of Urban Settlements

Human settlement in urban areas is inseparable from the development of the city itself which is closely linked to the rise and fall of many human civilisations. As the embodiment and site of urban culture, cities are strongly associated with geographical setting, tradition and cultural context of the society inhabiting the particular area (Roberts 1996). Within the realm of urban geography, urban settlement considerations include the physical form of the city (i.e. site, spatial pattern, urban morphology and urban form), where the central discourse concerns “space, place and environment” (Herbert & Thomas 2013, p.5).
The most basic understanding of human settlement ranges from the very temporary, where the ground is levelled for a night’s sleep, to semi-permanent or permanent settlements; from nomadic tents to huge, immovable cities occupied by millions of people, cities that are ever-growing and merging into one human settlement (Toynbee 1967). Doxiadis (1970) differentiates between “content” and “container”; where the content of human settlement is human, social relationships and material while the container is the physical settlement, which consists of both natural and man-made or artificial elements.

In terms of tenureship, the form of physical settlement can be distinguished between formal and informal settlement, where formal affords the legal security to invest in durable housing, supporting infrastructure, and speculative investment. On the contrary, informal settlement embodies uncertainty and affords more limited, temporary, even makeshift physical structures which may not follow building regulations, and may lack basic and supporting infrastructure including access to clean water and proper sanitation. In short, this form of settlement may lack urban security, order and function (Un-Habitat 2008). On the other hand, informal settlements can be highly organised and high-functioning, communally-minded, and exhibit self-reliance; such as exhibited in self-help buildings and services. Gold (2002) classifies urban informal settlement into eight categories, including urban villages, skid row, young adults, nonconformists, the “underworld”, the ghetto, and the “other” community.

Urban settlement is not only defined by its physical construct as containers for human activity and social processes, but it also embodies the inhabitants “symbolic values, collective memory, association, celebration and conflict” (Cuthbert 2008, p.1). As one of the fields concerned with the importance of public space in the daily activities of urban dwellers, urban design inevitably grapples with the social and the material, and the relations between them. As urban development continues apace, the forces that shape urban environments produce contrasting examples of both diversity and conformity, and both are in turn shaped by and populated by human culture and ingenuity. Adding to the discussion, the notion of urban settlement has long been debated and proposed by numerous scholars from various disciplines with multiple viewpoints, where the creation of settlement is as old as civilisation itself (Gosling 2003).
2.2.2 Megacities in the Developing Context

The presence of informal settlement in urban areas, especially on Asian megacities brings us to the discourse on megacities, where it is commonly defined based on quantitative characteristics, particularly the city population threshold. The population threshold for megacities “started” at four million inhabitants (Dogan & Kasarda 1988) and has since grown to more than ten million inhabitants (DESA 2009). Other features of megacities is their structure that is often monocentric, although there are megacities that have polycentric structures too (Kraas et al. 2013). But what megacities really share in common is the issues facing them throughout the world; pressures on urbanisation, transportation, water supply, air pollution, governance, housing, waste management – with varying hardship endured across contexts (Sorensen & Okata 2010).

Although megacities in developed and developing countries share common problems, the two worlds differ in terms of several fundamentals, including wealth, speed and timing of growth. This example can be seen in cities in the Global South that are growing faster than early industrializing cities in Europe. The city of London for example, took almost a century to grow from one million to seven million while cities like Delhi only took a few decades to make this transition (Sorensen & Okata 2010). The rapid growth of megacities that is mostly happening in the Global South is fuelled by urbanisation, globalisation and neo-liberal capitalist expansion. The result is Asian megacities that are experiencing “the world’s most dynamic changes” and high urbanisation rates at around 5% per annum (Kraas et al. 2013, p.2).

Urbanisation is a global process, but it happens differently across places and regions. It is arguably taking on quite different characteristics across growing megacities throughout the Asian region; China with increasing middle income population (Dadao 2007; Chen et al. 2010), India with rural push caused by “demographic explosion due to natural increase” (Datta 2006, p.13), Indonesia with increasing Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and extraction of natural resources (Aritenang 2008; Hudalah et al. 2013), and the Gulf States with oil-generated wealth (Fargues 2011). More in common, however is that the rapid rate of urbanisation has often exceeded the ability of cities in providing basic services to urban dwellers, which eventually leads to the culmination of severe urban problems, such as the ever increasing presence of squatter settlement, uncontrolled urban sprawl and inadequate urban infrastructure (Cohen 2006).
Within the discourse on megacities, the issue of globalisation is intertwined. Debates on megacities may only be limited to the size and magnitude of a city, but globalisation processes explain the growth of megacities through transnational commercial relations (Robertson 1992). The notion of “global cities” is afforded by their importance in the global urban hierarchy, therefore the presence of multinational companies is used as one of the indicators (Sassen 2011). The large population in megacities does not automatically bring wealth and prosperity to inhabitants, and in any event, new wealth is unevenly distributed. Much of the urban population misses out on the opportunities afforded to well-connected, well-educated elites, entrenching inequality and in turn hampering the ability of the city to be internationally competitive (Stratmann 2011).

Despite rhetoric and voter sentiments in the UK and USA, the interconnectedness between cities are expanding the flow of capital from one part of the world to the other, and this phenomenon is apparently unstoppable. Market-driven development is a feature of current globalised trade and so cities are sites of contemporary imperialism; as agencies, such as IMF, World Bank and WTO position, facilitate and direct international trade through the creation of Metropolitan capital (Patnaik 1999). Profound changes are sure to ensue, as in the case of China where rapid urbanisation is associated with the rise of a new urban middle class that is increasingly active in driving the national economy through new forms of domestic consumption (Tomba 2004). Urban and global capitalism is thus profoundly changing the socio-economic structures of megacities in the Global South (Kahn 1991).

In the context of this research, Jakarta as one of the largest megacities in the southern hemisphere is a site of enormous development pressure which has physically transformed the city through largely uncontrolled growth. Alongside capital development is the erosion of quality of life for many inhabitants (Firman & Dharmapatni 1994; Firman 1998). Slum and squatter settlements in the city centre are examples of lack of management of development issues including around tenure (Winarso 2011; Zhu & Simarmata 2015). Similarly, are the manifestations of organic growth on the urban periphery for industrial and housing purposes without any major supporting infrastructure from the city centre (Winarso & Firman 2002; Hudalah et al. 2007).
2.2.3 Urban Kampung in Indonesian Cities

Throughout the Malay archipelago consisting of Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Brunei Darussalam and Timor-Leste, a common term for settlement inhabited by low income community is “kampung”. In Bahasa Indonesia kampung originally meant “village” as in rural settlement, but now many kampungs have been absorbed by urban development and, in concert, the meaning of kampung has transformed to include an urban settlement typically consisting of a community of traditional/indigenous and/or low income households (Pembinaan 1989). This definition is supported by Sullivan (1992) where through his research in Yogyakarta, the term kampung was extensively used by the Javanese. Traditionally kampung refers to the residential compounds of princess, nobles and dignitaries; today it means something closer to “home community” and in many cases “slum”, since it is often regarded as informal and characterised by poverty (Sullivan 1992, p.20).

However, the nature and form of these elements vary, as they take various forms and locations; from settlements for low income people in marginalised areas and considered illegal settlement known as *kampung kumuh*; to *kampung industri* which focuses on house-based economic practises with on-site production line (Newberry 2008); to *kampung budaya* or commonly known as cultural village which preserves the rich heritage and tradition of the community (Tjahjono 2003).

Numerous researches have shown that kampung provides extensive benefits for urban dwellers. One of the prominent benefits of the urban kampung is providing shelter for the poor (Winayanti & Lang 2004; King & Idawati 2010). This notion of urban kampung as the provider of affordable housing for the poor in city centre is the result of governments’s inability in providing basic elements of human needs for the urban poor, which is affordable and job-oriented located housing. Hence the creation of urban ghettos in city centre is unstoppable (Ooi & Phua 2007). Informal settlements such as urban kampung can be understood as a means to solve housing problems for the urban poor, or as a subject requiring eviction and moving to public housing on the urban fringes, with dire consequences for their cost of living and livelihoods. An optimistic account that values kampung communities would recognise how they can address housing shortages and alleviate the need for public housing; as places where community living can maintain social and communal lifestyle (Dovey 2013).
Within their internal affairs, households in urban kampung often still maintain and preserve the tradition of communal cooperation, known as gotong-royong (mutual self-help) that is implemented in many aspects of their everyday lives, which is based on the principle of goodwill, consensus and reciprocity (Koentjaraningrat & Holt 1961; Bowen 1986; Koentjaraningrat 1987; Marzali 2005; Newberry 2008). One example of underpinning values is kerja bakti (neighbourhood cleaning activity), where people voluntarily help each other in cleaning their living environment without any coercion. Their involvement in this communal activity could be understood as a form of support and acknowledgement of the social structure that is inherent in their society while at the same time building social capital between community members (Schweizer 1989; Schweizer et al. 1993). In addition, aside from preserving rural values and norms, some neighbourhoods still retain the traditional social forms and model of community as a form of governmentality (Newberry 2007).

The urban kampung is a provider of cheap labour for many middle income families and provides a supporting environment for micro, small and medium enterprises (Newberry 2006). Many urban migrants that work in the informal sector come from rural areas and may have little knowledge or ability to access urban welfare system (i.e. housing, education, health, etc.), and in some cases, access to services is prevented due to administrative issues of their originality as they are coming from a different state, province or city (Zhang et al. 2005). The resulting phenomenon of social inequity between urban migrants and other city residents promotes migrant enclaves inside the city, often in run-down neighbourhoods close to job opportunities. Hence these migrants are contributing to and living in urban development, yet the idea of having decent housing is still distant for them, as their link to the city is maintained through tenuous family/friend networks and through informal low-paying hard labour (Lin et al. 2011).

Kampung often comprises people from these migrant-rich, low income and lower socio-economic groups. In order to understand the significance of this type of settlement, one needs to understand the rationale behind the existence of kampung and associated cultural and urbanisation processes. These are the product of governance, government and policy, including on land and housing in the Global South, which in turn shapes these governing entities.
Housing policy in the Global South is a globalised issue, with the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF), United Nations (UN), and other aid agencies acting as major players. Housing policy is very much connected and intertwined to international medium-term economic development, short-term macro-economic policies, national development policies and urban development (Riddell 2009). Policies and practices have been switching emphasis since the mid-1980s from focusing on project-based approach such as site and services scheme to whole housing sector development. The current policy agendas in housing have their roots in the World Bank international aid agencies’ experience of “learning by doing” since the early 1970s (Pugh 1994).

Housing policy for the urban poor in Jakarta, Indonesia began as early as 1970, with slum upgrading programs known as Kampung Improvement Programs (KIP). KIP initially started with the upgrading of physical infrastructure and did not include land tenure issues. However, Jakarta’s local government has been inconsistent, as a settlement that received the programme were later demolished to accommodate new commercial and business facilities. From mid-1970s, both central and local governments have tried to utilise the welfare concept of housing by developing public housing and urban renewal projects. During the late 1970s Perum Perumnas, the National Housing Corporation, developed a pilot site and services model in Depok, a small village located in the southern outskirts of Jakarta. The pilot project was developed using the self-help concept promoted by the work of John Turner (1976); however the strategy never became part of the country’s national housing policy. During the 1980s and 1990s, the central and local government issued exclusive permits (‘location permits’) for developers to obtain land for housing and urban development. The new housing development was focused towards the eastern and western outskirts of Jakarta-Bekasi and Tangerang. This was the era in which large areas of land in the fringe area of Jakarta were put under location permits for large-scale housing and new town development. Under this policy, it was assumed that developers would build housing in the proportion of 1:3:6, meaning that in any particular site the developer was obliged to build three units of middle-class housing and six units of low income housing for every unit of exclusive housing. Since no sanctions were enforced, most developers did not comply with the policy. Later housing policy shifted the central government’s role from being a provider to being an enabler. Then in 1994 the State Ministry of Housing stated that this policy change would shift the major role of housing provider from the government to the community (Winayanti & Lang 2004).
Research and studies related to urban kampung in Indonesia are diverse and varied. The variation of this research can be distinguished into several main topics ranging from slum upgrading and the provision of basic infrastructure at urban kampung to issues of kampung budaya or cultural village that focuses on the preservation of traditional or indigenous customs.

There is considerable research related to slum upgrading in the Global South, with Charles Abrams (1964) and John Turner (1976) providing some of the earliest insights in the modern era. Both figures have played significant roles in the debates over slum and squatter improvement programmes, housing policy, and housing provision for the poor. One of the most distinctive features of Turner’s thinking, by comparison with that of Charles Abrams and indeed almost everyone else who has written on the subject of housing, is its consistency of focus and outlook, where Turner relies more on self-help practices in overcoming problems faced by slum and squatter settlements (Harris 2003). More recent works by Kim Dovey (2011; 2012; 2013) on informal settlements in the developing context explore the possibility of adopting and embracing informality when dealing with slums and squatters, rather than moving the slum dwellers to public housing. The latter is a western/developed construct solution for low income communities and has not worked even in the Global North, and is unlikely to work any better in the Global South (Davis 2003). The form of informal urbanism that is proposed by Kim Dovey is through understanding the variables which makes it look informal. This is in itself a social construct, borne as it is from local and global narratives on housing construction capacity, the typology and morphology of settlement, the complexity of informal economies and their social structure. He further argues, rather than working against informality, it would be better and wiser to work in line with that understanding, yet this is the biggest challenge for designers, planners and policymakers in the Global South in the 21st century; as there should have been a shift of focus from only delving into aesthetic and beautification jargons, to also examine other aspects governing the livelihood of communities in informal setting to create a more accommodating built environment. The notion of informality is also mentioned by Ananya Roy in relation to postcolonialism, where she argues that the role of informality is synonymous with the Third World “models” and could be understood as a resistance to the First World “models” which glorifies orderliness and regularity, thus this “model” cannot be enforced in the Global South context (Roy 2005; 2011).
In an Indonesian urban context, the nature of informality can be seen in how urban kampung is shaped and transformed, including government and NGO’s assistance in improving the quality of the built-environment. Academician, practitioner and researcher Johan Silas from Sepuluh Nopember Institute of Technology (ITS) is a highly regarded figure that is actively advocating for slum upgrading in many urban kampung throughout Indonesia, where he successfully incorporates community participation in upgrading projects, including community voices and raising community awareness of the importance of a healthy environment (Silas 1990; Silas 1992; Funo et al. 2002). Despite numerous programmes of improvement, policy failure manifests in an unbroken cycle of slum settlement all over the city (Tunas & Peresthu 2010; Reerink & Gelder 2010).

One striking feature of urban kampung that distinguishes them from other parts of the city is their strong sense of social capital. Despite all the limitations they endure; it seems that, in Bourdieu’s (1986) terms, some sort of institution is needed in developing social capital, thus by implementing tradition/rituals (as the embodiment of the institution) from their place of origin, such as selametan (ritual meal of commensality), arisan (rotating-credit association) and gotong-royong (mutual-aid) the building and capitalizing of social capital is achieved (Schweizer et al. 1993; Newberry 2007). Social capital not only provides resilience, it also supports decision-making processes (Beard & Dasgupta 2006; Dasgupta & Beard 2007).

In addition, urban kampung plays an important role as business incubator and functions as a locus for small, micro and medium enterprises. Home-based enterprises are a means to sustain livelihoods for low income households in the city (Strassmann 1987; Sinai 1998). Women are at the forefront of many such initiatives, as formal unemployment rates among women are often high (Tipple 2005) and in some cultures women are restricted from working outside the house to earn a decent living (Mahmud 2003).

In summary, multiple dimensions of urban kampung are relevant to urbanisation and city development processes, and vice versa. Various perspectives upon these dimensions are provided across a broad range of disciplines and literature. Anthropological dimensions inspired, for example, by the writing of John Sullivan (1980; 1986; 1992), Jan Newberry (2006; 2007; 2008) and Patrick Guinness (1986; 1991) focus on tradition in urban kampung and typically use an ethnographic approach to illuminate and explain social capital. In contrast, more technical research emphasises the qualities of built environment in urban
kampung, where this research is done both in quantitative and qualitative methods, respectively. The work of, variously, Johan Silas (1990, 1992), Lana Winayanti (2004), and Kim Dovey (2011; 2012, 2013) illustrate the role of design, engagement and power in the curation of space and the making of place.

The reason for reviewing numerous research and studies related to settlement in the Global South, especially with the focus on urban kampung in Jakarta, is to understand the position of this research within the greater realm of human settlement. Most of the research conducted in the urban kampung is concerned with slum upgrading and the social life of the community. There has been very little research on urban kampung investigating the provision of green space.

Based on the reason which has been described above, the possible implication of this chapter for the research is to create a framework for selecting the appropriate case, which focuses on investigating the provision of green space in urban kampung. The rationale behind this issue is because in some cases kampung is packed with people and building structures that result in less open green space for the kampung dwellers, eventually becoming hazardous for their health and the quality of the environment.

The focus of this research is on urban kampung implementing green space initiatives. The initiation of the projects may originate from within the community (bottom-up approach) or the government (top-down approach). The case study chosen for this research is composed of several kampung/neighbourhoods in South Jakarta.

2.3. Urban Green Space in Urban Design

2.3.1 The Discourse on Urban Green Space

Green open space that is part of urban open space comes in various forms and shapes both in the Global North and the Global South. This definition of space is also diverse from one country to another, where the creation of green open space is strongly shaped by numerous related variables (i.e. geographical location, local customs and traditions, social structure, etc.). In order to have a deeper understanding of the notion of urban green space, this sub-chapter will explore the concepts and ideas of urban green space according to various scholars and practitioners, both in developed and developing contexts.
Within the developed context, urban green space has a more structured and highly regimented definition. According to Swanwick et al. (2003) urban open space can be distinguished based on dominant elements of open green space and grey space. Grey space can be defined as part of the land that is dominated by hard surface (i.e. concrete, roads, pavement, etc.), meanwhile green open space is plant based (see figure 1).

![Figure 1 Definitions of Urban Green Space](source: Swanwick et al. (2003))

Other terms used include open space and public space, which can have overlapping meanings and definitions. The following are definitions of open space and public space by several experts. According to Lynch et al. (1995, p.396) open spaces are “those regions in the environment which are open to the freely chosen and spontaneous actions of people: public meadows and parks, but also unfenced vacant lots and abandoned waterfronts”. Whereas Swanwick et al. (2003) defines open space as a part of the urban area that contributes to its amenity, either visually by contributing positively to the urban landscape or by virtue of public access, thus it combines urban green spaces and civic spaces.

Carr et al. (1992, p.3) stated in his book that public space is “the stage upon which drama of communal life unfolds, this space could be owned by private, public or individual and still has the openness for public usage”. According to this definition, public space can be owned publicly or privately as long as it is accessible to the public. Based on the various definitions above the presence of green, open, and public space in urban areas provide outdoor activity
space for the urban dwellers to improve their quality of life, while creating a healthy, scenic and secure environment to live in (Gold 1980).

Furthermore, Swanwick et al. (2003) classified open green space into four categories:
1) Linear open green space;
2) Semi-natural open green space;
3) Functional open green space; and
4) Recreational open green space.

**Table 1 Typology of Urban Green Space**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL URBAN GREEN SPACE</th>
<th>MAIN TYPES OF GREENSPACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMENITY GREEN SPACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreational Green Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal Recreation Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incidental Green Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Green Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Incidental Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Green Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUNCTIONAL GREEN SPACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Productive Green Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remnant Farmland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allotments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURIAL GROUNDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Churchyards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL GROUNDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Grounds (including school farms and growing areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Institutional Grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEMI-NATURAL HABITATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open/Running Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marsh, Fen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOODLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deciduous Woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coniferous Woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed Woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER HABITATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moor/Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grassland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within the Global South context, the notion of urban green space is typically less structured and less regulated compared to Global North counterparts. There are also fundamental differences arising from colonialism, and diverse social and cultural practices, development priorities, supporting Roy’s (2005) arguments on the distinction of First World and Third World models. Meanwhile, the relatively limited research in the Global South related to the presence of urban green space shows that aside from adopting the western model and typology of green space (Table 1), green space is also influenced by local culture and traditions (Wijaya 2004) and also everyday struggles of local people to meet their essential needs (Pretty et al. 2003; Corlett et al. 2003; Chadha & Oluoch 2003; De Zeeuw et al. 2011).

In relation to this research, the notion of urban green space in the developing context as an additional food provider and help to improve the community’s livelihood will be further investigated in the discussion chapter (Chapter 5). According to Mougeot (2010) issues concerning food insecurity and malnutrition goes hand in hand with urban poverty in the Global South, where urban green space is often seen as a temporary solution to overcome this problem. An example from a low income settlement located in Caragan de Oyo, the Philippines shows that the community managed to escape from economic and food deprivation through community-based gardens, despite limited available public space; which they managed by creating leases and contracts with land-owners in their neighbourhood (Holmer 2011).

In addition, the discourse of urban green space in the Global South context is progressively developing, due to the fact that every country in the Global South world is at different development stages and socio-economic maturity which requires them to develop their own definition and standards on urban green space. The definitions and typology of urban open green space which has been explained above will be further investigated and cross-checked.
with the research findings, in order to find the appropriate understanding and definition within the developing context.

2.3.2 Contested Ideas on Urban Green Space in the Global South Context
The prominent debate within the context of urban green space in the Global South is related to tensions between development, urbanisation, community engagement and land use. Urbanisation has been progressing rapidly in the Global South (Uy & Nakagoshi 2007) and United Nations predicts by 2030, 81% of world’s urban population will reside in urban centres of the developing world (UNFPA 2007). Increased urbanisation in Global South countries leads to more and more green space conversion for infrastructure needs (i.e. housing, business, and transport) (Byomkesh et al. 2012), where actually there are cyclical relations between environmental degradation, poor development and poverty eradication in the Global South (Adeel & Piracha 2004).

The loss of green space lands may be detrimental to urban livelihood in the long term. As discussed above, urban green space brings considerable benefits to urban citizens ranging from ecological and environmental benefits (Arifin & Nakagoshi 2011), social benefits (Zhou & Rana 2012; Kaźmierczak 2013), economic benefits (McPherson et al. 1997; Tagtow 1990; Luttik 2000; Wolf 2003) and health benefits (Ulrich 1981; Hartig et al. 1991; Godbey et al. 1992; Conway 2000).

Environmental sustainability as one of the many benefits of having urban green space, benefits the urban ecosystem as a whole; where the derived impact will be felt directly by urban dwellers. Researches conducted in several Global South countries, namely China, Vietnam, Indonesia and Bangladesh show empirical evidence as to how the presence of urban green space helps to improve the environmental carrying capacity and to some extent increases the urban biodiversity (Zain 2002; Kong & Nakagoshi 2006; Uy & Nakagoshi 2007; Arifin & Nakagoshi 2011; Byomkesh et al. 2012). This information is significant for policymakers in the Global South in order to improve quality of the built-environment and enhances the urban dwellings’ livability.

For urban dwellers, urban green space plays a significant role that impacts the community’s social life. This is due to the nature of urban green space that attracts all layers of urban...
society regardless of socio-economic and cultural backgrounds. This phenomenon allows urban green space to be used as an ideal setting for human interaction and activity (Whyte 1980; Lefebvre 1991). A case study from Singapore, a highly-developed Global South country, shows just that; how urban green space is used by policymakers as a deliberate social instrument to strengthen the society and promote inclusivity among all races living in the city-state (Yuen 1996b; Yuen 1996a; Yuen et al. 1999).

Another direct impact from urban green space is the implications for the local economy, especially for low income communities that live in the vicinity. All forms of open space that are accessible by the public; including open green space will eventually be used and occupied, often by locals and small businesses (food vendors, makeshift market, etc.) in order to sustain their livelihood in the city. This phenomenon is a distinct character of public space in the developing world that is synonymous with irregularity and informality (Oranratmanee 2012; Oranratmanee & Sachakul 2014). Another example of the use of urban green space that provides economic benefits to the community is manifested in the form of community-based gardens. Various research conducted in the developing world; The Phillipines, Ghana and Indonesia show that community-based gardens tackle the issues of food insecurity and malnutrition that affect many low income communities, in the process contributing directly in reducing poverty in the neighbourhood (Sinai 1998; Holmer 2011; De Zeeuw et al. 2011).

In addition, one of the most significant benefits of urban green space to urban dwellers is health benefits, whether it is physical or mental health benefits. This accords with Ulrich’s (1981, p.525) findings concerning mental health issues, where he argued, “The exposure to water or vegetation would have more positive influences on subjects’ physiological states than exposure to urban scenes lacking nature”. This statement is supported by recent research by Barton and Pretty (2010), where they argued that “strong correlations with activities conducted in the green environments and the increase and improvement of self-esteem and mood booster for those who are mentally ill”. Besides benefits to mental health, physical health is also directly impacted by the presence of urban green space, where this notion is in line with the empirical findings of Kaplan and Kaplan (1989), based on their research they noticed that individuals and community could be unhealthy because they are living in a neighbourhood without adequate green space.
Development pressure is enacted through a system of economic power and city governance, and this may overwhelm the positive case for retention of green space. This raises the question of “who decides” on green space retention or reconfiguration, and how the government role in the Global South around the development of urban green space is important (Li 1997; Xu et al. 2011). Nevertheless, from several cases in the Global South, municipal government in several cities have failed to manage green space that eventually leads to deterioration. This is caused mostly by weakness in planning, controlling and managing urban development (Uy & Nakagoshi 2007), and also budgetary constraint faced by the government (Gowda et al. 2008).

Attempts by local or municipal government in the Global South to resolve issues concerning the management of green space is done in various ways, one of which is through the promotion of public-private partnership schemes (Gowda et al. 2008; Arifin & Nakagoshi 2011). It can be argued that this initiative can be interpreted as the government’s inability to meet the urban dwellers’ needs for an accessible and decent open green space, where most of government policies regarding urban space are more inclined towards the affluent community and big enterprises, which eventually leaves the the low income community struggling on their own (Soja 2010). Examples from low income community in India, the Phillipines, and South Africa have shown that they brought this matter to their own hands, and without any government intervention they have succesfully created community-based green space and gain benefits from its existence (Grobicki 2001; Holmer 2011; Balooni et al. 2014).

Based on the arguments presented above, urban green space has multiple benefits for the urban dwellers. However, the presence of such space is contested, especially in densely populated cities in the Global South. Yet many experts agree that the decrease of green space in many cities in the Global South is caused by excessive and uncontrolled urbanisation (Jim 1998; Kim 2012; Henderson 2013; White et al. 2013).

Since 2007, Spatial Planning Law in Indonesia (Undang-Undang Penataan Ruang Nomor 26 Tahun 2007) has included and regulated the presence of green space throughout the Indonesian archipelago. According to the regulation, every municipal and regency government in Indonesia needs to dedicate at least 30% of land area for green space (i.e. urban parks, neighbourhood parks, river banks, agricultural areas, etc.). In reality, major cities in Indonesia such as Jakarta, Surabaya, Medan, Makassar, and Bandung are dealing
with tremendous challenges in providing green space, due to limited land space and budgetary constraint. Faced by this situation, many creative communities in Indonesia are creating community-based green spaces using private, vacant or marginalised land in their neighbourhood, which sometimes function as vegetable gardens or open space for various creative activity (Hussain 2012).

In relation to that, the connection between urban kampung and community-based green space is closely related and supports one another, especially in Jakarta, where city is experiencing enormous pressure and changes caused by vast development in the urban areas. This can be seen by how community-based green space in urban kampung benefits the low income community in numerous ways, such as providing space for small and micro industry (Newberry 2008; Peters 2010), as an interaction space for low income community (Newberry 2007; King & Idawati 2010), and productive space for local agriculture (Holmer 2011).

The presence of small and micro enterprises in urban kampung merely serves as a means to gain livelihood for the low income community where open green space plays a role in this endeavour, either directly or indirectly. An example of this undertaking is the small and micro enterprises usage of community garden to source materials for their businesses. This will not just benefit them from the reduction of overhead cost but also help to cut their production cost. Another benefit from having community-based garden in urban kampung for small and micro enterprises is that they can use the space for a production line, considering that they live in a small and compact settlement where space is a prime, thus the existence of communal space is paramount (Sinai 1998; Tipple 2005).

Open Green Space in urban kampung also operates as an interaction space between kampung dwellers. This accords with Lefebvre’s (1991) notion of social interaction space where he argued that the production of social space is created by community engagement within a particular space and based on an array of societal relations, which helps to glue the community together. As an interaction space, the presence of open green space can be seen as an investment to the community, where its presence is expected to develop the community’s social capital and inclusivity.

In addition, one of the significant benefits of having open green space in the midst of urban kampung is its role as a community agriculture garden, with the purpose of meeting the
kampung dwellers’ nutritional needs. Examples from several cases in the Global South suggested that the presence of community-based gardens in low income settlement helps to boost their nutritional intake, which is improbable to meet without the presence of such garden (De Zeeuw et al. 2011; Holmer 2011).

From the various benefits of urban green space mentioned above, the presence of urban green space in the developing context has been widely researched and investigated through various perspectives and approaches. In this research, another approach will be incorporated to investigate green space in urban kampung through community participation. Meanwhile the implication of the current debate on green space for the research is to help position the research within the wider context of green space and develop ideas for community-based green space from other cases in the Global South.

### 2.3.3 The Production of Green Space in Urban Design

The burgeoning of green space in urban areas is often the result of urban design process. As suggested by Barnett & Jones (1982, p.12) which define urban design as the “process of creating a physical design for growth, conservation and changes in urban context, this physical design includes landscaping and the built environment consisting of preservation and new construction”. The definition implies that the urban designer has the responsibility to create a livable urban space, and open green space is one of the important urban elements that need to be considered. This sub-chapter will explain more about the process of green placemaking within the realm of urban design.

The nature of urban design which is an inter-disciplinary study combining various disciplines such as architecture, urban planning, landscape architecture, civil engineering and social studies to name a few, has given rise to a discipline that is multifaceted with primarily a focus on people and place connection. In relation to the nature of urban design, Lang (1994) describes the challenges faced by urban designers, where “urban designing is an increasingly complex task as the range of human activities grows, communications processes become more diverse, new ways of putting geometries together are found, and the rate of physical changes being made in cities speeds up” (1994, p.453). This understanding means that the challenges faced by urban designers will evolve and become more complex, given the fact that changes in urban areas are constantly happening.
The creation of a physical setting for green space within the realm of urban design is related to the notion of placemaking. According to Schneekloth & Shibley (1995, p.1) placemaking is “the way all of us as human beings transform the places in which we find ourselves to places in which we live”. Placemaking sees space and place as the focal point of the discussion. Relph (1976, p.8) defines space as “amorphous and intangible and not an entity that can be directly described and analysed”. Both definitions of placemaking and space shows an interrelated linkage between those two aspects, where one will not exist without the other.

Aravot (2002, p.207) stated that “Place is a phenomenological term, introduced into architectural and urban design by Edward Relph (1976) and Christian Norberg-Schulz (1984)”. In general it seems that space provides the context for places but derives its meaning from particular places. Certain types of space could be distinguished; this variety of space seems to be relevant to a phenomenological understanding of place and to clarify the space-place relationship.

The narrative of contemporary placemaking in urban design has been extensively shaped by the unseen power of neoliberalism, thus creating a capitalist urbanism that favours large investors and capitals, where the profession of urban designer has been widely criticised for their unfair biases (Hubbard 1996). Examples from cities in the developed world, suggested that much of the creation of open space in the public sphere is influenced by the interplay of market driven decisions, where some sort of privileges are kept to ensure the continuity of the models (Gunder 2011), although the notion of contemporary public space are closely related and intertwined to commercial space and sometimes built on top of each other (Lees 1994). The universal model of public space will never be achieved, such as creating a one-size fits-all model, due to contextual differences and local circumstances that would not allow uniformity in the interpretation of public space. This accords with Matthew Carmona’s explanation that argues the application of his research findings to “developed Asian context will need careful interpretation, and they are likely to be least applicable in the least developed parts of the world” (2015a, p.399).

In order to understand the notion of placemaking, the meaning and understanding of “place” and how it is shaped and constructed need to be fully defined. According to Carmona & Punter (2013) there are three important elements that shape how a place is formed; those
elements are (i) activity, (ii) form, and (iii) image (see figure 2). In relation to the notion of “place”, the activity that helps to define sense of place, includes various activities related to the daily life of urban dwellers in the public sphere, such as street life, café culture, local events, public performance, etc. Meanwhile the form that constructs a “place” is characterised by specific boundary and features that define place into a state of being, namely scale, intensity, permeability, landmarks, etc. Lastly is the image that helps to illustrate a place in the eye of the viewer, where place can be understood through perception, information and cognition, where through this approach “place” can be seen as an embodiment of symbolism, memory, sensory experience, etc.

![Figure 2 Component of Place](Source: Carmona & Punter (2013)).

Within the discourse of placemaking in urban design, scholars and theorists are arguing about the importance in understanding the uniqueness of a place. These differences are oriented towards understanding the making of a place in the city, those voices are as follows: the idea and practice of placemaking (Smith 2000), the difference between place and space (de Certeau 1984; Augé 1995; Casey 2013), the separation of place and space in modern life (Giddens 1991), the increasing irrelevance of place in contemporary life (Long 1989).
Placemaking also correlates significantly with the identity of place. Lynch (1960, p.8) defines identity of place as “that which provides its individuality or distinction from other places and serves as the basis for its recognition as a separate entity; this definition means that each place has a unique nature”. Edward Relph (1976, p.45) stated that:

“Identity is a basic feature of our experience of places which both influences and is influenced by those experiences. What is involved is not merely the recognition of differences and sameness between place but also the much more fundamental act of identifying sameness in difference. And it is not just the identity of a place that is important, but also the identity that a person or group has with that place, in particular whether they are experiencing it as an insider or as an outsider”

In relation to the case study’s context, the significance of urban kampung as a “special place” for the community portrays their strong connection with the place. Urban kampung has become part of their identity which distinguishes them from other urban dwellers, yet at the same time defines their position in the wider urban society’s social structure. Through urban kampung the community finds refuge and solace, and assistance in dealing with harsh and troubled urban life.

The basic elements of the identity of place constitutes three basic elements that consist of (1) static physical setting, (2) activities, and (3) meanings (see figure 3). Within urban kampung, these elements can be interpreted as follows: (i) The physical setting of urban kampung consists of all the built-up environment, whether it is hardscape or softscape, and could be acquired formally/legally and through other means, such as informality or self-help. (ii) Due to space constraint, numerous communal activities occurring in urban kampung are conducted in a modest shared space, where members of the community need to be considerate to other users, while retaining social harmony and inclusivity. (iii) Last is the meaning of urban kampung to the kampung dwellers, aside from being the marker of their identity, urban kampung shapes and influences their everyday lifestyle, where community helps each other based on the spirit of gotong royong that creates a distinction between them and other urban dwellers.

Thus, according to Relph (1976, p.47) “the meaning of places may be rooted in the physical setting and objects and activities, but they are not a property of them rather they are a property of human intentions and experiences. Meanings can change and be transferred from
one set of objects to another, and they possess their qualities of complexity, obscurity, clarity, or whatever”.

In addition, on the placemaking process from an urban design perspective with a case study from a developed context, Carmona (2014, p.2) stated that the urban design process is influenced by three influential aspects, namely “contexts, processes and power relationships”. First, the context of a place is shaped by two contextual factors, namely: the history and tradition of a place, and the contemporary polity. Second, these contexts then influence four active components in the placemaking processes: (1) design, (2) development, (3) space in use, and (4) management (see figure 4). Lastly, power relationships happening between the stakeholders significantly influence the urban design process, where each stakeholder brings with them their approaches and ideas that colour and diversify the process and impact the outcomes of the process.

The understanding of urban design process identified by Matthew Carmona (2014b) stems from his work on a variety of public spaces in Greater London, where 14 squares and 130 public spaces across 33 local authorities are selected as the case study; a time-lapse observation and extensive interview on space users were conducted for this purpose (Wunderlich & Carmona 2012). This notion of urban design process is well suited to
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understand the social phenomenon happening in public space, with a focus on developed cities, such as London, however this model has also been adopted by other scholars in the field of urban design, in order to comprehend various aspects occurring in the public sphere, ranging from issues concerning green infrastructure to community resilience to understand urban design theories in great depth (Lennon et al. 2014; Coaffee & Clarke 2015; Araabi 2016; Roberts 2017).

As one of the important components that contribute to the urban design process as stated by Carmona (2014b), design itself has an influential role in space formation, where the involvement of these components in the urban design process started early as vision.
envisioning. This involvement is later continued with innovations, creating space values and identifying the constraints facing the urban design process, yet stages of design will differ depending on the context.

In contrast, in the context of urban kampung, design processes are more informal, where the role of community leaders or elders are significant in the design process. Through an understanding of urban design process in the developing context, particularly on low income settlements, new approaches for urban design process in growing Asian cities might be possible, built upon conceptual and extensive empirical research (Zeisel 1984).

The second influential component affecting the urban design process is the role of management which consists of some important points. The notion of management in the urban design process ensures the spatial order within the whole process is implemented appropriately, hence the crucial points on management associated with issues such as everyday stewardship, curating place, controlling space, and space redevelopment or revitalisation. Leitmann (1999) shows that rigorous implementation of planning and management in urban design could improve space sustainability and livability, which can improve the user’s living quality.

The third component in the urban design process is development, where the desired development encompasses multiple practices and aspirations which determine the outcome of public space. These aspirations concerning development in the urban design process include ideas such as negotiating consent, injecting quality and garnering support. Development of public space within the realm of urban design mirrors the urban societies complexities, where every user’s aspirations concerning the improvement of the space need to be taken into account; thus individual values need to succumb to greater communal good (Madanipour 2010).

A further component that helps to define the urban design process is the existence of the space itself (space in use), where this component relates to everything happening within the perimeter of the object. As the core investigation in urban design, space is one of the topics that always intrigued many urban scholars in this discipline, whether it is the activities, associations, adaptation or amenities related to public space. Urban scholars such as Trancik (1986), Madanipour (1996a; 1996b; 2004), and Gehl (2011) have dedicated much of their
work to understand the nature of urban public space, which constantly evolves in accordance with their contexts and circumstances.

2.3.4 Implementation of Green Policy in Asia

Cases of green policy in Asian cities shows how green space is constantly threatened and displaced by rapid urban growth with more than 60% of the world’s urban population estimated to be living in Asian cities (Ooi 2007a). To keep this phenomenon from affecting and reducing urban green space, governments and policymakers in Asian megacities have formulated planning and development initiatives that support green development programmes. Examples from Singapore reveal how the government launched an ambitious plan to turn Singapore into a Garden City, which aims “to solve the problems arising from the twin processes of industrialisation and urbanisation” (Yuen 1996a). Similar green initiatives also adopted by the City of Seoul in South Korea with the launch of Seoul 2020 Vision with an objective of making Seoul a “human-oriented green city with as many public green spaces as cities in advanced nations” (Ra 2006). The largest urban green initiative in the world can be seen in China through the enactment of China’s national standards on “National Garden City” and “National Ecological City” that is conducted nationwide with a sole purpose of integrating greening into the urban development model of its cities (Zhao 2011). Challenges facing Asian nations are diverse and uneven. While economically well-established countries, such as Japan, China, South Korea, Taiwan and Singapore have gradually shifted their urban policy towards environmental sustainability, emerging Global South countries, such as Indonesia, India, Thailand and Vietnam are still faced with economic and political instability, thus green and sustainable development is rarely seen as the nation’s policy priority.

Aside from government initiatives, communities in Asian countries are also actively involved in shaping and managing the urban green space in their neighbourhoods, this becomes more obvious in poor settlements in Global South countries where government intervention in providing green space is still lacking (Grobicki 2001; Miura et al. 2003; Holmer 2011). This phenomenon could also be understood as a form of resistance by the community to seek social justice in spatial distribution, where urban green space in this context has turned into a privilege for the few people (Soja 2010; Iveson 2011). As has been shown by community members in the Global South through urban guerilla movements; the community used greenery as a political statement against the establishment (Mckay 2011).
Safeguarding urban green space in major cities in the Global South is a problematic issue, given the pressure created by urbanisation and population growth faced by many cities (Tan et al. 2013). In the Global South, the responsibility for providing and managing urban green space increasingly involves government with community engagement (Grobicki 2001; Holmer 2011) and public-private partnerships (Gowda et al. 2008). The implementation of public-private partnerships in the public sphere has long been practiced in the realm of urban design in many developed cities (Appleyard 1982), and this concept could also be applied to generate urban green space in the developing country through understanding the local context. The involvement of community in safeguarding urban green space in their neighbourhood in major cities of the Global South will be further investigated in this research.

The rationale for implementing green policy in many Asian cities conducted either by government or the community is spurred by various reasoning where urban green space appears to have a significant function in the urban landscape as a public open space that is accessible for city dwellers. This motivation is grounded on the following premises; urban green space as part of the identity of the city (Whiston 1984; Uy & Nakagoshi 2007), as a way to rejuvenate the city dweller and provide a sense of peacefulness and tranquillity (Kaplan 1985), and as improvement of quality of life in many ways (Chiesura 2004). Green space also contributes significantly to ameliorating noise pollution and environmental damage (Gowda et al. 2008).

In addition, the presence of urban green space may also conserve biodiversity, providing natural habitat and enriched subsoil water (Watson et al. 2003; Arifin & Nakagoshi 2011), while also providing social benefit as people’s usage of the outdoor space leads to positive interaction among neighbours and the community (Coley et al. 1997; Zhou & Rana 2012). Proximity to natural elements such as trees or water also helps to increase property values, and therefore tax revenues (Tagtow 1990; Luttik 2000), and enhance business revenues (Wolf 2003), and reduce business costs such as cooling-related energy costs (McPherson et al. 1997). Research on urban greenery also shows that it helps to reduce stress (Ulrich 1981) and benefits mental health (Hartig et al. 1991; Conway 2000). In one study, those who used local parks frequently were more likely to report good health than other wise (Godbey et al. 1992).
Based on the explanation above, the policy in many Asian countries in implementing a more environmental and sustainable approach to urban development has been built upon the various benefits that will be generated by the presence of open green space in their cities. Furthermore the role of urban design in defining urban green policy in the Global South context needs to be further encouraged.

2.4. Community, Social Capital and Post-Colonialism

2.4.1 Community and the Urban Society

In the realm of social sciences, many scholars and academics have debated the notion of community within the fabric of urban society. This is in line with the statement by Delanty (2003, p.xiii) where the meaning and definition of community is “never settled for once and for all and there will always be rival claims to community”. Based on that understanding, this sub-chapter tries to find out the contextual meaning and interpretation of community within the urban society, particularly in a developing Asian society in order to provide a foundation to be utilised in this research.

In a broader term, Mulgan (1995) defines community as a way of valuing the independent voluntary or non-profit organization. Community rests on such intermediate-level institutions as neighbourhood schools, family centres, or volunteer organizations to handle the matters that top-down models of local government cannot fulfil. Tönnies (1955) defined traditional community (Gemeinschaft) in terms of social networks of friends and relatives with close emotional ties developed through frequent face-to-face contact. Gradually the traditional terms of community has undergone a change of meaning, especially in the global age where urban society has progressed immensely and can no longer be limited by geographical boundaries (Mulligan 2015); added with the role of technology that enables remote communication of societies (Sassen 2007). This eventually raises a fundamental question on the true nature of community in the Global South context, where at the moment the society is evolving and undergoing monumental socio-economic changes.

Maser (1997) who focuses on “sustainable community”, indicates that the presence of local community serves five elemental purposes:

1. Social participation – where and how people can interact with one another to create the relationships necessary for a feeling of value and self-worth;
(2) Mutual aid – services and support offered in times of individual or familial need;
(3) Economic production, distribution, and consumption – jobs, import and export of products, as well as the availability of such commodities as food and clothing in the local area;
(4) Socialization – educating people about cultural values and acceptable norms;
(5) Social control – the means for maintaining those cultural values and acceptable norms.

Other writers such as Jewkes and Murcott (1996) define community as a group of people linked by common identity, geography, commitment, interest or concerns. This definition is aligned with the concept of community introduced by Christenson & Robinson (1980) which will be the basis for this research, i.e. for the purpose of this research, community consists of people, living within a geographically bounded area, involved in ongoing social interaction, and with psychological ties with each other and to the place where they live. The selection is primarily based on the physical context of the research that is urban kampung, where community lives in close proximity and located within a particular built-environment.

Within the context of dynamic and heterogeneous urban society, the terminology of community has become more prevalent as Castells (2011) argues that community in modern society has moved from the definition of geographical boundaries to more global networks that are made possible by the existence of new communication technologies. This statement is also supported by Sassen (2007) and Urry (2012) who argue that global migration gradually erodes sense of attachment to a particular place. A more well-rounded definition comes from Irish Marion Young (1986), a feminist sociologist that foresees community as an entity that is bound by religion, ethnicity, racial, class division, and related feelings. She argues that the “desire for community rests on the same desire for social wholeness and identification that underlies racism and chauvinism on the one hand and political sectarianism on the other” (1986, p.302).

The fabric of urban society is diverse and multifaceted; this diversity is evident in the social structure that makes up the society, where city is inhabited by the super rich that live in luxurious mansions to people living in urban slums and squatters. Nowadays, in a more liberal and global urban society, the idea of community has been challenged from within the society with urban society becoming more individualised and is attracted to newer and global
values that emphasises individual freedom (Puplick, C.J., & Southey 1980). Liberal global values are easily adopted by the upper-middle income group due to their everyday interaction that exposes them to new values and ideas, meanwhile lower income groups tend to be more reserved and hold firmly to their sense of communitarianism (Etzioni 1994).

2.4.2 Community and Social Capital

According to Pierre Bourdieu (1986) in his book titled ‘The Form of Capital’, capital can be categorised into three types, which consist of economic capital, social capital and cultural capital, and later on symbolic capital is added to the list of capitals. He then further detailed the definition of social capital as "the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition” (1986, p.21). Bourdieu argues that social capital is dependent on the connections and network one can effectively mobilise, and how each created network possesses and brings more capital to one’s benefit. This is to emphasise the nature of social capital that never stands alone and is always tied to other forms of capital. He also indicates that the existence of connection and network is not naturally constructed, and the creation of social capital involves institutions in the making, such an example can be seen in a family group, where the characteristic of the social formation involves kinship relations. In addition, the creation of connection and network can be interpreted as a form of investment in producing social relationships that can be used anytime one is needed, i.e. kinship, neighbourhood, or even work-place relations (Bourdieu 1985).

The relationship between community, society and social capital can not be separated from the role played by the influential agent within the community that helps to shape and direct how the relationship should be established. This corresponds with Gidden’s theory of structuration, where he argued that the production of a social system is influenced by structure and agents, in which he sees agents as active participants in the social transformation process (Giddens 1984). In this theory, Giddens implies that the term structure refers to rules and resources that allow the binding of time and space in social systems, and the idea of stucture is tied closely to the agent’s memory tracing. Futhermore, Giddens argued that agents are pivotal and critical in the transformation of a society, and although agents are bounded within their stucture, they have the capacity to carry out social actions and interactions (modality) that can gradually change and influence the shaping of the structure.
through continuous social cycles.

These two theories help to unpack how the relationship between community and social capital are shaping and influencing one another. Although some sort of social capital has existed among members of community in urban kampung, it is only through the institutionalization of urban kampung that the structure and agency much needed in building and strengthening community’s social capital has been provided.

2.4.3 Community Resilience

The notion of resilience within the context of urban community has recently been much anticipated among scholars in various fields related to urban development. The basic understanding of resilience comes from the discipline of environmental and ecological studies (Holling 1973), which was then adopted, embraced and adapted by other disciplines, including social sciences, in order to understand human ability and capability in adapting to global challenges (Walker et al. 2004).

According to Kirmayer et al. (2009, p.68) resilience can refer to (i) a sort of strength, resistance or invulnerability that prevents individuals from getting sick; (ii) a capacity to quickly and fully heal, recover and return to being in function; or (iii) an ability to adapt, change course, and find a new way to live and go forward despite impairment. Resilience can be found at any level of the social system starting from families, groups, communities and even bigger social systems. This means that resilience at an individual level can help to create a more resilient community. This phenomenon also works the other way round where the community that already has resilient characteristics can help to nurture resilience in its individual members. It is possible that certain aspects of resilience at the individual or community level may be in conflict with each other, what is considered good for individuals is not always good for the community and vice versa (Kirmayer et al. 2009, p.67).

Resilience in the community can be interpreted as the ability of a community to withstand, recover, and respond positively to a collective crisis or adversity. Within the framework of resilience, there are three possible ways that a community facing adversity can handle the situation which are as follows (Kirmayer et al. 2009, p.72):
(1) **Resistance** – the community may resist change, adjusting and adapting in ways that counteract the impact of the change. A resilient community can withstand considerable disruption before undergoing any lasting change;

(2) **Recovery** – with severe or prolonged challenges, the community, is changed but after the challenges are resolved, the community may work its way back to its original situation. A resilient community returns to its pre-disaster state more quickly than less resilient communities;

(3) **Creativity** – a community may be transformed by adversity, developing new modes of functioning that brings the community along a new path. A resilient community can adapt to new circumstances and create new institutions and practices that carry its values forward.

In addition to the definition of community resilience and the coping mechanism or strategy, other related factors in building community resilience are the community capitals and capacity. Flora, Flora and Gasteyer (2015) describe community capital as the community resources that is meticulously invested in communal undertakings to solve community problems. This definition shows how community capital is built and shaped from within their internal structure, and other aspects pertaining to their social structure such as “social, cultural, spiritual, and political resources” (Magis, 2010, p.406). Alternatively, community capacity can be understood as assets existing and owned by community members (McKnight & Kretzmann 1993), which focus on collective action (Fawcett & Paine-Andrews 1995), where it is built on the interaction of their human and social capital which is then used to address collective problems and improve the well-being of the community (Chaskin 2001).

Research on community resilience in the context of Indonesia has been recently studied and explored both in urban and rural community, where there has been growing awareness by homegrown scholars and researchers in understanding the importance of this discourse for the community in facing internal and external challenges. Threat from natural disaster are regular occurrences in the life of many Indonesians, which makes community resilience strategy crucial to overcome the impact of the calamity (Sagala 2006; Sagala 2009; Sagala et al. 2009b; Sagala et al. 2009a; Sagala et al. 2013). In addition, it is also important to understand the social infrastructure that supports community resilience, so when there are threats or challenges facing the community members, know the roles and functions carried out by each individual (Prilandita et al. 2016; Prilandita et al. 2017).
Based on the explanation above, the terms and conditions that define community resilience within the context and scope of this research will be further investigated. The investigation will be focused on low income settlement (urban kampung) in one Asian megacities, which is Jakarta, and how the notion of community resilience is influential in the green placemaking process.

2.4.4 Community-based Governance
The relation established between community and green placemaking is inevitable; community participation in the creation of open green space in urban kampung is crucial, especially through the coordination of local residents to collectively achieve common goals. This section discusses and explores the notion of community-based governance and how it affects the decision-making process to provide a clear understanding within the context of this research.

According to Beard & Dasgupta (2006, p.1452) community in the context of community-level governance can be described as “a bound territorial unit comprising residential and other land uses and whose citizens make planning and governance decisions jointly”. Based on the definition, the decisions taken by the community include the distribution of public goods and services, allocation of economic and environmental resources and also decisions about political process and representation.

Governance and power are very close and interrelated. Governance in the community is different from the formal organisations that govern local, state, and national government. Governance in the community tends to be informal and sometimes refers to “illegitimate” forms of power – more specifically those that are not formally sanctioned or are not embodied in the formal structure of political institutions, such as cities, metropolitan regions, states or federal government (Gold 2002).

Communities may form parts of good governance because they address certain problems that cannot be handled either by individuals acting alone or by governments (Bowles & Gintis 2002). Studies and researches about community governance (Sampson et al. 1997; Platteau & Seki 2000) show that communities solve problems that might otherwise appear as classic market or state failure, namely – insufficient provision of local public goods such as
neighbourhood amenities, the absence of insurance and other risk-sharing opportunities even when these would be mutually beneficial, exclusion of the poor from credit markets, and excessive and ineffective monitoring of work effort.

In recent decades, the paradigm of development approaches in the community has shifted to include more examples of community driven development (Dasgupta & Beard 2007), in response to the fact that for the last fifty years, top-down, modernist and authoritarian approaches have failed in bringing key elements of social progress to the community (Holston 1989; Escobar 2011). This claim is supported by many practitioners and academics who favour a community-based development approach (Crassweller & Hirschman 1984; Korten & Klauss 1984; Chambers 1997; Fung & Wright 2003). Studies in the Global South also show that bottom-up approaches help the community in many aspects of life, such as the provision of public goods (Díaz-Cayeros et al. 2014), building resilience (Prashar et al. 2013), sustainability (Thompson & Kent 2014), and poverty alleviation (Beard & Dasgupta 2006; Dasgupta & Beard 2007).

Models of governance in the community vary according to the type of governance used to govern formal institutions, such as local, state or national government. Mulgan (1995) distinguished community governance from formal governance as “things that the top-down models of local government cannot fulfil” and Mulgan’s statement is supported by Gold (2002, p.181), who stated that community governance models tend to be informal and “are not embodied in the formal structure of political institutions”. Top-down approaches have often failed in tackling major issues faced by many communities and many authors argue that models of community governance help the community in various ways, including the provision of public goods (Díaz-Cayeros et al. 2014), building a disaster resilient community (Prashar et al. 2013), or creating an independent community (Paton & Emery 1996; Moran 2010). Lane & Corbett (2005) on the other hand disagree with those ideas, founded on their research on community-based environmental management in Australia’s indigenous community.

“bottom-up governance serves to magnify the importance of local material and symbolic contests in which indigenous groups are engaged and community-based environmental management can fail precisely because of what many of its advocates take to be its more democratic quality: its localism” (Lane & Corbett 2005, pp. 141-159).
Parker (2013) tries to counter Lane & Corbett’s (2005) ideas by using a similar case in a traditional community (Anabaptist) in the US, stating that “centralization without local participation can place communities at risk by eroding the environmental knowledge and decision-making capacity of local people” (Parker 2013, pp. 159-178).

Thus, there are a numbers of tensions in the debate on community governance;

- Whether community governance is a response to poor government and is a useful supplement or essential alternative, and;
- Whether local community governance leads to “Nimbyism” and contests between communities, regressive actions, and/or loss of the benefits of larger scale governance/government or whether and how local community governance can be a force for good and avoid the negative risk of ‘localism’.

From the arguments and debates presented above, we can conclude that community governance plays an important role in many local community developments. It can play an important role in delivering basic infrastructural needs in the community (Díaz-Cayeros et al. 2014), which is important given the fact that many governments in the Global South are facing numerous hurdles in providing basic infrastructure.

In addition, the nature of community-based governance that is build upon its informality, define this system from other types of governance. Hence, the notion of informality within the decision making process will be further investigated in the discussion chapter, in order to understand how green placemaking is conducted in urban kampung, and the interplaying variables in the process.

2.4.5 Understanding Asian Society from a Post-Colonial Perspective

Society in Asia is deeply rooted in eastern philosophy and ways of thinking, where values and norms shape and dictate how the society is constructed and interacts between one another. Confusious teaching, especially the importance of family as the building block of the society, has greatly influenced how the society works and has become the very foundation of the society which emphasises and revolves around family as the core unit. This is evident in many aspects of Asian society, from household, business to state affairs, where these values foreshadow any decisions made by individuals or community in relation to wider concerns
and interests (Chen & Chung 1994).

The arrival of western nations to Asia in the early 15th century has brought a tremendous impact on the socio-cultural aspects of Asian society. Their intention that was originally for trading purposes, gradually evolved into an ambition to monopolise and control regional natural resources that caused direct conflict with local landlords, sultans, kings and rulers, which eventually led to the colonization of the region. The western colonization of Asia that lasted for more than 500 years has significantly influenced the society in many aspects, one of which is creating dependency on Western/European knowledge, which was deliberately created by the axis of colonial power at the time. After the independence of many colonised nations in the Global South, scholars from these parts of the world began to discuss the systematic way to deconstruct the production of knowledge in their country from the influence of their former ruler, which is known as the post-colonial movement (Bremen & Shimizu 1999; O’Sullivan 2013). Anibal Quijano, a very well-known and vocal Peruvian sociologist sees that western colonial power still exists until today and is strongly linked to our modern neo-liberal order. He argues that “Whiteness” still emerges as “the central place of the pattern of world Euro-centered colonial/modern capitalist power” (Quijano 2000, p.217-218). Together with Walter D. Mignolo, based on the experience of South American nations, they proposed decoloniality as a way to distance and delink themselves from the gravity of eurocentrism, in the political, social and cultural aspects of the society. This statement is also supported by Ananya Roy, where Western/First World models of society can not be forced or automatically implemented in the Global South (Roy 2005).

Nowadays, modern Asian society has emerged as part of the global community, where their presence has been taken into account, primarily due to rapid economic growth in the region. Rapid economic growth has brought significant socio-cultural changes to Asian society, where together with globalisation it has shaped and created the Asian society into a lucrative and potential market for major global businesses. This phenomenon exhibits how society in the developing context, including Asian society is still used by their former coloniser (replaced by big global corporations) as an economic tool and perceived as weak and submissive (Mignolo 2011).

The discourse on post-colonialism is chosen to help the researcher in unpacking the production of knowledge in the realm of urban studies, particularly urban design. This is due
to the nature of the knowledge which is still very much influenced and shaped by western understanding of urban space, therefore the current discipline of urban design needs further and deeper scrutiny by urban scholars in the emerging Global South nations. By doing this it will enrich and contribute to the knowledge of urban design, particularly in the Global South, where urban development is growing very rapidly and faced with inadequate urban development guidelines to support policymakers.

In addition, from a practical point of view, by developing an understanding of urban design from a Global South nation’s perspective, urban designers in the region will better manage and resolve urban design issues by using local insight, considering the knowledge is relatively new to the region and needs further exploration.

2.5. **Implications for the research**

The literature review highlights several key themes, which will be investigated much further in the discussion chapters (Chapter 5 and Chapter 6). Three important issues are highlighted in relation to this research: (i) the phenomenon of densely populated settlements in Asian megacities, and the efforts undertaken by stakeholders to improve them; (ii) the production of urban green space in low income settlements, focusing on urban kampung; and (iii) the social phenomenon that influences the shaping of an urban space, which covers a wide spectrum of social approaches, including social capital and social inclusion. This informs the basis for the analytical framework for further enquiry, including the selection and prioritisation of information for data analysis.

Based on the review, there are several important and significant literatures that will help in explaining the phenomenon of urban kampung in Indonesian cities. Starting with Silver’s (2007) book, which gives an insight about Jakarta as a megacity and the challenges faced by Greater Jakarta. Newberry’s (2006; 2007; 2008) research on urban kampung in Central Java, helps the researcher in understanding the living condition and everyday life of kampung dwellers from an anthropological perspective, where clear details and evidence is exposed and told vividly. Indonesian scholars and academics, such as Silas (1990; 1992), Winarso (2002; 2011), and Tjahjono (2003) provided a good local insight on the variety and physical characteristics of urban kampung which will support the analysis and assessment of the case study. Meanwhile Winayanti’s (2004) research provided a rare glimpse and short brief on
housing policy for the poor in Indonesia starting from colonization period until early 2000 (contemporary Indonesian history). In addition, debate on low income settlement is discussed and contested between Abrams (1964) and Turner (1976), this helps the researcher to map the existing debate on low income settlement at a theoretical level.

The central issues of the first literature framework deals with the discourse of informality in the urban context, especially towards cities in the Global South world. As an entry point to understand the formation and the interplay of power on low income settlement, informality holds a significant place on how space is shaped and created. As has been mentioned by Kim Dovey (2011; 2012; 2013) the element of informality has touched upon every aspect of built-environment in low income settlement starting from land ownership, self-help initiatives and the societal structures, which in a way shaped the nature of low income settlement as we know it today. Whereas, from an epistemological perspective, the notion of urban informality is endorsed by Nezar AlSayyad (2004) and Ananya Roy (2005), as an attempt to deconstruct ways of thinking for any critical thinkers who are willing to decolonise urban development in the developing worlds from capitalist hegemony.

The second literature framework discusses placemaking discourse, with an emphasis on the production and creation of green space based on community-led initiatives within the realm of urban design. An array of literature supporting the green placemaking discourse is available such as the terminology and definition of open green space and public space as stated by Carr (1992) and Swanwick (2003), which provides the researcher with a clear understanding on how developed society interprets and gives meaning to green space in their built environment. The review then follows with the researching on placemaking theory, which is often discussed by Carmona (2002; 2007; 2008; 2010a; 2010b; 2010c; 2013; 2014a; 2014b; 2015) in his research and articles on placemaking process, where his reflections present a valuable insight on the theory. In terms of early development of urban design, scholars such as Lynch (1958; 1960; 1984a; 1984b; 1995), Whyte (1956; 1980), Jacobs (1961; 1969; 1987), and Appleyard (1982) are responsible for developing and designing the field of urban design, through their critical engagement with urban issues that are primarily based on cases from North American cities. Also, Madanipour (1996a; 1996b; 1997; 2004; 2006; 2010) and Lang (1994; 2005) have successfully brought contemporary issues to the field of urban design that suit the 21st century. Lastly, the literature related to the development of urban design in South East Asian cities has a contrasting characteristic to
their developed counterpart where the knowledge was first developed. Oranratmanee (2012; 2014), a Thai scholar provides a very clear example of how this distinction shapes many Asian urban areas that are highly influenced by the society and unique geographical condition.

The primary concern of the second framework discusses the notion of green placemaking through community participation. As has been mentioned in the literature, within the realm of urban design, the notion of placemaking has been much debated among urban scholars, where one of the critical disseminations of the discourse is proposed by Matthew Carmona (2014b). He stated that the process of place creation is influenced by contexts, processes and power relations. Definitely his arguments are based and built on developed paradigm, where the urban landscape is very different in the Global South; i.e. geographical condition, social structure, technological advancement, law and order, etc. Thus, the notion of placemaking from a Global South perspective is needed, considering the variables that interplay in the placemaking process such as informality, which will greatly influence the result of the process.

The last literature framework for this research examines social relationships between members of the community, particularly community in a rapidly emerging Asian society, starting with a comprehensive definition of community as stated by Delanty (2003) in his book titled ‘Community’, which gives the researcher a thorough understanding of this issue. In order to understand the community and the society, a theory from the sociological field is needed to unpack the structure and construction of the society where the case study is located, for this reason structuration theory by Giddens (1984) is selected. Bourdieu’s (1986) idea on capital, including his view on social capital is also a crucial tool for the researcher to understand the relation and interaction happening in the community and also other social phenomena. To better comprehend society in the Global South context, especially Asian society after the colonization period, post-colonial approaches need to be included in this discourse, due to the impact of colonial influences to the social and cultural aspects of the society, where influential scholars in this field include Edward Said (1978) and Ananya Roy (2005; 2011; 2015). In addition to these two scholarly experts in postcolonial studies, other social science experts that combined their expertise with post-colonial discourse include Quijano (1972; 2000; 2007), Bhabha (1984; 2012; 2013), Spivak (1985; 1990; 1999), and
Mignolo (2000; 2002; 2007; 2009; 2011); those scholars prove that postcolonial theory could be seen from various disciplines, not mentioning urban design.

In this section, the emphasis of the discussion will be directed towards the role of social capital on low income community in the developing context. Although the discourse on social capital has been long debated between scholars in social studies, a more accepted understanding borrowed from the work of Pierre Bourdieu (1986); a well known French sociologist, which stresses how social capital can be utilised to achieve specific social connections; the theory has gain much exposure and have been widely observed by other disciplines. This can be seen on the field of urban studies where urbanist Jane Jacobs (1961) and William H. Whyte (1980) referred to the role of networking in the public space in Northern American cities. Further exploration is needed to understand the role that social capital serves as a contributor to placemaking process in the Global South context, considering the novelty of the approach in the region.

To sum up, the analytical framework draws on informality, green placemaking and social capital and its relation to low income community in the developing context.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This part of the thesis explains the methodological framework utilised in this research, where the first section provides the philosophical approach underlying this research. This includes the paradigm of inquiry which covers the ontological and epistemological insight that helps to position the research within the domain of knowledge production. The focus of this section is to rigorously explore the premises of truth/reality in the realm of social science that is suitable for this study.

The second part of this chapter explains the research design and methods employed in the research, where qualitative approaches are considered appropriate based on the nature of the research. This chapter continues with the third part that explores ways to gather information from the interviewees. The logical processes in developing this thesis use an inductive reasoning, where it is primarily based on observation ground, going from specific to general premises, and where the use of this approach is suitable to comprehend an empirical affinity in the case study (Vickers 2009). Lastly, theories that have been gathered through this approach are then connected and tested with the empirical data collected from the case study.


3.2 Philosophical Approach

The philosophical paradigm that underlies this research leans towards the discourse of phenomenology in an effort to find reality/truth/knowledge within the realm of social science, which is built upon the works of Husserl (1952), Merleau-Ponty (1956; 1964; 1996), Heidegger (1988), Hegel (1998), and Sartre (2004). Unlike positivist and post-positivist approaches which are based on empirical evidence, phenomenological inquiry “provides us
with interpretations regarding the distinctions between the internal and external world as well as levels of objectivity and subjectivity...thus meaning and conscious experiences are central to phenomenology” (Howell, 2012, p.55-56). That being said, phenomenology can be understood as a critique towards the positivist tradition, where in phenomenology “reality is not an objective entity the mind duplicates within itself; it is the result of that something and the mind’s percipient activity...there is therefore, no objectivity” (Mairet 1973, p. 13).

Phenomenology attempts to construct a view from the insider’s perspective, which is suitable for this research that tries to comprehend the green placemaking process in the context of low income settlement and within the realm of social science; as Howell (2012, p.26) points out that social science theory favours “its ability to provide validity and understanding rather than its ability to enable measurement, proof or prediction”, thus the phenomenological approach chosen is the appropriate one for this research.

Ontologically, the form of reality/truth/knowledge acquired in this research is based on the philosophical ideas of constructivism, where the theory suggests that humans create meaning and knowledge from their experiences. This accords with Watzlawick’s (1984, p.10) ideas on reality in constructivism that “any so-called reality is in the most immediate and concrete sense-the construction of those who believe that they have discovered and investigated it”.

The constructivism paradigm is also locally and socially constructed, where objectivity is created through social interaction and the production of knowledge is a social activity (Berge & Luckmann 1967; Longino 1993). In other words, ontologically this approach is closely associated with “relativist realism”, thus there is no such thing as universal objectivity, and reality/truth/knowledge exist in relation to society, historical and cultural context.

In addition, epistemologically in constructivism, “researcher and the researched continually interact and influence one another and the research project involves limited possibilities regarding generalisation (Howell, 2012, p.90). This means that the relationship between the investigator and the investigation is biased and opaque, where the sound and language of the investigator could unconsciously influence the course and outcome of the research. As has been mentioned by Michel Foucault (1982) in his critical thinking regarding the relationship between knowledge and power, where he argued that power bestowed upon the investigator/researcher can be abused as a tool for social control in the context of an object-subject approach. Nevertheless the objectivity and reality that is built through this paradigm...
is the result of mutual consensus and construction; this includes the investigator’s constructions.

The above-mentioned paradigm of inquiry (ontology and epistemology) leads to the selection of the methodological approach to be utilised in this research. This means knowing how the investigator/researcher discovers truth and knowledge on the basis of social construction of reality, where in this case the investigator’s individual construction is pivotal in identifying the objective reality that can be discovered (Lincoln & Guba 1985). A more detailed explanation related to the methodological framework will be discussed in the following sub-chapter (Research Design).

As a conclusion, the philosophical approach underlying this study is built upon the construct of phenomenological research, where objectivity is sought through the insider’s perception and experience. Thus a constructivist paradigm is considered appropriate for this research in order to find truth/reality/knowledge that is based on local and social interpretation or understanding. Through the investigation of the green placemaking process in the context of low income settlements in Asian megacities, the investigator wants to understand, from the community’s perspective, how the community on low income settlements (kampung) provide and maintain urban greenery in their dwellings.

3.3 Research Design

3.3.1 Qualitative Approach

Rapid urbanisation and urban growth in many Asian cities have led to fragile urban environments with decreasing green space as one of the problems faced by these cities, which in the long term will eventually compromise the quality of life of urban dwellers. However many local communities in Asian cities have begun a green initiative programme in their settlements with an aim to create a better living environment. Accordingly, the objective of this research is to understand how the local community engages in the process of creating green environments in their neighbourhood and whether this initiative could be replicated in other settlements in other cities. Furthermore, this research could be helpful in producing a policy framework in creating a green environment by the local community in the context of Asian megacities.
In selecting the methodological approaches for this research, the key research problems that focus on the role of local community in shaping the green environment have been taken into consideration. Therefore, to gain important insight and understanding of the role of the community, a qualitative approach is utilised. This is due to the nature of qualitative research that emphasises greatly the interviewee’s point of view. Another advantage in applying this approach is its flexibility compared to quantitative research. This allows the researcher to ask a diverse range of questions which gives insight into what the interviewer sees as relevant and important (Bryman 2015, p.470).

Over the past decades, the nature of inquiry in qualitative research has expanded from the issues of social construction, to interpretivism and issues on global social justice facing marginalised groups-such as suppression, alienation, domination and oppression (Denzin & Lincoln 2011). Today, the nature and characteristics of qualitative research are closely situated within the researcher’s social, cultural and political background and also grounded in their ability to reflect on the account that they are being presented; while qualitative research is mainly utilised to understand or explore complex issues/problems on a certain population/group which helps to identify the components and variables that cannot be easily measured by other research techniques (Creswell 2012). In designing qualitative research, there is not any rigid structure as the process in designing a research framework is very much shaped and decided by the researchers’ approach. Thus, scholars in this field consider that the design of a qualitative framework can be done by learning from best practises or other similar research/study, peer/group discussion that utilise similar research procedures, and make the issues become more apparent for others to notice (Weis & Fine 2000).

The qualitative method that is used to collect primary data for this research is semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions. Meanwhile, the interview is targeted to three groups of interviewees, namely: (1) community leaders, (2) members of the community, and (3) government officials. These groups are chosen due to their important role in addressing the issues of green environment in an urban kampung settlement.

The selection of the participants for this research follows purposive sampling strategy, where participants that were chosen are either related or have experienced the phenomenon being studied, which is in line with the understanding proposed by Creswell (2012, p.158) that stated “inquirer selects individuals and sites for study because they can purposefully inform
an understanding of the research problem and central phenomenon in the study”. In this case, the central phenomenon is the green placemaking process in urban kampung. Subsequently, the snowball technique is also incorporated in helping to identify/allocate potential sources, where this technique helps to “identify cases of interest from people who know people who know what cases are information-rich” (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p.28). Meanwhile the utilization of semi-structured interviews in this research is to gain any valuable information from the interviewees, and “attempts to understand the world from the subject’s point of view, to unfold the meaning of their experience, to uncover their lived world” (Brinkman and Kvale, 2015, p.3)

Along with qualitative methods, a case study approach is also used in this research, with the aim to explore and understand the phenomenon of community-based green space in cities in developing countries. According to Thomas (2011), case studies are analysis of persons, events, decisions, periods, projects, policies, institutions, or other systems that are studied holistically by one or more methods. The unit for case studies may be a person, a small group, a community or even an episode. For this research local communities in Asian megacities are chosen as the case study. This selection is based on an estimation that more than 60% of the increase in the world’s urban population over the next three decades will be in Asia (Ooi 2007b).

Furthermore Creswell (2012, p.96) suggested that “case study research is defined as a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a real-life, contemporary bounded system (a case) or multiple bounded systems (cases) over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (e.g., observations, interviews, audiovisual material, and documents and reports), and reports a case description and case themes. The unit of analysis in the case study might be multiple cases (a multisite study) or a single case (a within-site study)”. Meanwhile Stake (2005) deemed that case study is not a proper methodology rather than just a case within a bounded system, which was then opposed by Denzin and Lincoln (2008; 2011) and Yin (2013) who argue that a case study as a form of methodology, comprehensive research strategy and strategy of inquiry, where in the early development this methodology is derived from the knowledge of psychology, medicine, law and political science.
In conducting this research, two phases are implemented. The first phase is related with obtaining data or data collection phase. While the second phase of the research will concern data analysis.

**Data Collection**

Data collection involves the gathering of primary and secondary data. In this phase, there are several instruments that are used in obtaining primary and secondary data. Primary data is collected through a semi-structured in-depth interview to obtain specific qualitative information and using Bahasa Indonesia as the working language with participants from different groups of community leaders, members of the community and policymakers, both in provincial and municipal level. The snowball method is also used for acquiring relevant interviewees. Meanwhile, secondary data is collected from several sources, such as books, journals, and official government documents.

The use of semi-structured interview in this research is to provide leeway for the interviewee on how to reply or respond to the questions given, as well, adjusting with their frames and understanding of the issues being investigated (Bryman 2015). Investigator or interviewer have the flexibility to tailor their interview technique adjusting with the response given by the interviewee, where questions not included in the interview guide could be added and elaborated with the existing one. After the interview is conducted, the result of the interview will then be translated from Bahasa Indonesia into English, using the principle of back-translation as stated by Brislin (1970) to ensure its validity.

The snowball technique is incorporated into the data collection process, especially when recruiting candidates who will be interviewed. This is done through the help of “the initial samples of small groups of people relevant to the research questions, and these sampled participants proposed other participants who have had the experience or characteristics relevant to the research. These participants will then suggest others and so on” (Bryman 2015, p. 415). This cycle of interviewing will continue to be repeated many times until the data gathered from the interviewee is saturated. Several methologists in qualitative research argue that the minimum number to be interviewed ranges between 20 - 30 people (Gubrium & Holstein 2002; Baker et al. 2012).
The majority of secondary data to be used in this research comes from various government sources. The documents are obtained by using written permission from RMIT, stating that the researcher is conducting research in Indonesia by attaching a list of names and types of documents required (see Appendix A). While the selection of such documents is based on the need to know and understand government’s plans and programs on the provision of open green space for communities living in low income settlements.

**Data Analysis**

There are several data analysis methods that are used in this research. Relevant records from interview and questionnaire is translated, transcribed into English and grouped into categories for further analyses.

Creswell (2012, p.181) stated that the data analysis process “involves organizing the data, conducting a preliminary read-through of the database, coding and organizing themes, representing the data, and forming an interpretation of them”. During the analysis process, data that has been collected will then be organised to facilitate the next process which is data grouping based on the appropriate themes, that derives from data codification. This process will then be followed by the presentation of the research result which can be manifested in the form of figures, tables or discussion. Analyzing data in qualitative research is a complex and painstaking process, where the approach that is used is moving in an analytic circle rather than a fixed linear one, and Dey (1995, p.78) stresses the need for qualitative researcher to rely on their three I’s – “insight, intuition, and impression” everytime a qualitative researcher analyses their data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>RESEARCH QUESTION</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>DATA REQUIRED</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION METHODS</th>
<th>ANALYSIS METHOD</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | How and why is urban green space shaped and maintained in urban kampung? | To understand the success of green placemaking process in urban kampung and identify significant social variables related to the creation process. | Results from Research Question 2 and 3 | - Semi-Structured Interview  
- Photograph  
- Participation observation | Back Translation, Coding and Content analysis | The objective of this research. |
| 2   | What is the meaning and significance of open green space for the community living in urban kampung? | To understand the importance and significance of having open green space through the eyes of community member. | Primary Data  
- Community’s perception on the idea of open green space;  
- Their emotional relation with open green space;  
- Benefits of open green space for the community. | - Semi-Structured Interview  
- Photograph  
- Participation observation | Back Translation, Coding and Content analysis | Community perception and preferences on open green space in urban kampung. |
| 3   | What factors influence the creation of open green space by the community in urban kampung? | To comprehend the influence of social activities in green placemaking process in urban kampung. | Primary Data  
- Structure of the community and local governance in urban kampung;  
- Community activity that support green initiative;  
- The process of community engagement in the green initiative;  
- The success factors that support green initiative in urban kampung. | - Semi-Structured Interview  
- Photograph  
- Participation observation | Back Translation, Coding and Content analysis | The social variables that support community-led initiative on open green space in urban kampung. |
3.3.2 Case Study Approach

The selection of the case study approach for this research is based on the nature of the method. According to Yin (2013) the case study method is used in order to understand complex social phenomena. The method also allows the researcher to focus on a case while still able to have a wider perspective on the issues being investigated. Case study research often is misunderstood with fieldwork or participant-observation, where both of them are data collection techniques, while by definition case study could be defined as a method used to understand a real-world case and assume that such an understanding is likely to involve important contextual conditions pertinent to the case (Yin & Davis 2007).

According to Creswell (2012, p.101) procedures in conducting a case study research can be done through the following stages.

- Determine if the research problem is best examined using a case study approach;
- Identify the intent and case (or cases) for the study as well as case sampling procedures;
- Develop procedures for conducting the extensive data collection, drawing on multiple data sources;
- Specify the analysis approach for developing case description(s) based on themes and contextual information;
- Report the interpreted meaning of the case and lessons learned by using case assertions.

The main challenge in qualitative case study is determining the delineation and limitation of the case itself, where the scope of investigation can be as broad as investigating an organisational body to as narrow as exploring a decision-making process. These challenges must be determined by the researcher him/herself, where when choosing a case study the researcher needs to give a strong reasoning accompanied by accurate evidence and information regarding the case study. One thing to be concerned about in case study research is the level of detail and accuracy during research implementation. If this is not implemented, it could lead to a poor quality case study research, which is often encountered.
3.3.3 Research Instrument

The following are methods being used in acquiring data for this research. The survey instrument could be classified based on the type of data gathered, whether the instrument is used to acquire primary or secondary data.

1. Interview

The interview is an instrument used to acquire primary data. This research instrument is used to acquire qualitative data from relevant sources, such as government officials, community leaders and members of the community. The interviews are conducted in Bahasa Indonesia as the official and working language of many Indonesians and later the result of the interview will be translated and transcribed into English. Data obtained from interviewees will be processed. The expected outcome of this survey instrument is providing insight on green placemaking in urban kampung based on the experiences of the kampung dwellers.

Semi-structured interview with open-ended questions is used in this research. To help navigate in the interview process, the questions are grouped based on three main question themes, where each theme consists of more than three supporting questions (see Appendix A). In the implementation, the questions were evolved adjusting to the conditions and knowledge of the community.

2. Logbook

In gathering information during the data collection period, a logbook is utilised to support the other survey instruments with the main purpose to note information or activities of the community that could not be obtained from interview and questionnaire. The use of a logbook for case study research will help the researcher in cataloging information on day-to-day basis while blending in with the community.

Logbook is a personal note of the researcher. For this research the logbook started from the time the researcher arrived in Indonesia, Saturday 19 April 2014 until the last day of data collection, which is Tuesday 17 June 2014 (see Appendix B). Logbook entries are logged daily and recorded at the end of each day by looking at the fieldnotes from research activity conducted during the day.
3. **Participant Observation**

Another important research instrument in case study research is participant observation. Through this instrument the researcher can observe all activities undertaken by the research respondents whether it is done individually or in groups. In terms of this research, participant observation will be carried out on the 35 participants across 3 neighbourhoods which covers government officials, community leaders and members of the community (see Appendix C).

4. **List of Formal Documents**

Another source of survey instrument that will be used to gather data is the list of secondary data. This instrument is used to collect secondary data, mostly official documents issued by the government, whether at the central, provincial or local government.

The list of government documents range across Jakarta’s Provincial Master Plan, the Statistic of the Province of Jakarta and the Municipality of South Jakarta, Masterplan for Jakarta’s Green Space, and the current Spatial Law Number 26 Year 2007 (see Appendix A).

3.4 **Interview Methods**

3.4.1 **Conducting Semi-structured Interview**

In this research, interview will be utilised as a technique to gain valuable data from the respondents. The type of interview that will be used in this research is a semi-structured interview with open ended questions. This allows the researcher to explore the richness of the data in a more in-depth manner. Prior to the interview, a selection of key questions will be prepared and grouped based on the classification of the interviewees.

During data collection, the questions asked are grouped according to the classification of the interviewees. Questions asked to government officials/policymakers focus on policies related to open green space and how the policies accommodate the interests of low income communities living in urban kampung. Questions asked to community leaders focus on their involvement in green placemaking initiative and how they direct the community to be actively involved in such activities. Meanwhile questions towards members of the community
are directed towards their involvement and the motivation to be involved in the initiative (see Appendix D).

3.4.2 Data Collection Phase
Data collection phase is one of the crucial stages of the research; this is due to its nature that will shape and determine the outcome of this research. To undertake this phase, meticulous preparation needs to be performed. This preparation includes creating a framework for collecting data, choosing the right respondents and keeping the data in a safe place for further processing.

Data collection has been conducted from 19 April 2014 to 17 June 2014. During data collection 35 people were interviewed which comprised 12 community leaders, eight members of the community, and 15 government officials (see Appendix C). The community interviewed in this phase is spread across three different districts. Each area is different in terms of characteristics and approaches in delivering green space in their neighbourhood. All of the data is collected through in-depth interview and recorded using a tape recorder. Meanwhile, the selection of respondents is by using snowball techniques.

3.4.3 Profile of the Interviewee
This part of the thesis explains the participants that were interviewed during data collection process; ranging from community leaders, members of the community and government officials, where the interview itself took place at various neighbourhoods and government agencies. The three low income neighbourhoods chosen for this research are located in three different districts, namely: Mampang Prapatan, Cilandak Barat, and Jagakarsa (see Chapter 4). Meanwhile government officials interviewed in this research ranged from the highest tier; agencies from the Provincial level, Middle tier; agencies at the Municipality of South Jakarta, and lower tier; district and sub-district level.

The first group of interviewees consisted of government officials, where six government bodies/agencies were successfully interviewed. These bodies/agencies comprise one agency at provincial level (park and cemetary agency), one agency at municipal level (park agency) and five bodies/agencies at local level. Further details can be seen in Appendix C.
The second group of interviewees are community leaders, where 11 community leaders across three neighbourhoods were successfully interviewed. The community leaders interviewed come from different backgrounds and community organisations, such as RT/RW, KWT, Gapoktan, PKK, and UP Setu Babakan. Further details can be seen in Appendix C.

The last group of interviewees are members of the community involved in the green placemaking processes. More than 30 community members were observed during the implementation of the green initiative, with the observation conducted at various venues and activities, including *kerja bakti*, compost processing, crop harvesting, community meeting, government counselling, etc. Further details can be seen in Appendix C.

All of the data collected from the interviews was then processed and categorised according to the themes which have been set based on the research questions.

### 3.5 Summary

The philosophical paradigm that underlies this research leans towards the discourse of phenomenology in an effort to find reality/truth/knowledge within the realm of social science. Ontologically, the form of reality/truth/knowledge acquired in this research is based on the philosophical ideas of constructivism, where the theory suggests that humans create meaning and knowledge from their experiences. In addition, epistemologically in constructivism, the relationship between the investigator and the investigation is biased and opaque, where the sound and language of the investigator could unconsciously influence the course and outcome of the research. Nevertheless the objectivity and reality that is built through this paradigm are the result of mutual consensus and constructions. This includes the investigator’s constructions.

The methodology used in this research is qualitative research, where this type of research allows the researcher to examine the socio-spatial relation within the observed placemaking processes. A case study approach is also used in this research, with the aim to explore and understand the phenomenon of community-based green space in cities in developing countries. For this research, local community in three neighbourhoods in South Jakarta will be chosen as the case study.
The research drew upon semi-structured interviews with open ended questions, to allow the researcher to explore the richness of the data in a more in-depth manner. The selection of the participants for this research follows a purposive sampling strategy, where participants are either related or have experienced the phenomenon that is being studied. During the data collection process, 35 respondents have been interviewed from 19 April 2014 to 17 June 2014, and targeted three groups of interviewees, namely: (1) community leaders, (2) members of the community, and (3) government officials from three different neighbourhoods/urban kampungs.
CHAPTER 4: CASE STUDY – SOUTH JAKARTA

4.1 Introduction
As the capital city of the Republic of Indonesia, Jakarta has played a significant role in the country’s economy, politics, culture and history. According to the Tugu Inscription, the history of Jakarta dates back to the 8th century when it was under the Indianised kingdom of Tarumanagara that governs much of the western part of Java (Saidi 1997). In the 12th century, Jakarta was called Kalapa and during this period, the Port of Kalapa was created. This occurred when Jakarta was still under the Sundanese Kingdom of Padjajaran. The creation of Port Kalapa attracted many merchants and traders from around the world; Chinese, Arabs, Portuguese, Dutch and Malay came for spices and many other goods. This period also saw an influx of traders and merchants which created a vibrant and multicultural port and also marked the beginning of urbanisation and globalisation of Jakarta. In the year 1527, the port and city of Kalapa was seized by Prince Fatahillah from the neighbouring Islamic Sultanate, which later changed the name of the city into Jayakarta.

In 1619, the Dutch through its trading company Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie (VOC) or Dutch East India Company succeeded in defeating the newly established city of Jayakarta and also conquered the city of Banten from the Islamic Sultanate. The Dutch later changed the name of the city, from Jayakarta to Batavia, which then became the capital of the Dutch East-Indies. By 1799, Batavia was transferred from VOC to the Dutch Kingdom; this era saw a major development in the city’s landscape due to the fact that Batavia had become the center of the colonial government and administration. Major development had sprung outside the old city wall, with new residential areas developed in suburban Batavia, known as Weltevreden and Menteng which were exclusively made for the Europeans (Silver 2007).

After the independence of Indonesia in 1945, Jakarta was selected as the capital city of the newly formed republic. Indonesia’s first president Soekarno, which was known as the great modernist (Kusno 2000) had a massive agenda to transform Jakarta into a world class city, through city beautification and major urban development programs. During his term of presidency many infrastructure projects were carried out, starting from Central Business District (CBD) adjacent to the presidential palace, a National Monument, sports complex, and
the well known residential area of Kebayoran Baru, which was designed to house the middle and high income population of Jakarta (Winarso 2011).

As a capital city and centre for trade and commerce in Indonesia, Jakarta attracts both skilful and unskilful migrants from all round the archipelago hoping for jobs and better quality of living. In the 21st Century, Jakarta will play a significant and strategic role in the region due to its position as Diplomatic Capital of Association of South East Asian Nation (ASEAN) where currently the economic growth in many Asian and ASEAN countries increase progressively, compared to their counterparts in Western Europe and Northern America. Based on statistics published by the ASEAN Secretariat, in 2009 alone, approximately 20 international organizations spent around US$100 million in Jakarta and employed roughly 7,000 staff members, including 4,000 Indonesians. With the rising trend and growing numbers, the city will need extra capacity to cater to this growing population and supply the required space and services (Djonoputro 2011). This will increase Jakarta’s appeal as a regional hub to attract a new wave of migrants from different countries and continents.

4.2 Jakarta: The Megacity

According to Silver (2007), the discussion on megacity as a concept does not only revolve around the population threshold but also around the physical aspect and boundaries of urban areas. These areas are significantly influenced by the urbanisation process that extends the city boundaries to more than 75 to 100 kilometres from the urban core. The growth of megacity is typically a result of unplanned and uncontrolled urban development; this is usually characterised by environmental degradation, loss of agricultural lands and increased poverty in the city centre among others. This phenomenon is notably visible in the Asian region where high economic growth triggers rapid urbanisation due to people’s pursue of a better quality of living which in turn transforms small and medium cities into large or even megacities. Meanwhile, in the 1990s, five metropolitan regions in South East Asia were projected to be the next megacities of the future, namely Jakarta, Manila, Bangkok, Singapore and Kuala Lumpur (McGee 1991).

Jakarta along with its surrounding area known as Jabodetabek, which is an acronym for Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang and Bekasi is inhabited by more than 28 million people (Statistik 2010) with the population density of 4,500 people/km² that could reach up to 15,000
people/km² in the city centre. The large population and high urban density has placed Jakarta on the world map as one of the world’s prominent mega cities. Meanwhile, in terms of regional governance, Jabodetabek is under three different provincial governmental jurisdictions, namely Special Administrative Province of Jakarta, Province of West Java, and Province of Banten. This sometimes creates confusion among stakeholders when dealing with policy formulation and its implementation, as there are different jurisdictions with overlapping regulations to adhere to. The confusion is made more complex with the requirement to maintain the approval of the central government in Jabodetabek that may differ from these other jurisdictions.

![Image of Jabodetabek population map]

Figure 5 Population of Jabodetabek  

Jakarta’s major transformation into a modern city started in the mid-1970’s during the governorship of Mr. Ali Sadikin, when he successfully laid the foundation of modern Jakarta by transforming a decaying old colonial city surrounded with poor settlements (kampung) into a metropolis and highly regarded international city. He also introduced kampung improvement programmes to improve the built environment of the poor settlements in the city. Jakarta’s transformation into a modern megacity was due to the sacrifice of its urban dwellers. Faced
with high population and limited urban space, Jakarta is dealing with mounting urban problems that are extremely challenging for city planners and policymakers. Nowadays, the challenges that Jakarta is facing are markedly different with the ones faced 30 years ago. Rapid urbanisation, uncontrolled urban growth, lack of green space, urban heat island, and global warming are some of the pressing issues faced by this modern megacity.

4.3 Urban Kampung in Jakarta

Similar to other cities in the world, Jakarta is not immune to urban problems. One major problem that the cities in the Global South are facing is residential issues, especially of densely populated settlements with poor infrastructure. Kampung, which is a common feature in many Indonesian cities, is prominent in megacities like Jakarta. Kampung is synonymous with informal settlement and sometimes associated with slums although etimologically kampung refers to settlement in rural areas. In urban areas, due to city expansion these traditional settlements were absorbed and trapped in the growing urban setting and are transformed into “urban village”. Some of the urban villages in Jakarta still retain their rural characteristics, such as in the people’s way of living and very minimum availability of basic infrastructure (Winarso 2011, p.181). According to Winarso (2011) the general characteristics of kampung include lack of public facilities, small alleys or footpaths, limited clean water supply, poor management of solid waste and drainage.

As one of the components that make up Indonesia’s urban fabric, kampung still holds an important place for the everyday life of many Indonesians. This is due to the fact that although kampung has limited resources and infrastructure, it is still a favourite place for many urban dwellers to find affordable housing, especially for those with low income or work in the informal sector. That is why the presence of kampung is prevalent in Indonesian cities, and it will still dominate Indonesian urban landscape for many years to come.

4.4 Overview of the Case Study

In this research, three neighbourhoods have been chosen to represent the research sample. All the neighbourhoods are located in the municipality of South Jakarta (see figure 13) and are spread throughout three Districts, namely: Mampang Prapatan, Cilandak and Jagakarsa. The selection of three neighbourhoods is to show the diversity of livelihood in each kampung and the different approaches towards green initiatives in their settlement.
Figure 6 Map of Special Capital Region of Jakarta
4.4.1 District of Mampang Prapatan

The first case study of this research is located in the District of Mampang Prapatan in the Municipality of South Jakarta, Special Administrative Province of Jakarta. There are three neighbourhood units or *Rukun Tetangga / RT* (harmonious neighbourhood) chosen for this
area, namely RT 007, RT 008 and RT 011. These neighbourhoods or kampungs are located near Jakarta’s CBD or known as the Jakarta’s Golden Triangle (*Segitiga Emas*), which incorporates Thamrin, Sudirman and Kuningan and is accessible via Jakarta Inner Ring Road. This close proximity creates opportunity for homeowners in this part of the city, where they could lease their empty rooms to people working in the CBD. However, this phenomenon also creates problems for the neighbourhood where the homeowners would sacrifice the existing green space in their house to give way to more dense and profitable rent houses.

Migrants from other regions of Indonesia dominate the neighbourhoods, such as Javanese and the Minang ethnic groups. This reduces the population of the indigenous people of Jakarta called Betawi to approximately 30% of the neighbourhoods’ population. The majority of people living in this neighbourhood are working in informal sectors, although there are several members of the community that work in the public sector. Meanwhile, the built environment in the neighbourhood is dominated with small alleyways, open drainage, poor air circulation, and limited green and public space.

![Figure 8 Kampung in the District of Mampang Prapatan](source: www.googlemaps.com, 2014.)
4.4.2 District of Cilandak

The second case study selected for this research is located in the district of Cilandak, in the Municipality of South Jakarta, Special Administrative Province of Jakarta. For the purpose of this research, three neighbourhoods or Rukun Warga / RW (harmonious citizen) is chosen; those neighbourhoods are RW 02, RW 03 and RW 08, which are located in proximity to each other. The Jakarta Outer Ring Road (JORR) runs through Cilandak Distrik and the newly constructed Corridor 1 of Jakarta’s Mass Rapid Transportation (MRT). The area along JORR is planned to be Jakarta’s new business district in the southern part of the city alongside two other CBDs which are located in the eastern and western part of the city. Currently many offices, apartments and other high-rise buildings have sprung up along the JORR toll road, which increased demand for land and caused a surge in land prices.

Just like the kampungs in Mampang Prapatan, kampungs in Cilandak are also dominated by migrants from other parts of the archipelago, where the proportion of the migrants and locals in Cilandak Barat is slightly closer; approximately 50% of the population identify themselves as Betawi. The condition of the built environment inside kampungs in Cilandak is much better compared to kampungs in Mampang Prapatan, where the houses are quite well-organised and have wider road access. Meanwhile, there are also issues of green space in the neighbourhoods. Due to the increased demand for land, much vacant land has been converted into built up spaces.
4.4.3 District of Jagakarsa

The third case study is located in the district of Jagakarsa, in the Municipality of South Jakarta, Special Administrative Province of Jakarta and was focused on neighbourhoods located in the Betawi Cultural Village / BCV (Perkampungan Budaya Betawi). In the year 2000, the provincial government of Jakarta, designated BCV as the preservation area for Betawi culture and tradition, which includes protection of their traditional houses and the built environment. BCV is situated in the southernmost part of Jakarta, close to the border of West Java province. Currently, the central government has been planning to build a second Jakarta Outer Ring Road in the southern part of the site which aims to reduce traffic congestion at the Inner and Outer Ring Roads, but at the same time this plan will increase land demand for built up spaces in the
area that could threat the existence of BCV as a sanctuary for Betawi people’s culture and way of living.

The BCV residence is dominated by the Betawis, who make up 80% of the population. The built environment at BCV is dominated by low-density housing, which mostly consist of 1-2 floor houses and arranged in organic patterns. The sites also feature two lakes that function as important landmarks, both for environmental purposes to prevent flood from reaching Jakarta and as a landmark to identify the area.

Figure 12 Kampung in the District of Jagakarsa

Figure 13 Built Environment in the District of Jagakarsa
source: Personal Collection, 2014.
4.5 Summary

As an important global city in the region, Jakarta is dealing with numerous urban problems, one of which is the presence of kampungs, being a type of traditional settlement absorbed and trapped in an urban setting. Due to competition with major urban development, most kampungs in Jakarta are experiencing intense pressure caused by rapid urban growth, which places them in a difficult position. Increase of land price, inward migration, land shortage, eviction and diminishing green spaces are some major issues faced by kampungs in modern Jakarta.

The selection of the three case studies in this research is based on the proximity of the sites to major infrastructure project, such as toll road, public transportation and business district which will later influence and shape the form of the kampungs. Moreover, another reason in choosing the case studies is also because of the green initiatives in the kampungs, which are most likely a response from the community to the lack of green space access in their neighbourhood.
CHAPTER 5: DEFINING GREEN SPACE IN A GLOBAL SOUTH CONTEXT

5.1 Introduction
For urban kampung residents, open green space poses diverse meanings and significance, practical and symbolic; material and meaning. These elements shape, and are in turn shaped by, the ways that green space is designed, curated and utilised as well as by the benefits it brings to the different residents and visitors. By analysing primary data, this chapter explains the meaning of green space through the eyes of the community living in the selected urban kampung case study locations in Jakarta.

The meanings and significance of green space for urban kampung dwellers have temporal and spatial as well as cultural and economic characteristics. Temporally, these places have been part of the urban fabric in many Indonesian cities for generations, and their presence may predate the formal city as when a village becomes absorbed by urban development (Dovey & King 2011). Over time, the multiple meanings of green space can be expected to have changed and so this study provides a snapshot of generations of dynamic urban processes. Economically, kampung as a dominant type of settlement in Jakarta provides much needed affordable housing for urban dwellers. The morphology of urban kampung is recognisable from its distinct characteristic where large numbers of dwellings are built from makeshift materials, typically incrementally, starting from a very simple unit which later develops into a permanent house (Silas 1992). Thus, the spatial morphology of urban kampung is the result of economic and social structures, and it is in this context that green space is maintained or abandoned around the built form of the kampung.

Spatially, complex relations govern private and public spaces in urban kampung. Nevertheless, as a cohesive unit, the urban kampung serves as a safe haven for the often-marginalised urban community. The neighbourhood operates as a micro-ecosystem that supports their daily livelihood, and this leads to a strong sense of belonging among kampung dwellers. Unsurprisingly, as in all human cultures, there are both symbolic and material dimensions to the ways in which residents create and re-create green spaces, and in this process memory plays a role.
Through analysis of the interview data, key themes emerged as described in chapter 3. These themes provide the range of meanings of green space across the urban kampung studied. These key themes are presented here as sections in this chapter, namely; image identity and memories (Section 5.2); food security (Section 5.3); interaction space (section 5.4); and health and well-being (Section 5.5).

Under each section or theme, key findings are presented from the data. These findings are then subject to sense-making (Dervin, 1998; 1992; Klein, Moon, & Hoffman, 2006a, 2006b). Intersections, accordances and divergences with existing work are drawn as observations which the findings extend from previous work in understanding and defining meanings of green space in a Global South context, which in this case is the selected urban kampung in Jakarta.

5.2 Image, Identity and Memory
The existence of green space in urban kampung cannot be separated from the role that is played by human memory in the placemaking process, where individual and collective memories are significant tools in the creation of place identity and character of urban space (Rose-Redwood et al. 2008). Their significance in the placemaking process is highly contested within the social research realm, however there are few studies in the Global South context that discuss this phenomenon. In this subchapter, the relationship between human memory and urban space in the Global South context will be unpacked through the investigation of community-based green space in urban kampung.

5.2.1 Findings – Image, Identity and Memory
Image, identity and memory in the green placemaking process provide key motives amongst members of the community in recreating their ideal dwellings and spaces. Examples from community members in Mampang Prapatan shows how they have successfully created images for their settlement, such as when they designed greenery in urban kampung to make their living conditions more liveable, thus creating a sense of warmth and homeliness not only to the kampung dwellers but also to visitors and passers-by who happen to walk past the area.

“The trees and flower pots make home more welcoming and comfortable...[M4]”
Still from the same area, Mampang Prapatan where members of the community worked to re-image green space in their dwellings to produce a village-like ambience which is surrounded by lush greenery with abundant fresh air. Many community members that come from the villages have a vivid recollection of their past or childhood memory, where they want to bring back the concept and idea of greenery that they were familiar with to their current dwellings.

“So that we can breathe fresh air, and it will remind us of the village in our hometown…[L1]”

Meanwhile, the case from Cilandak shows that the community applies greenery in their dwelling as a beautification strategy in order to distance themselves from the rundown image that urban kampung is mostly associated with.

“More for the beauty of the neighbourhood, to decorate my house to make it look beautiful, serene and sociable [M12]”

In addition, the presence of green space in urban kampung helps to create a cosy and pleasant feeling for the kampung dwellers. Having a positive image of their dwellings is central to their lifestyle, given the situation of their accommodation which is cramped and densely populated.

“I have lived here for more than 36 years, so I feel that home is here…and because I live here, I have a responsibility towards the community…[L4]”

The existence of green space in urban kampung can also be interpreted as a way for the particular area to create its own identity. This is done by displaying a visually recognizable identifier which places the kampung as distinct from others. This is similar to the case of Mampang Prapatan where urban greenery helps its dwellers to differentiate their kampung from other surrounding kampungs, and marks its identity as an urban kampung which retains its village atmosphere.

“I want to create an atmosphere just like in my village, because Jakarta is crowded with building structures and high rise buildings…[M1]”

Furthermore, the green space attached to one of the kampung in Mampang Prapatan has created an additional identity to their area, where it is known as an urban green oasis. This
inherent identity is the result of a green design initiative that is carefully planned and implemented by the community members, so that their kampung could become a green oasis amidst large urban development.

“It looks fresh on the eyes too…nice to wake up and see some greenery. It is nicer here because you can still see some green. In other places, you can only see the walls surrounding you...[M7]”

Urban kampung as an embodiment of urban minorities has had a reputation as a safe haven for people with marginalised background, whether by race, culture, language, religion, sexual preference or even in terms of economic context. This reputation has attracted many migrants from the hinterland to seek refuge and shelter during their stay in the city, which eventually helps to redefine the identity of urban kampung as a multicultural hotspot in a complex and harsh urban setting. Their instinct as a migrant in an unknown and foreign land is to create a community based on common adversity, where they can freely communicate and share stories and experiences with an aim to establish a home away from home with the help and support of their new social network.

“Now there have been a lot of migrants coming to the neighbourhood which makes it easier to communicate and cooperate with each other. This is due to our common goal which is to create a home away from home...[M1]”

In addition, the urban greenery can also be used as an identity to represent the neighbourhood. This example can be seen in RW 03, Cilandak where the community has selected dragon fruit as the neighbourhood’s iconic plant. They hope when people see dragon fruit they will remember their neighbourhood, which eventually will boost the profile of their kampung.

“...The residents here had the idea to change the crops planted by the Women Farmers’ Group with dragon fruit, and our dream is to iconise the fruit at RW 03, and we already started the initiative from our neighbourhood...[L6]”

A pervasive, consistent theme arising from the interviews was that aspects of the green space reflected a sense of home, whether that is a childhood/original rural home or a long-held aesthetic of the kampung’s identity. Green space contributes character to the neighbourhood and also serves a nostalgic function. Memory plays an essential part in shaping kampung green space; through memory, green spaces are created, constructed and modelled. This includes childhood memories which are often the inspiration for green initiatives. The
examples below show that many of the kampung dwellers try to imitate the natural atmosphere that they once experienced in the village and recreate them in their current neighbourhoods:

“Well, this is our neighbourhood. We only have that much of a garden, and we have to take care of it. It makes it nicer just like up in the mountains… like in Jogja in the villages, there are a lot of trees, not so many houses. That’s what I was going for…[M3]”

Childhood experiences were significant in accounts of contemporary green practices. Having been brought up in a family that cares for the environment, one participant described how this shaped her views and practices in addressing environmental issues:

“During the Dutch era, my father worked as agriculture and farming instructor for the Dutch government in the city of Solo, Central Java. Since I was born, raised and educated in a family that is very concerned with environmental issues, automatically I feel that I am one with nature, and I regard plants and animals as my best friends…[L5]”

This example exhibits the manner in which a family, as an institution, forms the character and identity of children as people that are aware of the living surrounding. The daily practices conducted by parents create a learning environment for children to observe, imitate and in turn adopt the behaviour as adults. Due to the behaviour being so internalized, in the example is that of being aware of environmental issues, it makes up the person and in turn forms his or her identity.

5.2.2 Discussion of findings – Image, Identity and Memories

Identity is one of the important tools in creating an image, thus through identity, a place can instantly be recognised and can also be made distinct from other places. This will ultimately decide how a place will be remembered by the observer (Lynch 1960). At RW 003 Cilandak, identity is being reproduced and created by members of the community through various explicit means, one of which is through having an iconic plant that could represent the neighbourhood. The plant does not just symbolise the place identity but is also expected to bring economic and environmental benefits for them. The creation of identity in their neighbourhood helps to create a sense of attachment between the dwellers and their neighbourhood. This accords with Lilburne (1989) on the relation between the environment and sense of place, where he asserted that the care for the environment can be reactivated by reviving sense(s) of place; in creating an attachment to a place, the residents seek to keep and
preserve the quality of their neighbourhood. Lilburne’s finding is supported by more recent researches (Sousa 2003; Arnberger & Eder 2012; Kimpton et al. 2014; and Buta et al. 2014), which observed the same phenomenon as Lilburne did, that is the sense of attachment by having a patch of nature or green space in the neighbourhood. Green kampung is the embodiment of community attachment to a place in manifesting their ideas, visions and memories of what a place “should” be and how they want it to be created. Creating identity through green space strengthens the relations between residents and their neighbourhood, which in turn creates senses of belonging and attachment to the place, and reinforces collective memories among members of the community. Green kampung case study in South Jakarta provides insight in how green space in low income settlement in the Global South context creates a sense of attachment and togetherness for marginalised members of communities from rural backgrounds who try to assimilate into the larger urban society.

In interpreting the role of memory in shaping the urban kampung, the starting point is the relation between memory and urban space, including the dynamics of relation referred to as “urban memory” by Crinson (2005). The concept is supported in the findings in this study. Srinivas (2001, p.25) describes urban memory as a “means of accessing how various strata of society and different communities construct the metropolitan world”. Social-ecological memory, coined by Barthel et al. (2013, p.5) provides “the combined means by which knowledge, experience and practice of ecosystem management are captured, stored, revived and transmitted through time”.

The role that memory plays in shaping green space in urban kampung is highly influential in shaping both meaning and material making of the green space. This supports findings elsewhere by various studies and scholars which suggested the role that memory plays in shaping urban space (Boyer 1994; Ladd 1997; Crang & Travlou 2001; Srinivas 2001; Andreas 2003; Crinson 2005; Legg 2005; Till 2005; Jordan 2006). In the case of urban green space, based on observation on several urban kampungs in Jakarta, the findings imply that childhood and hometown memories are an important and crucial factor that enables the creation of green space in the first place. Some members of the community try to re-create green space in their neighbourhood to resemble their former space, solely based on their memory. This is in line with Rose-Redwood et al. (2008, p.161), where he asserted that “memories ultimately made visible on the landscape do not simply emerge out of thin air, but
rather they result directly from people’s commemorative decisions and actions as embedded within and constrained by particular socio-spatial conditions”.

Memory is one of the instrumental building blocks in the process of community green space, and with vivid recollection of the past, the community try to re-enact and revive the old memories within compact, urban and modern time settings. Yet, the notion of memory-based space creation has been challenged by various scholars. Lowenthal (1998) in his book titled “The Heritage Crusade and The Spoils of History” warned the danger of being obsessed by the past, although memory can be beneficial and important when it is implemented in the right time and place. David Gross challenges the role of memory by questioning the rationale of holding up memories as the basis for action, where he argued that “always available to anyone at any time is the freedom not only to remember in a manner unlike most other people but also to remember other and different things that are encouraged by conventional norms” (Gross 2000, p.134). Furthermore, the discourse on memory and space has been critiqued as embodying colonialist influences in its narrative, therefore depriving precolonial memory in counter historical ways (Behdad 1994, p.8).

Undoubtedly the role of memory in the urban kampung is neither entirely progressive nor faithful to the past. However, the accounts in 5.2 indicate direct links between memory and manifestation in design and utilisation of green space. Moreover, research on identity and memory-based space in the Global South context is rare and along with place theory more broadly, theory and empirical work is mostly rooted in cities in the developed world. The contribution of this research on urban kampung is all the more important given that it is rooted in the creation of public space in the developing world, where much of the world’s urban growth is taking place now and will continue to take place throughout the 21st Century. Contemporary concepts of public space as we know today were formalised in the early 20th century, deriving from the field of urban design with cases from cities in the US and Europe (Carr et al. 1992).

The First World “models” of public space was then duplicated in many parts of the world including the Global South, where the concept has been accepted largely without criticism and at least to some extent without acknowledging the diversity and uniqueness of each place. Thus, in post-colonial theory, a dichotomy is presented between First World “models” and Third World “models” (Roy 2005). One aspect that is pertinent is the role of informality
which, according to Roy (2011, p.233) is “synonymous with poverty and marginality” and has been the dominant mode of livelihood among the poor in the Global South (Davis 2003). The role of memory-based space as a driving force in the creation of public green space is also contingent on the informality of space in urban kampung, due to their nature as the initiator and part of an important building block in reshaping and creating sense of identity for their neighbourhood.

5.3 Green Kampung as sources of food security

Green space in urban kampung is used to grow food and medicinal products, and this emerged as a significant activity and source of engagement in the study. The utilization of green space to support urban food security is characteristic in many cities, both historically and contemporarily. For example, this practice was prominent in the early 20th century during food shortage crises caused by massive international trade blockages, which affected millions of people (Barthel et al. 2013). Community-based urban farming has also been practised in a variety of contexts in order to ensure food security in the neighbourhood. More recently, radical social movements have also sought to reclaim the urban space and to “green” the city through guerrilla gardening (Mckay 2011). The next subsection presents findings on the ways in which research participants accessed and protected their land to provide basic food and medicinal materials for the community. Moreover, the following subsection analyses these findings and reflects upon the social implications this placemaking practice has on the community.

5.3.1 Findings – Green Kampung as sources of food security

Members of the urban kampung community who cares for urban greenery and sustainable food production have initiated community-based food-crop production in their neighbourhood. For example, in the Mampang Prapatan district, a clear and socially significant connection exists between the Family Welfare Movement (PKK) and the local “green neighbourhood” initiative. This is linked to the broader goals of the PKK as a nationwide female-oriented organisation. It has a national programme focusing on the utilization of backyards (pemanfaatan tanah pekarangan) or available common open space in the neighbourhood for conversion into productive green space such as medicinal herbs (apotek hidup), urban farming (lumbung hidup) and green convenient shop (warung hidup).
In Mampang Prapatan, many members apparently preferred to plant fruit trees as these plants produce food and are easy to nurture and have great longevity:

“The community prefers fruit-producing trees...[G2]”

Another group of consumable plants that are widespread in urban kampung are medicinal gardens known as Family Medicinal Garden (TOGA). This type of garden is in the form of small patches of greenery dedicated to growing plants with medicinal properties, such as turmeric, betel nut, ginger, galangal, many of which are also widely used in Indonesian cooking:

“There are many benefits to keeping greenery; it helps to reduce pollution and provide cleaner air and produce fruits from the trees such as guava fruit. The greenery also provides medicinal benefit through TOGA where every plant has a healing purpose, such as turmeric, betel, ginger and galangal...[M1]”

In the district of Cilandak, an emphasis on medicinal plants was also present, albeit enabled through varying initiatives. Indeed, the study reveals that community-based food security initiatives come in various forms and shapes and, moreover, each neighbourhood has their ways of defining and interpreting green space in their neighbourhood. In RW 008, much of the greenery was apparently a result of the sustained dedication of one prominent local female figure, who had been advocating and leading communal food projects since the early 1990’s. As she recounted in the study, her persistent advocacy for green conservation was frequently met with rejection and resentment in the early years, but today these efforts have led to wider acceptance and engagement, and even numerous appreciations both from the Indonesian government and international agencies. Nowadays, the edible plants that can be found in RW 008 are in the form of various medicinal herbs planted along the street and alleyways, where they are accessible for members of the community to harvest and co-manage. This use of public land as an addition or alternative to private backyards has profound implications that include but also extend beyond the obvious increased land capacity and equity dimensions of local food security. This public display and effort also has implications for both the visual urban landscape experience, and for governance, ownership and identity at the street level.
Another neighbourhood (RW 003) in the district of Cilandak, has developed a different approach towards food security. Their approach is to plant an iconic fruit that has various functions and benefits, namely the dragon fruit. The purpose of having an iconic plant is not solely for conservation, but also for economic and health reasons, because dragon fruit is regarded as having numerous health and nutritional benefits. Also there is a high local demand for dragon fruit. In addition, the presence of this distinct commodity is intended to give a sense of identity to the local streetscape. This illustrates once again the co-benefit intention; in addition to food, the community express the sought image and branding for their neighbourhood and dragon fruit is seen as a means to bring short-term economic benefit, while at the same time they want to be recognised as a producer of dragon fruit as a positive, long-term contribution to community identity.

“The reason we chose dragon fruit; it started firstly when we read magazines and newspapers showing the benefits of dragon fruit. Secondly, the price of dragon fruit is still relatively high, and the plant can live up to 10 years, and most importantly is that it is easy to maintain. After discussing the benefits of dragon fruit with the whole community, we then proposed it to the Head of RW and he agreed with it, and then we proposed it to the Head of Lurah, he also agreed with the idea, afterwards we decided to find financial sponsor for the initiative. Then Mrs. Eti heard about our idea, and she suggested us to make a proposal to the government, and she asked how our progress so far with the greenery is...[L7]”

The other district of Cilandak included in this study is RW 002. Here, green initiatives are strongly advocated by the community leaders, who are also actively involved in PKK and Farmers’ Group (GAPOKTAN). In this neighbourhood, urban farming utilises private land borrowed from one member of the community who allowed her land and property to be used. The community worked together, hand in hand in all aspects of the farming, such as sourcing the seeds for the community garden, usually from the government, and experimenting with land cultivation, including learning from other neighbourhoods such as RW 008. They have
also sought ways to sell the vegetable produce from the garden, although most of the vegetable produce is used to supply the needs of those involved and their families.

Urban farming thus provides additional nutritional intakes to the community and helps the households in reducing their food expenditure. A suitable illustration of this benefit is in the community’s consumption of chilli and sambal (chilli paste). The relationship between chili, sambal and Indonesian culinary practice has intertwined for hundreds of years, and these ingredients hold an important position as the most sought after food condiment by many Indonesian households. Due to the people's high consumption, chilli is considered to be a commodity that can even contribute to the inflation in Indonesian; demand is so high and inelastic that price fluctuations affect the macroeconomy, including the micro-economy of households, especially those on low incomes. Hence, the production of chilli in urban kampung farming initiatives significantly helps in reducing the family expenditure for chilli, which can reach up to IDR 5,000 (€50) every day.

“We usually spend IDR 5,000 for sambal, but since we can get the ingredients from the garden, we don’t have to buy anymore. During harvest time, we can harvest corn and cucumber as well...[M12]”

The study also revealed tangible monetary benefits to the community through sale of produce. Farmer’s group associations produce and market saleable commodities, in addition to their household needs. This allows them to gain extra income and offset daily shopping expenditure.

“Some members of farmers group have opened up businesses selling potato and cassava chips with the raw material sourced from the garden. The vegetable produced in the garden is later on processed, and the profit is kept in the treasury, aside from these two crops, we also have readily available ginger...[L4]”

The above example exhibits a form of open green space in urban kampung where users cultivate produce which in turn will increase the people’s livelihood. Moreover, urban agriculture practiced by the people will lessen their dependency on commercial food which allows them to save from the expenses that are not being spent, and help the community attain food security in the long run.
5.3.2 Discussion of findings – Green Kampung as sources of food security

Green urban kampung in this study variously illustrates attempts to develop and ensure food security through edible/medicinal crop cultivation. The plants grown in the neighbourhood are selected based on a variety of factors namely people’s level of skills in gardening, negotiated understanding of the community’s needs, and land availability. Both public and privately-owned land parcels were exploited with the utilisation of private ownership as subject to consent and approval from the owner.

Access to open public green space in urban kampung is limited, and private land is also sought and used where possible. Similar constraints and practices were observed by Holmer (2011), in research in Caragan de Oyo, in the Philippines, which found that most of the allotment gardens were established on private land due to limited open public space. One way the community overcame land issues, was through establishing a lease contract with the land owner to ensure security of tenure for the gardeners, in an Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD) approach (Holmer 2011). Similar land contract initiatives were discussed in the urban kampungs in this study. However, enforceable contracts are yet to be in place; leaving potential vulnerability over people’s access to the land as the owners can revoke access to the land at anytime.

Local food production helps the kampung dwellers reduce daily food expenditure and meet health/nutritional needs. The practice of growing chillies, medicinal food and dragon fruit is a response to the financial difficulties that low income households face to help supplement nutritional needs. This is a common practice in areas where a large proportion of the local community is on very low income, and parallels can also be found in developed nations, such as in disadvantaged Latino communities in the US suffering from extremely high levels of child obesity and poor nutrition (Chen 2006, cited in Birch & Wachter 2008). The ability of local groups to negotiate social and legal rules, such as access to suitable land is critical in such cases; along with access to materials (seeds, equipment), and knowledge (growing strategies, seasons, seed types).

In addition, the practice of food growing has direct potential economic benefits. For some members of the urban kampung community, urban agriculture provides them with an additional income generated from the profit of selling the yields that are harvested from their neighbourhood. This finding accords with Nugent’s (2000) research in the developing world.
It was found that low income communities undertaking urban agriculture obtained not just nutrition but also additional income. Numerous cases from several cities in Africa shows that the income earned from urban agriculture benefits the urban farmers and contributes significantly to the livelihood of households, which in turn raise their standard of living higher than non-farming neighbourhoods (ENDA-Zimbabwe 1996). This indicates that urban agriculture has the potential and capability to alleviate poverty.

While the literature on self-provisioning dimensions of local urban food amongst the urban poor is reasonably consistent, there are two areas of discernible controversy; one around the access to land and the other around the relative merits of local food production. As indicated above, in the rapid urbanisation context, land is at a premium, thus constricting the access to green space for food production. Planning policies and pro-modern urban land development practices often favour built development and clean lines of concrete and glass. In this context, vestiges of rural life as indicated through corners and pockets of food production are unlikely to be tolerated (Morgan 2009). The idea that urban food is valuable as a means to promote poverty alleviation therefore potentially contradicts such notions of modern city.

Furthermore, some critics argue that by promoting local food production, benefits are limited to the locality (Morgan et al. 2006), and in some cases, the food that they produce in the neighbourhood may not be as sustainable as imported food (Born & Purcell 2006). These raise valid questions about the observations in the urban kampung for this study. On the point of locally limited benefits, two empirical findings reveal a different story. Firstly, evidence of economic participation suggests that food produced locally is finding its way into the broader food provisioning economy of Jakarta. For example, dragon fruit farming on vacant spaces profits from their yield and indicates the demand for locally grown fruits in the wider urban economy; the local dragon fruit was in fact substituting the fruit that is mostly imported from other countries.

Secondly, in Mampang Prapatan the local community used the existing green space as a showcase for other communities to observe and learn how they created and maintained urban food production. Hence, they also provided assistance for other communities to start-up initiatives. These two observations highlight the fact that urban food production processes are connected beyond the local community. It is true, of course, that locality does not imply environmental sustainability. Imported dragon fruit have higher food miles, but they may use
lower impact farming methods and this is outside the scope of this study. However, what is apparent is that broader sustainability measures such as community self-reliance and cohesion may outweigh any sustainability concerns about local food production in this context.

This observation leads to a more general discussion concerning the imbrication of food self-provisioning in urban kampung with broader social benefits. The deep inquiry undertaken here using observational techniques accompanied with semi-structured interviews extends beyond much of the research on urban food production that is focused on economic or environmental dimensions of self-provisioning, and allows for new insights to be made about the bundling of broader social and economic benefits of food security practices in urban kampung. The creation of edible gardens as a form of green space in urban kampung plays a significant role in the everyday life of the community. In relation to the notion of placemaking in urban agriculture, the creation of each particular space was variously motivated, with food security being a stated reason for the collective endeavour, and where the process of space transformation to edible garden did not focus on the dominant design and aesthetics of the growing city but instead upon the needs of food security for the low income. Moreover, although not the stated intention, in practice, the shaping of each particular space in turn shaped the social discourse through relationships and common endeavours. In each case, social discourse reflected the uniqueness and character of each place, regardless of the activity, or the shape and form of the area or even the image that the space conjured for the participants (Carmona & Punter 2013). The presence of urban agriculture empowers the community through food provision, and at least potentially enhances their nutrition intake. This tangible bundle of benefits sits in line with urban poverty reduction and food insecurity reduction programmes (see Miura et al. 2003; Zezza & Tasciotti 2010; Holmer 2011). However, in addition, it produces and reproduces social transformation possibilities.

These broader social benefits associated with urban agriculture are a feature of recent research in western urban contexts, where the debate has shifted from subsistence to sustainability, and to improving the quality of urban life in a broader social context. A milieu of issues are at play, including concerns about processed or distantly produced foods; concerns about large multi-national agricultural industries and a system of production that ostensibly ensures the availability and accessibility of food all year round but neglects the
merit of seasonality, flavour and quality; concerns about the individualised, impersonal retail environment of food purchasing, and invisibility of food chains, and a perceived need for local social interaction around engagement with more direct food provisioning chains through urban DIY (see Birch & Wachter 2008; Nordahl 2009; Morgan & Sonnino 2010; Mckay 2011). However, such debates are less well developed in the equivalent literature concerning urban food provisioning in the Global South contexts. The evidence from this study points towards a similar range of multiple co-benefits for urban kampung.

The creation of urban agriculture in urban kampung is part of the broad set of city design processes. Fran Tonkiss defined this design process as “social practices and processes that shape spatial forms, relationships and outcomes in intentional as well as in less intended ways” (Tonkiss 2014, p.5). In turn, design shapes and is in turn shaped by the material city, but also policy, legal and economic, and of course social interactions. This research is built upon the arguments that urban agriculture that is created in urban kampung is built based on community consensus processes that involve the participation of all stakeholders in every aspect of the design process, which is in line with Tonkin’s idea of design; holistic and comprehensive approach between space and social units. In addition, Kevin Lynch asserted that design process as “the interrelation between urban forms and human objectives” (Lynch & Rodwin 1958, p.201), where green space developed in urban kampung considered the shape of the settlement that is notorious for its small alleyways and limited open space, which in itself creates a huge challenge for the overcrowded settlements faced by mounting social and economic pressure. Nevertheless, all elements of the community strive to shape their neighbourhood into a better living space and they successfully achieve their objectives. These examples add to the understanding on creating green urban form through participatory involvement.

5.4 Interaction Space
Green space in urban kampung discursively has a positive impact on the community’s social life. Aside from the “greenery” purpose, its presence also functions as an interaction space between community members. Moreover, initiatives conducted in and around the green space can bring residents together, providing social cohesion. This in turn contributes to the production of social space between community members engaging in the space, which is
based on the societal relations that are supported by a homogeneous socio-economic background that ties the community together (Lefebvre 1991).

5.4.1 Findings – Interaction space
The presence of green space in urban kampung brings significant impact to the community’s social life. This is because green space invariably serves as a social space; much of the neighbourhood’s community social interaction happens in this place. Based on observations from the kampung, green space develops and nurtures cohesion and inclusiveness among particular members of the community, through various “green” activities, ranging from the initiation of the green initiatives through implementation and maintenance of the green space. Interaction around each stage promotes empathy, shared purpose and values, and a collective outlook. These activities bring the community closer while at the same time promoting a sense of familiarity among the members.

“It can also be for social purpose, because the activities like voluntary work creates harmony among the people and make them know each other...[L2]”

Due to space constraints in urban kampung, many private house owners allow their property to be utilized as public green space, which allows the neighbourhood’s community members to access their backyard freely. One example in the district of Mampang Prapatan shows how one member of the community voluntarily allows her backyard to be accessed and enjoyed by other community members. She created a green space that is accessible to everyone with a welcoming environment where everyone who visits her backyard will feel accepted. She also planted hedgerows along her property instead of building a high fence from concrete. This is to ensure that passersbys can still enjoy the green space and prevented isolation from the rest of the neighbourhood.

“I don’t want to put up a fence. My parents told me if I put up a fence it can’t be higher than people’s average height. That means secluding one’s self from the neighbours; nobody will know if something bad ever happens to me. So I replace the fence with trees, and I trim it every week...[M1]”

Furthermore, the independently provided green space does not merely serve as an open space but also as an important function to strengthen social cohesion and engage the property owner with the rest of the community. An example from the case study shows that privately-owned
green space is turned into a makeshift playground every afternoon to accommodate the severe lack of play space for children in urban kampung, where in this space the children can play freely with their friends under the supervision of their parents. This phenomenon revealed how physical space can be used as a medium by the land owner to communicate and interact with other community members and create a social space through community networking. In addition, the owner will feel secure knowing that the neighbours are looking after them and their property, and in return the neighbours can use the space freely.

“There’s no open space here, and children need playground.....as long as I’m good to my neighbours, they will be good to me too...[M1]”

In addition, the existence of green space in urban kampung provides a communal gathering space, which enables community members to spend time together and catch up with the latest news happening in the community. An example of it was found in the district of Cilandak, where members of the community, which are affiliated with the PKK and are involved in the urban farming initiative, often use gardening time as an opportunity to socialize and provide informative updates on the community and various PKK activities. This is mostly because many PKK members are pre-occupied with their daily routinity and green activity serves as an opportunity for them to stay connected and maintain their social network.

“But for us, we love the activity since we can enjoy the time together; we rarely have the opportunity to do that …[M9]”

This gathering space is both physical and social in character. The case study in Cilandak shows how community cohesion allowed them to work together to choose one particular plant that could benefit the collective in many ways. The example of dragon fruit displays how the community interacts to reach a consensus by having collective discussions.

“The reason we chose dragon fruit; it started firstly when we read magazines and newspapers showing the benefits of dragon fruit. Secondly, the price of dragon fruit is still relatively high, and the plant can live up to 10 years, and most importantly is that it is easy to maintain. After discussing the benefits of dragon fruit with the whole community, we then proposed it to the Head of RW and he agreed with it...[L6]”
This example shows that any decisions made in regard to the use of open green space in urban kampung require the consent and mutual agreement of its members. Maintaining such order will create a sense of belonging among the members, which in turn will strengthen the bond and increase the urge to resolve together the many issues that this programme comes to face in the future.

5.4.2 Discussion of findings – Interaction space

The observation that public green space facilitates social interaction is not new; for example, William H. Whyte (1980) explored the role of urban space in the community’s social life in his book titled “The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces”. Green space serves as a community interaction space, which allows members of the community the opportunity to interact and to know each other much better. The discourse of neighbourhood green space as a social interaction space was firstly raised by a renowned urban scholar Jacobs (1969) using cities in the Global North as the context in explaining the phenomenon. Likewise the benefits of open green space as an interaction and socialization space raised in Jacob’s study confirms the findings from Yuen (1996) in Singapore, a growing urban metropolis in a developing region. According to her research, the majority of the neighbourhood residents that she interviewed were convinced that “neighbourhood green space provides a convenient place for social contact and interaction” (Yuen 1996, p.304), and the space acts as a stimulus that triggers numerous social activities to be carried out, such as meeting and chatting with friends, “people-watching”, housewives gathering and sharing their cooking recipes, place for the elderly to watch the world go by, and for family members to be outside of their small house.

Furthermore, the discourse on social interaction space in the context of the Global South also accords with findings by Oranratmanee & Sachakul (2014) on public spaces in Southeast Asia focusing on cities in Thailand, where he asserts that the characteristics of public space in
Asian countries are markedly different from the western world. Public space in Southeast Asian countries is utilized for multiple functions with social and economic aspects being the major reason, which eventually changes the meaning of public space from a dull space to an active and lively urban space (Oranratmanee & Sachakul 2014). This notion of a lively and vibrant public space in Southeast Asia is closely related to the use of the space. Unlike public spaces in western cities, Daniere & Douglass (2008) argued that the nature of public space in most Southeast Asian countries is informal, spontaneous and more intensive in terms of its space usage. The activities carried out in a Southeast Asian public space are mostly influenced by two important aspects; the society and climate. In terms of the society’s characteristics, much of the Southeast Asian communities still retain their agricultural basis, where social, cultural and economic aspects of their lives are intertwined. In addition, the hot and humid climate of Southeast Asia coupled with the society’s strong kinship create a public space that is inclusive, relaxed and adaptive to changes, which makes it suitable as a social interaction space (Oranratmanee 2012; Oranratmanee & Sachakul 2014).

The existence of urban greenery as a social interaction space in urban kampung cannot be separated from the discussion on public space, as it provides the stage for urban greenery to exist amidst the density and overcrowding of urban kampung. Meanwhile the notion of public space in the realm of urban design is closely related with the discussion on the theoretical object of the knowledge, which covers the relationship between civil society and the public realm (Cuthbert 2007). The examples from Singapore and Thailand mentioned above show that the presence of green and public spaces can bring the community together and closer through social interaction (Yuen 1996b; Oranratmanee & Sachakul 2014) thus the importance of social structuration cannot be understated in analyzing urban green space. Biddulph (2012, p.10) points out that “urban designers cannot deterministically design society or social relations through the design of urban form”. In the urban kampung we see both evidence of design and also the shaping of design processes by social relations, as local stakeholders exert their preferences in how urban green space is shaped and governed. Biddulph blames the lack of understanding by urban designers of social sciences and of various social phenomena in the public realm, for a determinist tendency amongst designers about the influence of designed space upon social outcomes (Biddulph 2012, p.10).

These debates have taken place primarily in the context of developed world/western contexts. Renowned and respected authors and scholars in this discourse, including Whyte (1956;
Lynch (1960; 1984a; 1984b), Jacobs (1961; 1969), Cullen (1961), Carr et al. (1992), Tonkiss (2005; 2014), Carmona (2010a; 2010b; 2013; 2014; 2015), Schmidt & Németh (2010), and Gehl (2011; 2013), underline the importance both of public space as one of the significant forming elements of urban townscape and the role of social structuration in urban design in the evolving social-cultural dynamics of western cities. In the context of developing Asian cities, there is an absence of urban design and social science scholarship concerning the socio-cultural significance of public space as an interaction space.

Research on public space in the Southeast Asian urban context suggests that public space in these cities is utilized differently to their western counterparts. Significantly, public space is populated by a different tapestry of informal and temporally shifting activity which in turn creates varying lively and vibrant urban spaces (Oranratmanee & Sachakul 2014). In urban kampung we see that informality means (often) without some form of legal consent but with the approval and consent of the community members. Governance is present and as such vibrancy and informality is governed but in ways that in general enhance rather than detract from the creation and maintenance of social cohesion, while at the same time it transforms otherwise underused, dull and negative spaces into active and dynamic spaces filled with human interaction.

Interaction is all the more present in spaces modelled after the traditional vernacular forms, derived from rural and/or indigenous knowledge and tradition (O'Connor 1983). A phenomenon of public space evolution can be seen in the case study, where kampung common spaces, which are used to function as a connector and linkage between houses or settlements have been gradually reduced due to infill construction responding to urbanisation pressures in built up areas. The resulting reduced green/open/common space is more valuable as a result, in particular as sites for public interaction. Servicing a more intensive demand for community interaction space places higher value on the remaining green space. This phenomenon of high interaction in open space in the face of urban development pressures has been documented elsewhere (Sien 2003).

Interaction in public space is shaped by material factors such as form and climate, but also through the social construction of the community; through the meanings and competences of residents. Oranratmanee (2012) argues that the characteristics of public space in Southeast Asia were influenced and shaped by the hot-humid climate and strong community kinship.
He also argued that these two factors result in public space becoming more inclusive, relaxed and adaptive to changes. There is much here that parallels the findings of this research, which uses greenery as a medium of social interaction in public space, where the hot and humid climate forces the community to be active in finding ways and solutions to make their neighbourhood cooler, more comfortable, and livable, especially in the hot and polluted climate of modern Jakarta, where thermal comfort is a luxury.

In the absence of residential air conditioning and finding themselves in poorly ventilated dwellings, the warm and humid climate also forces the kampung residents outside and into active public spaces. However, this climatic materiality is fused with a culture that favours strong social interaction in public spaces, borne out of community kinship. This phenomenon of strong kinship in urban kampung can also be attributed to the social structure that the society holds and practices, and still apparently dominates the residents’ perceptions of everyday life in agricultural-based societies. Values such as gotong royong, consensus and neighbourliness are the backbone and building blocks of this society (Newberry 2008), which makes social cohesion central to this society and eventually influences how public space is being shaped. The case study reveals the interplay of material and social elements that result in such interactions.

5.5 Health and Well-being
According to residents of urban kampung, the presence of green space is linked to positive benefits for health and well-being. Urban greenery provides them with a patch of nature in a compact and dense urban environment. This provides physical health benefits through reduced albedo and increased evapotranspiration lowering street temperatures on hot days. It also provides physical health benefits through nutritive means as discussed above. It also provides psychological benefits through self-determination/self-provisioning, and through therapeutic benefits associated with lush, calm, clean, green islands within a sea of urban noise and pollution. As Frederick Law Olmsted the well-known landscape architect argued, the existence of nature is believed to make urban dwellers more relaxed and brings “tranquillity and rest to the mind” (Olmsted 1870, p.23). The health benefits that the kampung dwellers receive encompass both physical and psychological benefits, where physical activities related to the provision of urban greenery improve their physical condition, and the psychological benefits are in the improvement of their mental health, mental
functioning and well-being. Those aspects of well-being have a very close relation with community social life, be it physical greenery activity or a healthy individual benefited by urban greenery, they will definitely impact and shape the social relation within the community in urban kampung.

5.5.1 Findings – Health and Well-being
In Cilandak, trees, shrubs and other forms of greenery planted in urban kampung was universally reported as a means to help reduce air and sound pollution coming from the surrounding neighbourhoods. Cilandak is relatively close to new urban growth centres in the southern part of Jakarta. In Cilandak, members of the community were actively involved in planting various forms of greenery, one of which is sansevieria, a plant that is known for its air purification benefit as it helps to reduce the air pollution and at the same time serves to beautify the neighbourhood.

“Greenery has a lot of meaning for me, for example planting sansevieria is very helpful to absorb and prevent the pollution from coming into the house, we encourage the community to plant greenery such as decorative plants to minimise the impact of pollution on them...[L4]”

Similar to the case of Cilandak, the provision of greenery in the community living of Mampang Prapatan serves to minimize the impact of pollution on its community members which are prone to such problems as the settlement is surrounded by concrete jungle that hinders the community from acquiring fresh air.

“The green space in my house is mostly used for the garden that can reduce pollution...[M1]”

The presence of greenery also has healing benefits, especially when deliberate attempts are made to produce medicinal plants. The case study of Cilandak demonstrates the effort of one community leader in introducing numerous herbal plants to the community, where at the early stages she faced strong rejection and resentment by the community, yet she patiently confronted these rejections with persistence and was able to show the community the benefits of medicinal products. Another member of the community changed her mind and joined the effort after members of her family suffered chronic disease, prompting her to take
a renewed interest in alternative medication. She became an avid advocate for herbal gardens in her neighbourhood:

“It started when Mrs. Harini brought plants every day and made me wonder why she would do that. She came around every day but did not seem to get bored; I was sick of her constant visits each day…. at first I did not believe in the medicinal plant, every time my children were ill, I always run to the doctor. Because I wanted to find cure [for my sister in law], I came to Mrs. Harini who learned from Prof. Hembing about the medicinal plants though I was embarrassed. She was happy. I learnt from her how to make my own concoction for my sister in law to drink….. I'm here to motivate you to start paying attention to the plants in the local environment, like medicinal plants, and start planting, because I was not interested before. From now on avoid chemical drugs, use the plants from your own garden…[M13]”

Greenery in urban kampung also affects the psychological well-being of residents, providing relaxed and peaceful environment, which helps community members find serenity amidst the cacophony of the urban landscape:

“Having open green space in our RT makes the air more cleaner…. and also makes the surrounding area more peaceful…[M10]”

Based on the elaboration above, green space in urban kampung allows an increase of living quality for the inhabitants, which is attained through a betterment of their health due to improved air quality in their settlement.

5.5.2 Discussion of findings – Health and Well-being

Many accounts from the case studies support the arguments for diverse human health benefits from green space. Evidence for psychological benefits of green space for human well-being has been accumulating over recent decades. Kessel (2009) suggested that the increased usage of green space will increase the physical activity of users which is likely to improve their strength, stamina and overall health, however, this work and indeed the vast majority of related works are set within a white-dominated and westernised developed literature.

What arises from this study is different but parallels the developing urban context of Jakarta. For example, the aforementioned notion of enabled physical activity can also be found in urban kampung, in the form of communal activity known as kerja bakti (neighbourhood cleaning activity), where members of the community work together to clean up and improve the quality of their settlement on a particular date agreed by community members. This
activity does not merely improve the well-being of the community, but also has a social dimension, which plays a significant role in creating social cohesion between the kampung dwellers.

The benefits of green space for physical health is also mentioned by Van de Berg (2010) who argued that green space could serve as a buffer to minimize or relieve the negative impact of urban life that is synonymous with high levels of stress, where unhealthy urban lifestyle can lead to a variety of chronic diseases. In addition to the discussion on the correlation between green space and health, an epidemiological study was conducted in several cities in the Netherlands where the findings show a very strong linkage between green space, urbanity and health, especially prominent in people with a lower socioeconomic background (Maas et al. 2006). Both research findings correspond with the findings on urban kampung, where the presence of green space in their dwellings helps to improve the dwellers’ physical well-being.

Greenery appears to be beneficial for the community’s psychological or mental health. This is in line with Roger Ulrich’s investigation on the presence of nature in an urban setting. He argued that “the exposure to water or vegetation would have more positive influences on subjects’ psychophysiological states than exposures to urban scenes lacking nature” (Ulrich 1981, p.525). Statement by Ulrich on the relation between green space and mental well-being is supported and strengthened by a more recent research by Barton and Pretty (2010), which looks into the degree of dependency between nature and mental health using a meta-analysis approach. Based on their findings there is a strong correlation between activities conducted in the green environments and the increase and improvement of self-esteem and mood booster for the mentally ill, where the existence of a body of water enhances the benefits. The notion of green space as psychologically important is also supported by Kaplan & Kaplan (1989) where they asserted that living in a neighbourhood without adequate green space is unhealthy, because residents are not exposed to nature-based coping strategies.

The discourse on human well-being and it’s relation to urban green space remains contentious among health practitioners, urban scholars, and academics. Studies have been dominated largely by research in the context of the Global North, where the creation of urban green space for well-being purposes is realized through various formalised greeneries such as parks, gardens, urban forests, urban food projects and/or green walkways (Bedimo-Rung 2005; Maas et al. 2006; Lee & Moudon 2008; Kessel et al. 2009; Cimprich & Ronis 2003).
The provision of such spaces is based on a planned urban development where green space is carefully and meticulously designed ostensibly to accommodate the needs of the users and conform to other urban elements.

In contrast, research related to the discourse on green space and its relation to human well-being is limited in the Global South cities going through rapid urbanisation. The spatial, economic, cultural, social and governance realms between cities in the developed countries and the Global South are very different, hence it is critical that more research focuses on the latter. Considering the significant relation between green space and health in their impact on community well-being, as shown in this study where green activities encourage community members to engage more in physical activities and provide intangible benefits on mental health due to the social interaction and peaceful ambience it creates; it is sufficient to say that there is an urgency to further the investigation on the relation between these elements in the context of developing nations.

The materiality of green space in urban kampung varies widely. Set in both private and public spaces, the gardens are created in the form of vertical gardens, green canopies, food lots, and medicinal gardens. Green space creation and maintenance is motivated by various health concerns and needs, which encompass both physical and psychological well-being. These issues are also internalized into a larger community concern, where the green space initiatives are adopted and implemented at a neighbourhood level. As a result, human well-being and green space in urban kampung is embedded in the wider community issues that interplay with social fabrics, thus creating a linkage between the creation of green space, human well-being and social cohesion.

5.6 Summary
The conclusion that we can draw from the explanation and analysis above is that the discourse on green space within the realm of public space and urban design in the context of Global South is relatively new. The nature of green space in low income settlements such as urban kampung is shaped and influenced by variables both coming from internal and external factors. Based on the empirical data gathered from the selected neighbourhoods in South Jakarta, there are four main arguments that underline the redefinition and meanings of green
space in urban kampung, which includes communal memory and identity, food security, social interaction and human well-being.

Image, identity and memory as important variables that construct the meanings of green space within the Global South context play significant roles in strengthening the community’s sense of place. According to empirical findings, the creation of identity through green initiative helps to strengthen the community’s social capital which leads to stronger sense of belonging and place attachment. Identity and image of green space in urban kampung can also be created through individual or communal memory in the form of childhood or hometown memory. Memory as one of the informal instruments in the green placemaking process is central to many members of the community, where through memory, vivid recollection of the past can be re-enacted and revived to invoke nostalgic moments in their dwellings. In addition, research on identity and memory in the Global South context is limited, due to the nature of the knowledge that is rooted in cities in the developed world. That is why the role of memory in identity and image creation on green space in the Global South context is essential as one of the major informal driving forces.

Another influential variable in the green placemaking process in urban kampung is the importance of urban agriculture as a component in the effort to attain food security in the neighbourhood unit. This initiative is conducted both in public and private spaces that are subject to the owner’s consent and approval; due to the limited access to communal space, which prompted members of the community to seek and utilize any vacant land. The benefits of having urban agriculture is not solely to meet their daily nutritional needs but also to bring monetary advantages to the kampung dwellers, where the food that they produce could reduce household expenditure and can even be a profitable commodity. Additionally the creation of urban agriculture brings about positive social impacts to the community, where the process of transforming the space involves all stakeholders and is based on community consensus for every aspect of the design process. Furthermore, the study on urban agriculture in low income communities in the developing world is still rare, which makes this research finding a valuable source of information for urban designers when designing public space in marginalised communities.

The utilisation of green space as a community interaction space is also considered as a significant variable that defines the meaning of green space in the Global South context. The
characteristic and nature of green public space in many Asian cities is different to their western counterparts, where cities in the Global South are closely associated with informality, and in which the formation and usage of space is profoundly influenced by structure of the society and local climate. Although it seems that cities in the Global South world is synonymous with informality, actually there are some forms of local governance which requires consent and approval of the community members. Studies focusing on the Global South that look into the relation between urban design and social science are very limited. This may be due to the lack of understanding by urban designers of the social phenomena occurring in public space caused by the training of urban designers that focus more on final products rather than the design process. In addition, the presence of green space in urban kampung also act as social engineering tools. The greenery is used as a medium for social interaction which creates social cohesion among members of the community.

The last variable extracted from the findings which helps to redefine the meaning of green space in the Global South context is human well-being. The implementation of green initiatives brings positive benefits for the kampung dwellers’ health, both physically and mentally. Informal green space in the neighbourhood indirectly affects the communities fitness through green related communal activity, such as kerja bakti. Through this initiative, members of the community work together to clean and improve the quality of their settlement, in which the essence of this activity is not solely for keeping them fit and healthy but also to make the community come together and grow closer. Similar to the other variables, lack of research in the Global South on the relation between urban design, human well-being and social science makes the exploration of this variable a challenging one. Furthermore the notion of informal green space is rarely discussed and documented since most cases devolve on formalised greenery such as parks and gardens.

Based on the explanation of all variables, it can be concluded that the rationale of having green space in urban kampung ranges from individual and communal memories to health and well-being, whereas the green space tends to be informal due to its utilisation of both public and private space. The creation of green space in urban kampung is also influenced by the shape of the society and the geographical condition of the urban setting. The creation of green space helps to bring the community together, which in the long term will benefit the community due to the increase of their social capital. An examination of the creation process
of informal green space could provide an understanding of the design process phenomenon in urban kampung, which will be explained in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 6: THE PRODUCTION OF SOCIAL SPACE IN URBAN KAMPUNG

6.1 Introduction
In addition to legal and social rules and conventions surrounding the formation of public space in urban kampung, green space is co-created through the work of local householders and neighbourhood leaders. The significance of social aspects of these placemaking processes in the Global South context are rarely examined by researchers and scholars. Notions of economic benefits to urban development are more typical areas of study. This chapter reveals how social structure and values influence place-shaping, by examining the creation of green space in urban kampung by local householders and neighbourhood leaders. The first part of the discussion examines the social structures in urban kampung and this is followed by the second part which explores the values shared by these stakeholders and their implementation. The third part of this chapter discusses the social process of space production and the defining aspects of placemaking in the urban kampung that were the subject of this study.

6.2 Social Structures in Urban Kampung
Urban kampung in Indonesian cities can be understood both as spatial and social entities. These urban enclaves are synonymous with traditional, informal layouts of dwellings. However, this does not mean the societies or the urban form is unstructured. They typically comprise people from low socio-economic backgrounds, known as wong cilik (Jv.) or little people, attracted by the affordability of these dwellings (Sullivan 1980; 1992). Urban kampung provides low-skilled labour force, with many residents working in the informal sector (Newberry 2008).

6.2.1 Findings – Social Structures in Urban Kampung
Within the urban kampung, there is a considerable overlap between local households and neighbourhood leaders; governance is informal and voluntarily, and local administrators are also part of the community. The structure of the administration system is modelled after Japanese village-like units known as Tonarigumi, which was enacted during World War II (WWII) under the Japanese occupation. In the context of modern Indonesia post WWII, the system was embraced and adopted by the Indonesian government and became known as Rukun Tetangga (RT) and Rukun Warga (RW). RT is the smallest unit of neighbourhood
which consists of 10-20 households, while groups of 6-10 RTs form an RW, and each RT/RW is headed by a leader that is elected every three years by members of the community through a community meeting. In doing his/her job, the leader of RT/RW is assisted by other members of the community, including a secretary and treasurer.

“Just like any other organisation, there is the head, secretary, and treasurer...[L2]”

The head of RT/RW has the prerogative right to add new positions within the RT/RW’s governance body outside the main three; the positions are adjusted and adapted to the needs of the neighbourhood. The personnel to fill the positions invariably come from the neighbourhood. One example is the presence of an environmental cadre in the RT/RW’s governance body.

“I’m one of the environmental cadres; most RT have environmental cadres...[M2]”

As the head of the neighbourhood, leaders of RT/RW have a significant role to play. Their formal duties include making sure that each person living in the neighbourhood is known and registered accordingly. They act as the extended eye and hand of the central government, testing policy enactment. They are also the face and representatives of the community; and are in the forefront of initiatives and programmes that have direct effects on neighbourhood well-being. They are expected to be role models that set standards and examples for members of the local community.

“We have to set an example to the community. So they follow us, and even after a given example, they still have to be monitored and controlled...[L2]”

Aside from carrying out their role and duty, a good Head of RT/RW needs to have exemplary leadership and communication skills. These skills are needed to interact with the various stakeholders in and outside of the kampung. This example is shown in Mampang Prapatan where the head of RT is an engaging person and is very approachable, including to the locals who disagree with her initiative:

“...The head of RT, she gets along very easily with people, and she’s also good in embracing and engaging with the community. Sometimes there are times when the community is hard to handle and with the approach that she uses, the community will
As the leader of the community, the Head of RT/RW has a moral and ethical responsibility towards their neighbourhood. In Indonesian culture, the head of RT/RW is considered someone who is an elder or respected person in the community. This cultural overlay means it is an obligation of the Head of the RT/RW to nurture the community in a neo-parental fashion.

"The duties and functions of the Head of RT is just like a parent to the community, whether it is nurturing or serving the community…[M5]"

Other influential groups in the process of green space creation in urban kampung are the women’s organisations under the auspices of two organisations, Family Welfare Movement (PKK) and Womens’ Farmer Group (KWT). PKK is a nationwide female-only organization in Indonesia. The organization is present in multiple classes of Indonesian society, ranging from wives of dignitaries to women in poor informal settlements. Their objective is to empower women, both in the family and community in order to increase their participation in the development of Indonesia. Their participation is manifested in various community activities ranging from small and micro economy empowerment, health awareness programmes, education and environmental initiatives. Among various PKK programmes, one particular programme expresses PKK’s concern for environmental protection. In most cases in urban kampung, an environmental protection agenda goes hand in hand with food security initiatives. It becomes noticeable especially during kerja bakti, where the community works together to clean the neighbourhood then continues with maintaining communal gardens which comes in the form of TOGA or urban farming, with the objective to create community resilience through food security.

"It’s the woman’s group association who started the programme, the family food security programme…[L7]"

Apart from PKK, the other womens’ organization that also has a significant role in green initiatives in urban kampung is KWT. KWT is an abbreviation for Kelompok Wanita Tani (Women Farmers’ Group); an organisation that is formed to increase women’s participation in the agriculture sector, with the objective to achieve higher productivity as well as motivating adoption and introduction of new farming technology. KWT receives support
from the government through various means, one of which is through a mentoring programme. Agricultural products that they produce in their neighbourhood are processed and sold in order to increase family income.

“In the farmers group I act as the head of the group, in the beginning I was asked by the Kelurahan (sub-district) to attend a catering short course, and in the meeting there was someone who made a suggestion to create a farmers group out of our product such as dried potato, so afterwards we have routine meeting, by that time we were fostered by Pak. Imbriyadi from the municipality of South Jakarta…[L4]”

Another significant organisation is the POKTAN and GAPOKTAN (urban farmers groups) where membership is open to all members of the community. POKTAN and GAPOKTAN are mainly focused on community agricultural production in urban areas, where POKTAN serves as the forefront in providing basic food security at community level; meanwhile GAPOKTAN is an association of several POKTANs at sub-district level. Members of POKTAN address challenges related to food security issues at the annual GAPOKTAN meeting where members of POKTAN can share their experiences of the planting and harvesting season.

“…POKTAN is at the RW level, GAPOKTAN is at the sub-district level…they are easier and organised because they already got routine schedule…[G11]”

The above example exhibits the role and presence of community organisations in urban kampung communities that is involved with the provision of open green space. This form of organisation eases the organisation of greening activities due to the structural support it provides in bringing people together and mobilizing them to meet the group’s objective. The systemized nature of their activities allow speedier development and growth of the initiative, as members are required to follow a rather set form of routine in creating the green space. A downside of having such organisations may come from the lesser binding effect of the membership, as members voluntarily join the movement.

6.2.2 Discussion of Findings – Social Structures in Urban Kampung
Based on the empirical findings from the case studies, the households in urban kampung derive from various ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds, making for a diverse, pluralistic and multicultural neighbourhood. This finding is in accordance with Newberry’s (2006; 2007; 2008) research on several urban kampungs in Central Java, where he found that the
inhabitants of kampungs bring with them their diverse ethnic and occupational identities into their dwellings and into the local community. This diversity in urban kampung brings with it some challenges. Social cohesion is not a given condition, and this argument is supported by research in several case studies that show a society with diverse social groups and limited shared communal spaces tends to include conflicts and tensions within neighbourhoods (see Madanipour 2004; Hernandez-Bonilla 2008; Calderon & Chelleri 2013).

The shaping of the society in urban kampung is also influenced by how structuring forces play out between powerful and influential actors, which contribute significantly to the socio-economic, and political aspects of the society. The example from the case study showed how the social system is manifested through the creation of community-based organisations such as RT/RW, PKK, KWT and GAPOKTAN, where these organisations provide particular social structure for the neighbourhood to work in particular ways, thereby reinforcing the aims and objectives of the community leaders. In many cases, the organisation acts as an agent of change in initiating activities which concern the community’s livelihood and welfare issues. Furthermore, the presence of community-based organisations in urban kampung does not necessarily bring significant impact to the livelihood of kampung dwellers but it is designed to encourage social inclusivity, by allowing all tiers of society to take part in kampung development initiatives.

The existence of community-based organisations in urban kampung invokes the discourse on communitarianism. Community organisations in urban kampung are voluntarily based and depend on support from the local community. Since leadership in the kampung is based primarily on ideas rather than resources, decisions are made collectively and with a strong sense of kinship. This accords with thoughts and ideas by American Sociologist, Amitai Etzioni on American society, where he argues about the need to embrace and restore community values which have been gradually swamped by individualism (Etzioni 1994). Moreover the term ‘community’ that is used in urban kampung context refers to people that live in a close-knitted neighbourhood, where some scholars in the realm of social science argue that the idea of community is highly fluid, misused and a contestable idea (Delanty 2003; Cohen 2013; Mulligan 2015).

To this extent, the success of community-based organisations in urban kampung is determined by the leaders of those community organisations in providing guidance and a
sense of hope for the community to progress and develop. There are broad parallels here with rural societies in Indonesia, and with other models of local governance in traditional communities, such as in indigenous Australia, where community leaders hold important positions as mentors and elders in their society (Paton & Emery 1996; Lane & Corbett 2005; Moran 2010). Another key aspect is women’s involvement in every aspect of kampung development initiatives, where many members of RT/RW, PKK, KWT and GAPOKTAN are women, and most of them practice PKK principles which focus on environmental protection. These accord with the observations made by Shiva (1988; 1993; 2005) on women’s roles as guardians of nature, providers of food, water, health and social security. In fact, women’s organisations and leadership help to strengthen and intensify green initiatives in their neighbourhoods.

The notion of community in urban settings is being challenged by a more “modern” and contemporary way of living. Cases from major cities in North America show how the spirit of communitarianism has lost ground in many urban societies and is replaced by a more liberal and individualistic society (Etzioni 1994). Not only does this phenomenon happen in modern American society, it has become a widely accepted global phenomenon, where individualism is increasingly dominant. Coupled with the advent of new technology that increasingly diminishes human interaction, a more “network” oriented society is emerging with global cities as the earliest example of this phenomenon (Castells 2011; Sassen 2011).

Another critique of community-based organisations comes from the holders of more independent, self-reliant and liberal values. Christine Everingham challenges the politics of community by questioning the dynamic of community as an effective social glue. She argues that community is used and abused by politicians as a “rhetorical tool, which in this sense is an agent of government” (Everingham 2001, p.107). She also points out how community has become a source for political dispute among politicians, which results in distrust between politicians and members of the community and creates dependency on government to “provide” for the community. This type of politics and duality recognises alternative community management, centred on the notions of self-help similar to practices of self-help housing by people in marginalised communities (Turner 1976).

The discussion on community in urban kampung and the challenges from urban modernity, especially from the “modern” and sophisticated urban society is closely linked with the
notion of decoloniality. Just like any other global community in the former western colonies, society in Jakarta is very much influenced by how the new and “modern” world order is constructed, which is heavily determined and formalised by western former colonialists. The mindset of the Indonesian general public still resembles how the division of power was constructed during colonisation, where Europe and “Whiteness” emerged as “the central place of the pattern of world Euro-centered colonial/modern capitalist power” (Quijano 2000, p.217-218). In terms of production of knowledge, Anibal Quijano, a renowned Peruvian sociologist argues that currently our global construct of knowledge production was the product of colonisation through the “subject-object” relation, which separated the society based on capital, race and cultures where this practice has become more homogenised and globally accepted (Quijano 2007; Mignolo 2011). This argument seeks to explain how urban society in general, especially those from middle income backgrounds, perceive community in urban kampung as different, backward and in need of modernization, and this inevitably creates tension due to different interpretations of urban values. This will be discussed in more detail in the next section (Section 6.3).

The evidence from my research strongly indicates that the presence of community-based organisation provides the community with important structure and support, building and nurturing social capital and social networking within the neighbourhood. Based on the discussion above, it can be concluded that the spirit of communitarianism is central in building a sense of community in urban kampung (Etzioni 1994; 1996). An example from Singapore’s meritocracy-capitalist society explains how the ideology of communitarianism is combined with an emphasis on individual responsibility to the community, where this ideology is being used by the ruling party (PAP) to redirect the socio-economic, political and cultural aspects of Singapore society (Chua 1997).

The discourse on social capital is rarely discussed in the realm of urban design, let alone communitarianism and the ramifications of community-based organisations in placemaking processes. Many urban designers are not expected to provide or combine with social science expertise, and may even be trapped within aesthetic or beautification jargons; such as city beautification, urban renewal programmes, increasing density at the expense of a deeper understanding of social structures and processes. As a renowned urban designer Donald Appleyard argues that, “Community as one of the focus/orientations in urban design has received the least attention” (Appleyard 1982, p.120). Engaging members of the community
in the design/placemaking process or community consultative practice is rarely done by urban designers in developing cities. This phenomenon could be attributed to the nature of the knowledge, which is considered “foreign”, new and has not been widely understood, both by practitioners and users alike. There are issues that need to be addressed in understanding the urban phenomenon in rapidly growing Asian megacities, where low income urban dwellers as key stakeholders are often neglected, especially those coming from traditional and rural backgrounds which often become victims of capital intensive development.

6.3 Shared Values and Principles in Urban Kampung

Shared values or principles at neighbourhood level influence placemaking processes and, hence, affect the shape/design of open space. These values and principles collide as divergences play out between social groups, geographic zones, and between contemporary and pre-existing conditions. Indonesian society is diverse and rapidly changing, and the community in urban kampung clearly understands the dynamic of social changes happening in their society, and the tensions between capitalist-individualistic urban influences and their own pre-existing core values and principles (Geertz 1957). The next subsection presents findings on how shared values in urban kampung affect the green placemaking process in this study. The following discussion reveals how particular shared values are notably influential in green placemaking processes in urban kampung. Ideas are drawn from this discussion about how such knowledge might be utilized in policy and in further research.

6.3.1 Findings – Shared Values and Principles in Urban Kampung

The core value of urban kampung is based on the principal value of gotong royong (mutual cooperation), which is aligned with broader values of solidarity, tolerance, mutual respect and understanding between members of the community. An example from the district of Mampang Prapatan shows how this communal core value is translated and manifested in the act of voluntarism. Voluntarism is significant in the green placemaking process and is not limited to “green” activities. Rather, it is featured in an array of daily communal activities, as in the example shown below where members of the community voluntarily help their neighbour in need using available resources.

“The housewives will chip in to help...there are also cash contributions, and sometimes the money is used to help people...[L1]”
Voluntary actions are not always communally undertaken, and may not be borne out of shared values. Not all members of the community in urban kampung share the same views. The example below exhibits the tireless effort of a member of the community whose strong determination and dedication is directed towards creating improvements in his neighbourhood. This is done regardless of the support from the community or lack thereof as he utilizes any available resources found in his neighbourhood.

“I used banana trees for composting... I also handle rubbish alone with no one’s help...[M3]”

Despite the above account, communal voluntarism is widespread in urban kampung and is manifested in the form of kerja bakti, which is a communal activity that focuses on maintaining the neighbourhood’s cleanliness, hygiene and health. This definition seems to now extend to cleaning and green activities, at least in the case study sites. During kerja bakti, members of the community voluntarily participate and work hand in hand to ensure that their neighbourhood is liveable and free from stagnant water, garbage, mosquitos and rat habitat. Community participation varies depending on individual competence, availability and ability. As an example there are members of the community that physically clean and green the neighbourhood, while others cook for the workers involved. Others provide the necessary tools and equipment for kerja bakti or provide drinks and cigarettes for other volunteer workers.

“It was everybody’s initiative. We just provide coffee, tea, sugar and cigarettes...[L1]”

In addition, the voluntarism act extends to recycling initiatives, where members of the community have the opportunity to conduct 4R initiatives (reduce, reuse, recycle and replanting) using recyclable materials in their neighbourhood. Through this voluntary initiative, the community manages daily waste, while at the same time preserving the surrounding environment. Furthermore, the activity generates income through sales of recyclable goods, which can then be used to cover community expenses. Socially, the activity provides continuity and strengthens social bonds, while also maintaining and increasing awareness, knowledge and skills in recycling.

“That’s what we call as 4R (reduce, reuse, recycle and replanting), and our community actively engages in that activity. There is an organization in the community that recycle waste into bags and they also sell second hand items, meanwhile the money received from
selling those items will be used to fund activities in this RW...Many of the community living here recycle their dry waste into imitation flower or bags; meanwhile in RW 03 they use newspaper rolled with glue and made into pencil case or tissue box...[G7]"

The processes of creating and shaping green space in urban kampung cannot be separated from the internal values that form the community’s inspiration and motivation. These values include diversity reflected in the diverse social groups of the kampung residents ranging from those who have stayed longer to recent arrivals coming from their rural origins and also temporary dwellers of the city. Nevertheless, an identifiable internal value-set as described above is clearly distinguishable, especially across members of the community that have recently come to the city and still hold close ties with their place of origin. This indicates that communal and voluntarist tendencies are associated with rural origins and might decay over time.

Predictably, the constant interaction and exchanging of ideas between members of community, coupled with the close proximity of their houses has provided the community with the opportunity to develop strong kinship relations which transcend their differences. It provides common ground upon which common values can be constructed. This in turn provides social capital and a sense of belonging:

“It feels like home here, my home town, people who live here are all my relatives now...[M2]”

An example from the district of Mampang Prapatan shows how the spirit of gotong royong has permeated the community and is part of everyday lives. Indeed, the solidarity and social awareness that is part of gotong royong has persisted among the diverse and multicultural community in urban kampung. The green initiative, as one of the instruments in creating and nurturing those values, prompts the community to engage with each other on a regular basis, which indirectly reinforces and in turn reshapes common shared values.

“Here the social consciousness is very high, if there is someone who wants to clean the neighbourhood people will surely help out...[M4]”

The success of green placemaking in urban kampung cannot be separated from the devotion and dedication shown by members of the community, without their earnest devotion the process of creating green space can be hampered. Devotion and dedication to the community
are two intangible values that exist within the community in urban kampung. These values are very much shaped by the socio-cultural background of the majority of residents, which mostly came from the rural part of Java, where the syncretism of Animistic, Buddhist, Hindu and Islamic teaching influenced their core values. An example from RW 008 in the district of Cilandak, shows the syncretic values and principles that they hold firmly helping to shape the green space in kampung’s neighbourhood in the form of green knowledge sharing, where one community member dedicated her house to be transformed into a training centre for people that want to learn more about a neighbourhood “green and clean” initiative, which included communal recycling and composting:

“Now I live with my son at the back of this house, and this house is devoted for classes and serves as a multipurpose house. This house is also used as the training ground for P4S (Independent Agricultural Training Centre)…[L5]”

Another significant value that influences green placemaking process is the work ethic exhibited by members of the community who consistently and persistently work to persuade the whole community in supporting the green movement in their neighbourhood. As demonstrated in the following example from Mampang Prapatan, this activism acts as an antidote to the factors of individualism that erode collective values around public green space. It shows how the benefits of having greenery in the neighbourhood provide a physical cue for residents who might otherwise be reticent about or agnostic towards green initiatives in their neighbourhood:

“Little by little community awareness has grown significantly. At the beginning they seemed reluctant with the environmental measures, then I started to give my neighbours plants for those who didn’t have any. Then they began to take care of the plants by watering them, and the money that we receive from the waste bank is used collectively to buy our greenery equipment, at the beginning it seemed hard but we have to do it slowly…[M1]”

In the spreading of values and principles associated with green placemaking processes, practical conduits include practical knowledge and simple guidance on green space design. Again an example from the district of Mampang Prapatan, where a member of the community patiently teaches the community how to create a small garden, compost organic waste, and recycle solid waste, as a means to improve the environment and supplement income:
“The activity which I’m currently doing, I tried to spread it to the community, such as planting plants, recycling solid waste into various products i.e. flower decoration, bag, tablecloth, etc...[M1]”

The process of knowledge sharing on green placemaking is carried out in other indirect ways, such as to incorporate green living into basic life skills programmes. An example shows how this approach is being conducted through persuasive and compelling ways, in a neighbourhood where illiteracy is still pervasive among the community members. One member of the community, who is also an avid green activist, took the opportunity of teaching reading and writing skills to slowly move the teaching material into examples that introduce green initiatives to the community.

“Before, a lot of people here were illiterate, so, as the first step I used to deliver a class that taught people how to read, write and make clothes. Once they’ve known me, then I invited them to create a green village...[L5]”

Green initiatives are also introduced to children starting from a very early age. A preschool (early childhood education) and elementary school programme in Mampang Prapatan uses various child-appropriate methods and techniques. A member of the community, who used to teach in preschool and elementary schools, explained how she taught the children to care for and protect the environment from small steps such as sorting waste and tree planting in their neighbourhood.

“When I was still teaching at PAUD I like to teach the kids to plant trees and sort their waste. I used to be a green facilitator for RW 05. I try to introduce green initiatives to the kids at PAUD as early as possible. And also the SD (elementary school) in our neighbourhoods already teaches kids how to sort the waste...[L3]”

Routine training and workshops were also provided to the kampung dwellers. The initiative is a collaboration with the local government that provides instuctors to train and supervise the community’s green project. This was initiated by the community that requested support and guidance from the local government.

“Yes. So that’s why we are now slightly shifting our training to vertical gardens so it would facilitate the green village later...[G3]”
Initiative in training and education also dovetails to some extent with initiatives from the provincial government of Jakarta. The government-provided training tends to be formal and conducted with large numbers of participants coming from every corner of Jakarta.

"Every year we conduct gardening training. The trainings are held for 14 days in this building...[G8]"

Another approach to spread green knowledge and principles to wider community members is by utilizing community based organisations and networks such as POKTAN and GAPOKTAN that focus on food security. These organizations are able to work together with the local community in introducing the ideas and concept of urban greenery at a grassroots level. These community-based organisations can also act as a bridge between community and government, in order to reinforce each others initiatives.

"I provide information and guidance to POKTAN and GAPOKTAN. They are easier to work with and are organised as they have schedules in place. Sometimes I visit the community as well, but it is not well scheduled...[G11]"

The application of values and principles associated with green knowledge in urban kampung is commonly conducted in a communal setting, where it covers a wide range of activities, such as kerja bakti, waste composting, urban farming. The community waste composting process in the district of Mampang Parapat shows an example of an activity related to green principles. This activity generates income from selling recyclable items which can in turn finance the local green initiatives:

"Fortunately in my RT we have communal composter, so once a week I’ll send organic waste that I’ve collected from my garden to the composter, to be processed. Dried waste such as empty bottles will be recycled, reused to be hanging pots, or even sold. The revenue from selling dried waste then will be used to purchase items such as pots and plants which will benefit the community through what we call the waste bank...[M1]"

In this way the communal activity also brings tangible social benefits, which reinforces the value of the green placemaking process. The links between social cohesion, trust and the collective efforts in green initiatives are recognised by the locals in quite deliberative ways:

"...rubbish bin, wheelbarrows and cleaning tools like hoes and basket...together with the community, we clean, and plant trees in the pots or on the ground...to build cohesive community... [G1]"
Through routine communal activity, the community can form social bonds in mutual time-spaces that contribute to social well-being and connectedness; as mentioned by one of the interviewees from the district of Cilandak who looks forward to communal activities as a moment to come together. This implies that communal activity has important meaning and value for members of the community that benefit from the opportunity to experience togetherness:

“But for us, we love the activity because we can enjoy the time together; we rarely have the opportunity to do that kind of activity…”[M9]”

Unfortunately, these communal values are not shared with their younger counterparts with the millennials preferring to adopt more modern, liberal and individualistic values. This is a common phenomenon in the younger generation in many Indonesian cities, particularly due to their interaction with the outside world, while at the same time adapting and absorbing more widely recognised global and universal values.

“Nowadays, the younger generation has big salary and high education, but they are very individualistic, and they didn’t even want to greet us or asking for permission when passing through…[L1]”

Another aspect that helps to deteriorate the communal values within the community in urban kampung is the economic pressures of living in a metropolitan city such as Jakarta. Skyrocketing prices coupled with high inflation has made the inhabitants of urban kampung focus much on making a decent living, which sometimes prompts them to sacrifice the opportunity to get together with their neighbours.

“The living cost has risen up, especially in Jakarta, where money is never enough…[L1]”

The above example shows the ability to adapt or the resilience that inhabitants of urban kampung have to exhibit in facing economic problems and how the members of the community have to work together hand in hand in resolving issues. This need arises from the constraints binding the people, which in turn holds them together.
6.3.2 Discussion of Findings – Shared Values and Principles in Urban Kampung

This urban study supports previous rural based studies that position *gotong royong* as a central unifying value in socially binding local Indonesian communities (Bowen, 1986). It also links to a large body of international work on the role of communally held values and collective endeavours in marking out and maintaining identity and cohesion at neighbourhood level. For example, Christine Everingham’s work on the politics of community uses Australian society as the case study, and asserts “the need for a stronger social glue” that can be accomplished by having and cultivating “norms of reciprocity”, “trust” and “social capital” in the community (Everingham 2001, p. 106).

These embedded values and principles cover several aspects such as genuine voluntarism, persistent work ethics, sincere dedication and willingness to share knowledge. Although not all members of the community inherently exhibit these qualities, there are what we might term “activist” members of the community who introduce and seek to persuade and link these values to green initiatives. These more overt and assertive actors exhibit skills in transacting between the diverse cultural influences and motivations that exist in urban kampung. As expressions of both rural values and urban spatial settings, these urban kampung can be viewed usefully through Homi Bhabha’s theory of hybridity. In his book “The Location of Culture”, Bhabha argues that the process of cultural creation undergoes multiple iteration and translation processes, furthermore he also addressed how an urban migrant community is culturally shaped and influenced by the interactions that happen among them (Bhabha 2012).

The imbrication of local values and the success of green initiatives, is supported by the empirical findings where most of the green initiatives in the district of Mampang Prapatan, Cilandak and Srengseng Sawah were initiated by the community, with little intervention by the government. Community-level activities to bring positive changes to their neighbourhood, are invariably associated with processes of communication of ideas and concerns among peers through social and physical spaces and networks. These internal discussions truly facilitate the decision making process concerning living conditions and day to day livelihoods, where the principle of “deliberation for consensus” (*musyawarah mufakat*) is widely practised. This observed practice accords with Morfit (1981, p.841) who notes that this principle is the “backbone of Indonesian style democracy based on the state ideology ‘Pancasila’ that rejects western liberal democracy”. It also accords with broader social theory regarding the relationship between agents and social space in the making and remaking of
social values. Social space is very much constructed through the hands of agents, which tends to personify the character of the society that they represent (Bourdieu 1989).

Gotong royong based on the principle of *muzyawarah mufakat* is thus positioned as, variously; rural Indonesian in origin; translated to urban kampung yet also challenged by more “modern” liberal and individualistic values, and; imbricated with the practice of “green” kampung activism and placemaking.

Marketist individualism is an ever-encroaching phenomenon driven through policy and regulatory settings that are pro-market and pro-capital. These are felt in particular by urban inhabitants involved in labour markets and especially in settings that promote more encroachment of commoditisation into social and economic life. These processes draw in inhabitants, where they have to take responsibility for themselves and focus on their own interests and needs, which is pivotal for their own survival (see Hayek 1948; Puplick, C.J. , & Southey 1980; Kim et al. 1994; Watson & Morris 2002). Meanwhile for community in urban kampung that still adhere to their traditional values/principles, they feel trapped both in their ideological stance and cultural identity because of the society that they are surrounded by, how they are perceived and how they reconcile different values. Alexis de Tocqueville, a 19th century French social theorist defines this phenomenon as “the tyranny of the majority” (Tocqueville 2003, p.526), where the differences in ideology make urban kampung inhabitants feel marginalized, facing numerous constraints and encroachment of urban development processes, hence the lack of green space available to their neighbourhood.

This debate between competing values/principles and associated power and social structures has been widely debated, including, increasingly, within urban studies, where the production of contemporary urban culture is widely accepted as very much influenced by globalisation; the phenomenon by which urban culture is gradually homogenised and becomes more identical between globalised cities (Appadurai 2011). In cities such as Jakarta, globalisation can be interpreted as a new form of colonisation, where the agenda of coloniality is still being endorsed and imposed by the matrix of colonial power in order to control the global economy. This idea of global domination has been challenged by new emerging countries, especially after the Bandung Conference /Asian-African Conference in 1955 which produced the idea of decolonisation guided by the spirit of Bandung, with the sole purpose to break away and separate from their colonial power which has infiltrated them in every aspect of
life, including their values and principles due to five hundred years of colonisation (Mignolo 2009; 2011). The acceptance of marketist individualism by the Indonesian urban elite could be linked to the rhetoric of modernity, where urbanites want to be associated with modern, contemporary, democratic and liberal values. These values were unconsciously heralded by the media to support the current establishment, where according to Mignolo (2007) this phenomenon could be understood as the darker side of western modernity in the name of European enlightenment, which is why it is important for new emerging countries to delink themselves from the imperial power and to explore values/principles from their own roots.

The discourse on the role of values in the placemaking process is rarely discussed in the realm of design, especially in the Global South context. As mentioned in the discussion, the communal values/principles that are held firmly by members of the community provide the unifying factor and driving force for them to work together and create a livable neighbourhood. These values can be understood as part of their culturally engrained habitus, as expressed by Bourdieu (1990) where it refers to the embodiment of their character, skills and habits which they gain through experiences during their lifetime. This phenomenon explains the process of green placemaking in urban kampung, which is strongly associated with the community values/principles which they have gained from experiences in their hometown. This research enriches the discussion on the significance of communal value in the placemaking process, particularly in Asian megacities. In addition it also tries to deconstruct the production of knowledge in the realm of urban placemaking in South East Asian cities, as has been shown by Takahashi (2007) and Iwabuchi (2014) which have advocated to de-westernise the production of knowledge in their field and creating theories and concepts based on Asian experiences.

Focusing on the discourse on the production of knowledge in the realm of urban design in the Global South context, the role of urban design has become increasingly popular and significant especially with the rapid growth in many Asian cities. It’s importance is often not accommodated by the urban designer having the ability and competence to understand comprehensive urban development issues, where mostly the problems are observed from a single viewpoint; mainly design approach. Meanwhile other viewpoints also need to be considered, such as the socio-spatial issues in placemaking process, which is no less important than aesthetic aspects, but is unfortunately often neglected by the designer in order to create a unique and iconic masterpiece (Madaniopour 1996a). In relation to socio-spatial
inquiry user’s embedded social and cultural capital, such as intrinsic values/principles are critical in understanding their view and the dynamics happening within their community, this could be attributed to the context where the community is situated/located, thus it affects how certain communities view/value/perceive green space in their neighbourhood differently from other communities (Carmona & Magalhães 2002). The example from the community in urban kampung shows just how value/principle influence the green placemaking process, and how their understanding on the production of green space differ to the urbanites, as the majority urban dwellers in Jakarta. This example shows the role that can be played more actively by urban designers in the developing world in trying to understand the local context and tradition in order to create a socially inclusive and accessible urban space for all urban dwellers, without advocating approaches such as “gentrification, exclusive enclaves, or gated and walled neighbourhoods” as proposed by Madanipour (2006, p.186).

6.4 Social Interaction and Networking in Urban Kampung
The production of green placemaking in the Global South context is explored empirically here, by examining the social space created as a result of human interaction and activities in urban space (Bourdieu 1985) which in this case is in the green spaces of urban kampung. Four facets of green placemaking are discussed in the following sub-sections; social capital, social mobility, power relations and local governance.

6.4.1 Findings – Social Interaction and Networking in Urban Kampung
Green space is shaped in urban kampung in part through committed cooperation and volunteerism. An example from the district of Mampang Prapatan shows how community participation and commitment contributes to the production of green space in one of the RTs. Their role as active agents in the process of realising the idea and concept of communal green space is significant. This participation includes the division of labor within the community as in the example shown below.

“Cleaning up our own neighbourhood, taking apart the pots, break apart the plants which are too big, rearranging the garden and seeding; they're all conducted together...[M6]”

Collective voluntary work in the urban kampung is also conducted through waste recycling initiatives, either household waste or recyclable items. The examples below show how
initiatives towards the cleanliness and beautification of the neighbourhood are linked to green placemaking, where the waste gathered from the community is processed into numerous useful items, such as compost fertilizer, flower pots, or other saleable goods. These items are beneficial in the green placemaking process, where they eventually become an important component that contributes to the design elements.

“I plant the trees and take care of compost. Rubbish like plastic bottles on the street will be collected at Mrs. RT’s house and will be sold because we don’t know what to do with it. Maybe we can use the plastic bottle as pots, sometimes Mrs. RT makes flowers from the bottles, but that process is way more complicated...[M6]”

Green space in urban kampung is also shaped by the community’s mutual cooperation, where the space creation processes call upon community willingness to sincerely nurture and care for the environment without expecting any reward. The evidence from the case study explicitly shows the role of social capital in the green placemaking process, where members of the community work hand in hand to ensure the success of the initiative. This includes various activities such as planting, watering and trimming the greenery which is conducted alternately by members of the community.

“Very often, we used to do these activities every week, such as watering the garden, and we also have people who will water it every day changing turns. At first we schedule it every day, and every week when the grass is already high we’ll cut and trim it together...[M12]”

Community-based green space in urban kampung is also shaped by volunteerism and resourcefulness.

“(The pots) were here before, but they were just left like that. Because I’ve got time on my hands, I cleaned them, and I cleared them up. If there’s a tall tree, I’ll borrow a ladder. I’ve never purchased anything for this...[M3]”

Another factor that influences green placemaking is the presence of local wisdom/values which is manifested in the form of kerja bakti (a local form of communal activity). The implementation of kerja bakti at community level helps to shape green space in the neighbourhood, while at the same time encouraging the community to work together as a team in order to build and strengthen their social capital and sense of inclusiveness. The process of creating green space in urban kampung through kerja bakti involves various activities, such as collective cleaning and planting of various greenery.
“I do. It was a rubbish pit. There were a lot of broken glass, wood, broken furniture there. The one who lives there doesn’t really care. Then I asked Mrs. Ida about that, what we could do because it wasn’t nice at all and we could use the land. So then we had kerja bakti to clean the land, but there were a lot of rats. First we planted vegetables but they were eaten by rats. Everything was gone...[M6]”

Integral to the practice of kerja bakti is togetherness and collective endeavour for the common good – in this case, ensuring the success of green initiative in their neighbourhood. Green placemaking thus strengthens existing bonds between households.

“When planting the plants we usually do it together...[M12]”

In addition, kerja bakti that is based on the principle of gotong royong have contributed significantly to the success of green space creation, where it has been proven in numerous areas located throughout urban kampung. In other words, green space can be interpreted as an embodiment of invisible social space, where the creation process involves and shapes various social elements.

“It came from the community initiatives, we did it through mutual cooperation (gotong royong), not just in this place but also at the streets and laneway, people are very active...[L6]”

The interactions about and upon green space provides a physical and social space to build, strengthen and enhance social capital. This is facilitated by, and in turn facilitates the strengthening of ties between households.

“The relation between me and my neighbours is very good; we are even like a big family...[M1]”

Bonds are maintained, and governance exercised, by community leaders who seek to familiarise and socialise initiatives across stakeholders in urban kampung. They regularly visit the kampung dwellers’ houses one by one to motivate and gain community support.

“I frequently visit their houses. As a form of friendship, just stop by every now and then...[L2]”

These visits also serve to remind people of their social duties to be involved in kerja bakti or other voluntary work. This provides a checking mechanism for community leaders to identify those who are active (or not) in initiatives.
“I usually visit their houses before the voluntary work and usually they would come to the voluntary work...[L2]”

Thus, there is an active expectation that people take responsibility for their surrounding, which includes the nature strip in their closest neighbourhood. An example from Mampang Prapatan shows this expectation. It also illustrates that, where this expectation cannot be (or is not) fulfilled, they are allowed to substitute their involvement through donations, such as food or money.

“Everyone is responsible for the plant in front of their house. Because we cannot force people to be responsible for all existing plants, so we made such system. They also have to be responsible for the local road. Residents here also have got high awareness for voluntary work, if they cannot participate in community work service, they will donate food for the people who work together or donate money...[L2]”

Other tactics used by pro-volunteers in an attempt to secure engagement is by providing a visible example of good practice.

“So if someone see me carrying a broom they will automatically be ready to help, even though I don’t have any plan to do a community voluntary work...[L2]”

Such tactics are not always successful and may be ineffective or even divisive. The difficulty of accomplishing even simple and short tasks when they are outside of the preferred aspirations, motivations or practices of individuals is, of course, well known. Engagement with green placemaking is no exception as the following quote from Mampang Prapatan illustrates.

“The problem is that pros and cons will always be there. There will be residents that agree, vice versa. But in general most of them agree with it, but we never know what is inside their feelings. For example, when we gave them flowers to be watered, actually that activity is not that hard, but they still find it very difficult. We have also socialised it a couple of times that a greener environment, makes our neighbourhood cooler and beautiful to see, and if it is messed up it will look like a slum...[M5]”

Opposition is less common than disinterest and indifference.

“There are people who are interested and not interested, the one who’s not interested will become indifferent, usually when we ask them to water the plants they become sluggish...[M5]”
However, outright opposition to efforts by particular community leaders to engage them in particular green placemaking is recorded, as in the following example. Here, it is clear there were well-established uses for land that was being reclaimed for urban gardening.

“…..there was a kampung in which the idea of greening was not readily taken up. In that area there was a vacant land which was used as a waste disposal area, it took much longer for that area, but now we’ve planted TOGA there...[L2]”

The curation of green space is critical here; the skills needed are not just of gardening but of co-production and the coordination of this is undertaken within an implicit social code. The process of green space production in urban kampung is also influenced by the notion of “traditional” gender role, which is commonly found in the developing world, where women are associated with care, environmental protection, processes of maintenance and keeping, and gardening. The way the community perceives gender influences how the division of labor is created and achieved.

“At the last community voluntary work, the women cooked and the men helped out lifting plants...[L2]”

Women are particular beneficiaries of and contributors to this as they are the main providers of care and cleanliness to the neighbourhood and dwellings. It is therefore unsurprising that they were the prime supporters and motivators of green initiatives in urban kampung. In turn this strengthens and supports local solidarity.

“...here the housewives are solid, if someone is sick or there is an event such as a wedding, they will help each other...[L1]”

A variety of tactics were adopted to engage citizens in such reclamation activities. Common among these was semi-formalised education through lessons, workshops or instructions on how to plant and maintain plants in and around private dwellings. In the following example of the district of Cilandak, local government collaborates actively with community leaders in the socialization process.

“Because we still lack of greenery and green space in our neighbourhood, that’s why we try very hard to socialise it to members of the community. In order to develop a green space in their houses, they don’t need a big space; a house that doesn’t have adequate space can also do it. They can use paralon pipe to hang the plants, to make their house greener. Nowadays we can sense that oxygen is very scarce in the city, that’s why we...”
hope that each house can have a minimum of ten types of plants planted in their house. Based on national and provincial standard, each house is expected to have these 10 plants...[G7]"

The effort to spread the know-how on green knowledge is done through various ways. The most common way is conducted through community meeting or activity. On these forums, members of the community can discuss any community problems among their peers or consult to the elders. These discussion issues range from communal greenery to dengue eradication programme, and it usually takes place in public space or people houses.

“If we are in the garden we usually discuss topics related to PKK, mosquito larva eradication or unrelated matters...[M12]”

Besides community meeting, sharing knowledge on green initiatives is also conducted through other methods such as teaching, training, and workshop. One example from Cilandak shows a community leader taught members of the community on processing household waste. The way she introduced it is by teaching English to the community in order to attract participants, while at the same time they gain new language skills.

“I also teach English to children, cleaning service and also security guards. I teach scavengers how to make compost, the results are kept here...[L5]”

Non-government organizations (NGO) also play a significant role in educating the community on green initiatives. A local organization such as subud in Jakarta promotes the teaching of urban greenery through community leaders who then pass on to other members of the community.

“Yes we have, there’s training from subud and there’s also training from Mrs. Bambang who trains the community how to do composting and plant cultivation...[G7]”

Teaching the importance of urban greenery is not solely the responsibility of the community. Formal education institutions also need to adopt green education in their curriculum. This initiative has been started by several schools in Indonesia, by creating nature school (sekolah alam) or school that is inspired by nature, where many have been learning the basic green principles and its applicability to the community.
“Yes, now many schools learn here, so they can teach it to their students. They introduce the go green programme to their students...[L5]”

Training for urban greenery also comes from the government, where they also provide the community with supporting materials, such as gardening equipment and fertilizer. One of the case studies shows one neighbourhood in Srengseng Sawah that is encouraged by the government to preserve greenery in their settlement, mainly local and indigenous plants, where they also try to revive the traditional architecture as a way to strengthen the identity of the kampung. This is aligned with the function of the kampung as a cultural village.

“Then there was training from the department of agriculture on trapping system and also they gave out fertilisers...nowadays, people are encouraged to conduct greenery, so each house has its own source of oxygen. As a member of the board, we suggest Betawi style homeowners to grow Betawi style plants or other plants such as TOGA or vegetable. However, limited land has always been a problem...[G12]”

Aside from teaching and training, workshop is also one of the means to deliver the knowledge on urban greenery. Just like any other learning process, sharing the knowledge requires patience and dedication. The example explains the community workshop conducted on managing waste bank; on how household waste can be treated and produced into something valuable.

“We’ve got a program called rubbish or waste bank. So first we explain to the public that rubbish can be handy and make money, for example plastic water bottles. We can sell it to scavengers; we can also use it to make table runner or other goods. We sell the newspapers and cardboard...[L2]”

The sharing of knowledge on urban greenery could also be done by providing good examples to the community. One community leader did provide such an example by nurturing plants in her surroundings, with the hope that her steps will be followed by other members of the community.

“I usually start by putting flower plants in used cans in front of their houses, after that, the community will follow suit and they will put the flowers pot outside as well ...[L7]”

From the community perspective, the process of observing other people conducting the initiative is considered the quickest method of learning. Just like the quote below that explained how the members of the community copied the greenery model from the neighbourhood and implemented it in their houses.
"Watch the neighbourhood, clean the area. From kerja bakti, we are suggested to clean our own house. If the houses are clean, the neighbourhood will automatically be clean too. We invite people to plant and love trees. Please take care of the tree that we plant, water it. RT would normally plant the tree, and decide who is responsible for taking care of it... There are people who don’t like trees, don’t water them. They let them die in their front yard. There are a lot of people like that, so we have to persuade them slowly while we keep planting the tree...[M2]"

Apart from acting as a conduit for binding ties, green placemaking is also utilised for more diverse ends than simply planting, greenery and urban gardening. Local activities ranged from sports activities to community social gatherings. This implies that green space in urban kampung does not only function as a single purpose space but also plays an important role in providing more diverse services for diverse members of the local neighbourhood.

"Sometimes we have sports events here by the houses or out near the main road such as futsal and badminton in the evening, and often people will continue to chit-chat until late. There is a little bit of space near the main road or at the gazebo near Mrs. Ida’s house...[M6]"

Young people use the green space in urban kampung as a place of meeting and gathering. Often on the weekend the space is used for various youth events which draw in street vendors.

"...we like to hang out here, every Saturday night, we hang out and on Sunday we make events...[M6]"

In addition to social interaction space, greenery in urban kampung also caters to various needs of the community. The example below shows how people produce products that serve to benefit the community, such as medicinal herbs or children’s playgrounds. Having those functions built within the perimeter of the neighbourhood may help to build and strengthen local social ties.

"I think it’s for aesthetic, health and social purpose. What I meant with social purpose is that I plant TOGA to meet people’s needs. For example, people can take medicinal leaves. Kids can also come and play but they’re not allowed to disrupt the plants or litter. During the school holiday, this place looks like a kindergarten, lots of kids play with their dolls, chasing around one another and many more...[M2]"

Social networks are valuable and the green placemaking process facilitates its development. This includes the activities of community learning. Green initiatives are socialised through various networking activities.
“There has been community awareness since the RT members they help to socialize it to the wider community through various way and activities, baby weighing, free vitamins, competitions. For instance, if there’s counselling from the sub-district level, we will pass it over through community gathering such as arisan or ladies’ gathering activities…[M12]”

A further benefit of green placemaking lies in its potential to promote traditions and re-enliven cultural life. The example below shows how tradition was engendered through communal activities. There is a tendency to revive communal traditional values by some members of the community.

“Local wisdom has declined sharply, in the old days, people would work together to renovate a house and they were quite happy to only be paid with food…local wisdom such as social work, locating groundwater, mutual assistance, and wedding receptions are started to be brought back as well…[G12]”

Various local languages and traditions are at play, and these often do not mix easily. The example below shows how one member of the community saw the active participants in green placemaking as different and having different traditions, priorities and agendas.

“It’s owned by Betawi people. They have garden with banana and star fruit trees, and they sell the fruits. It’s their main purpose. It’s hard to communicate with them, but at least they’ve got trees and it’s great…[M2]”

Within the process of creating community green space in urban kampung, there is an optimistic, forward looking narrative. It is part of envisaging the future, in order to create a better living environment.

“Yes, because we want to encourage them to live a healthy, cleaner and greener lifestyle, that’s why I distribute plants to each houses…[L3]”

**Figure 16 Interaction and Networking in Urban Kampung**

*source: Personal Collection, 2014.*
The figure above illustrates that interaction of members of the community leads to the creation of open green space, and how open green space can increase the bond and network of the kampung members.

6.4.2 Discussion of Findings – Social Interaction and Networking in Urban Kampung

The production of shared communal space in urban kampung through the co-creation of green space reveals how the process of space creation involves multiple agencies with different priorities. During the green placemaking process, social interaction and social networking happen intensely, where various related stakeholders in urban kampung have the opportunity to interact and get to know each other more closely. This phenomenon of social interaction during the placemaking process is acknowledged by Madanipour (1996) as a common occurrence when engaging with urban space, where social and spatial aspects are closely intertwined. Furthermore, the relation between the two aspects has the tendency to influence and shape each other, where rigor and carefully orchestrated spatial design can possibly change aspects of the community’s social organisation.

The social changes caused by spatial transformation in urban kampung is very much influenced and shaped by “green agents”, where in the beginning, their presence is to help and assist in the provision of greenery in urban kampung, but later on their role develops into community activity coordinator, such as *kerja bakti* and *arisan*. The significance of such agents can also be observed in other Global South countries, such as in Singaporean society that is relatively highly controlled and monitored by the government. The Singapore government utilizes resident’s committees (RC) in every public housing development to “transmit moral guides for behaviour to the public in their constituencies” (Wilkinson 1988, p.166). There are some passing similarities with the function and role of the heads of RT/RW in urban kampung.

Success in the implementation of green initiatives in urban kampung cannot be separated from the role played by the community in the placemaking process. In particular, this is notable in attempts to take over vacant or unused land to create greenspace as a form of self-provisioning, and also challenging the establishment for not providing adequate green space in urban kampung, as is a common phenomenon in numerous low income and marginalised neighbourhoods (see Chatterton 2010; Harvey 2010; Soja 2010; Iveson 2011). Such
community-based space production requires full commitment from local stakeholders and strong social capital between them, otherwise it is highly probable that such initiatives will fail.

Numerous scholars argue that space production in urban kampung is largely influenced by Asian values and norms which are gradually internalised by the kampung’s dwellers (see Emmerson et al. 1995; Robison 1996; De Bary 1998), and are heavily influenced by confucian teaching and doctrine that see family as the core unit of the society (Chen & Chung 1994; Adler 2014). In contrast, western approaches to community involvement in design processes can be seen in the form of charrettes, that are implemented in a more clear and structured way, and emphasise consensus building with active involvement of all stakeholders (see Costello 1994; McGlynn & Murrain 1994; Walker & Seymour 2008).

While this research on urban kampung does support the evidence for different cultural factors at play, it also points to some fundamental similarities between urban public space planning and establishment across regions. Carmona (2014, p.2) argues that the framework for the creation of public space is influenced and shaped by three significance aspects; “contexts, processes and power relationship”. Within the social context of urban kampung, low income communities are faced with great challenges and pressures arising from their disadvantageous power relations, especially from the government that is strongly supported by capital intensive development and rising middle incomes exposed to consumerism and capitalism. From a social justice perspective, the process of green space creation in urban kampung can be understood as a form of resistance that exhibits communal togetherness and strength. This said, the constellation of power that is happening during the placemaking process mainly revolves around the community leaders and their active role in ensuring the success of the green initiative.

Learning from the case studies from the three kampungs in South Jakarta; strong leadership, sense of cohesiveness and inclusiveness, gotong royong and musyawarah mufakat, a community’s social capital and willingness to improve the quality of living are significant factors that influence and improve the condition of the built environment in urban kampung. Those factors reflect the values and norms that are embedded in the community where sense of eastern philosophy still strongly dominates their social lives. This research has raised an
awareness for scholars in the field of urban design, particularly for those who are practicing or researching in developing Asian countries.

6.5 Summary
Processes of informal green space production within the developing urban Asian context is an under-researched topic, and one which is increasingly important as green space disappears under the pressure of urbanisation. This research establishes that this production process in low income settlements is shaped by three significant factors, according to the findings gathered from three different locations in South Jakarta. These factors are; social structures; values and principles embedded within the community, and; interaction and relations between members of the community.

Social structure as one of the factors in the space production has a significant influence in placemaking processes in urban kampung. The households in urban kampung derive from various ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds, making for a diverse, pluralistic and multicultural neighbourhood. They are brought together informally and formally, through the creation of community-based organisations such as RT/RW, PKK, KWT and GAPOKTAN. The success of community-based organisations in urban kampung is determined by the leaders of community organizations in providing guidance and sense of hope for the community to progress and develop. The evidence from this research strongly indicates that the presence of community-based organisation provides the community with important structure and support, building and nurturing social capital and social networking within the neighbourhood. An example of their importance in urban kampung can be seen during kerja bakti, where community-based organisation really comes to work, through their extensive networks and links it is relatively easy for them to mobilize people in order to implement a particular programme. Furthermore, the discourse on social capital is rarely discussed in the realm of urban design, let alone communitarianism and the ramifications of community-based organisations in placemaking processes, where this aspect is often overlooked by urban designers which are often trapped in beautification jargon.

Other influential factors include the values and principles embedded in the community. These embedded values and principles cover several aspects such as genuine voluntarism, persistent work ethics, sincere dedication and willingness to share knowledge. Gotong royong based on
the principle of *musyawarah mufakat* as the core value of the Indonesian society is positioned as rural Indonesian in origin and is currently being challenged by a more “modern” liberal and individualistic values. The communal values/principles that are held firmly by members of the community provide the unifying factor and driving force for them to work together and create a livable neighbourhood, where these values refer to the embodiment of their character, skills and habits gained through experiences during their lifetime. In relation to socio-spatial inquiry; the community’s embedded social and cultural capital are critical in understanding their view and the dynamics happening within the community. This could be attributed to the context where the community is situated, thus it affects how certain communities value green space in their neighbourhood differently from other communities.

Social interaction and networking also influence placemaking processes, based on empirical findings, these play a substantial role in mobilizing the community to support green initiatives. Through social interaction and social networking various relevant stakeholders in urban kampung have the opportunity to interact and get to know each other more closely. The relationship between those two aspects has the tendency to influence and shape one another, where through rigor and carefully orchestrated spatial design it could possibly change the community’s social dimension, especially the society. Community initiative in the provision of green space can be understood as a critique, and as a way of challenging the establishment for not providing adequate green space in urban kampung, where the community is left with neglected built environment and poor urban access. Space production through social interaction and networking in urban kampung is influenced by eastern values and norms that sees family as the core unit of the society and these values are gradually internalized by the kampung dwellers. The discussion on social space within the realm of urban design in the developing Asian context is rarely discussed by influential urban design scholars, which has created a gap in understanding the knowledge of urban design from this context, and it is time for urban scholars in this region to better understand the social-spatial aspects of placemaking processes from a local perspective.

Placemaking processes in urban kampung are influenced by three important aspects; social structures, values and norms and also social interaction. Social-spatial aspects are often overlooked by planners and designers in the developing world, giving way to capital intensive development that sees social issues as a nuisance to development. In addition, the empirical evidence suggests that the provision of green space through community-led
initiative not only improves the quality of the built environment of urban kampung but also builds ties between community members and enhances their social capital and cohesion.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

This chapter describes the summary and conclusions of this research, consisting of a section detailing the conclusion of the research findings, then sequentially followed by an explanation of the research contributions, limitations and recommendations for further research. The research contribution, both to knowledge and practice is also summarised in this chapter, as are the limitations and constraints on the research findings.

The research is concerned with the phenomenon of community-based green space in the Global South contexts of emerging megacities, with specific focus on the case study of Jakarta. Jakarta has grown significance as a global city and one of Asia’s megacities that is facing rapid urban development coupled with numerous urban problems. This research focuses on understanding the socio-spatial relations in placemaking processes on the low income settlement locally called urban kampung by looking at how green space is created and shaped by the community.

To guide the research the following overarching research question was used:

“How and why is urban green space made and sustained in urban kampung?”

This was then further supported by two secondary questions:
- What is the meaning and significance of open green space for the community living in urban kampung?
- What factors influence the creation of open green space by the community in urban kampung?

These questions were in turn addressed through a combination of secondary and primary research. The primary research was focused in three neighbourhoods of urban kampung located in the district of Mampang Prapatan, district of Cilandak and district of Jagakarsa. As discussed in the research methods chapter, the selection of these neighbourhoods is based on a variety of factors including the proximity of the sites to the city centre and major infrastructure projects. In addition, the selection of the case studies also considers the implementation of green initiatives which have been implemented in those neighbourhoods.
The research is oriented toward the discourse of phenomenology. Ontologically, the research follows ideas of constructivism, where the theory suggests that humans create meaning and knowledge from their experiences. Meanwhile epistemologically in constructivism the relationship between the investigator and the investigation is biased and opaque, where the sound and language of the investigator could unconsciously influence the course and outcome of the research. Nevertheless the objectivity and reality that is built through this paradigm is the result of mutual consensus and constructions, this includes the investigator’s constructions.

The methods chosen were of qualitative nature, and were selected to enable an examination of socio-spatial relations within the observed placemaking processes. The advantage of applying a qualitative approach in this research is that it emphasises the interviewee’s point of view and allows the researcher to ask a diverse range of questions which gives insight into what the interviewer sees as relevant and important. The research drew upon semi-structured interviews with open ended questions, providing rich in-depth data. During data collection process, 35 respondents were interviewed between 19 April 2014 and 17 June 2014, and across three groups of interviewees, namely: (1) community leaders, (2) members of the community, and (3) government officials from three different neighbourhoods/urban kampung.

7.1 Contribution to Knowledge

The discourse on green space within the realm of urban design in the developing context is relatively new. This research is therefore pioneering in drawing upon western theories and empirical studies but also locating these within a Global South context. As such, the findings have parallels with previous work but also build upon it and provide new insights. In the empirical study of urban Kampung, I found that image, identity and memory are central in the constructed meanings of green space. Moreover, self-maintained urban green space has a significant role in strengthening the community’s sense of place, maintaining social capital, and contributing to a sense of belonging and place attachment. The existence of urban greenery in urban kampung also help to ensure food security in the neighbourhood unit, where food and medicinal plant growing is conducted both in public and private spaces that are subject to the owner’s consent and approval.
The benefits of urban agriculture are not limited to meeting daily nutritional needs but also provide economic benefits in reducing household expenditure and providing saleable commodities. It also provides a focus point for communal activity. Indeed, the utilization of green space as a community interaction space is a significant element of the meaning of green space. This finding may be applicable more broadly in the developing context, across cities in the Global South where informal formation and usage of space is profoundly influenced by structure of society and provides a focal point for communal action.

The presence of informal green space in the kampung provides a material basis for green related communal activity, such as *kerja bakti*, where through this initiative members of the community work together to clean and improve the quality of their settlement. Here, the essence of the activity is not solely for keeping healthy but also provides a means to reflect and strengthen community ties.

In this way, the research contributes to knowledge of *how and why urban green space is made and sustained in urban kampung*. In relation to the first supporting question, “*what is the meaning and significance of open green space for the community living in urban kampung?*”: As stated in the summary discussion on the meanings of green space in the Global South context (Chapter 5; page 114), the research found four main arguments that underline the redefinition, meanings and significance of green space in urban kampung; communal memory and identity, food security, social interaction and human well-being.

These findings challenge the dominance of the idea adopted by many designers, planners and policymakers in the Global South countries that seek to simply adopt the understanding of the developed context.

Space production through social-spatial processes within the urban Asian context is rarely discussed among urban scholars. Society’s social structure has a significant influence in placemaking processes, where the social system in urban kampung is manifested through the creation of community-based organisations such as RT/RW, PKK, KWT and GAPOKTAN. An example of their importance in urban kampung can be seen during *kerja bakti*, where community-based organisation really comes alive, through their extensive networks and links. Social cohesion means it is relatively easy for them to mobilise people in order to implement particular collective actions. The values and principles that are embedded in the community are sufficiently shared to facilitate these processes. *Gotong royong* based on the
principle of *musyawarah mufakat* as the core value of the Indonesian society is the communal core value/principle that are is firmly by members of the community. This provides a unifying factor and driving force for them to work together and create a livable neighbourhood. Social interaction and networking is made possible. Through social interaction and social networking, various related stakeholders in urban kampung have the opportunity to interact and to know each other more closely. The relation between these two aspects has the tendency to influence and shape one another.

Related to the second supporting research question, “*what factors influence the creation of open green space by the community in urban kampung?*”: As discussed above, open green space production in urban Kampung is shaped by three significant factors; social structures, values and principles embedded within the community and interaction and networking between members of the community. As per the discussion on production of social space in urban kampung (Chapter 6; page 146), the research findings suggest that the production of open green space in urban kampung is shaped by the social dynamics within the community. In broad terms this accords with the theory of space production of Henri Lefebvre (1991) and the interplay of social capital as explained by Pierre Bourdieu (1986). However, there are divergences in processes of space production, in particular, in the informality and community based characteristics of urban kampung, contrasting with dominant western models of urban space production that are relatively highly controlled and regulated.

Based on the empirical findings the notion of green space in the Global South context, especially in low income settlements, is multi-faceted, dynamic, spontaneous and informal. The placemaking process of creating urban greenery in these settlements is greatly influenced and shaped by social structures in the community, including social class and mobility, social interaction, social norms and values. In turn, these are shaped by the urban green space. All of these variables that support the placemaking process of low income settlements in the Global South context, help to explain the discourse of urban design in the Asian context, which is distinct and different from western counterparts, where the knowledge is created and nurtured, and also where processes emanate from different conventions, regulatory settings and cultural mores.

Addressing the main research question, “*how and why is urban green space made and sustained in urban kampung?*”, this research helps to unpack and understand the dynamics of
placemaking in this type of settlement, while at the same time contribute to the knowledge of urban design focusing on socio-spatial aspects of green placemaking processes in low income settlements in the context of a developing Asian megacity. To answer the question above, the notion of placemaking as one of the fundamental theories in the realm of urban design is a useful starting point. However, it has been developed in a Global North context, and cannot be simply applied to this context considering the many differences that exist between the two. Where in practice the process of creating open green space in the Global South context often intersects with issues of informality and irregularity, as discussed by Kim Dovey (2012), which is also found in the critique of placemaking processes by Matthew Carmona (2014b; 2015a). To address how open green space is created, maintained and interpreted in the context of low income settlements, these differences must be acknowledged.

The contribution that this research makes towards the development of urban design in the context of emerging Asian cities is timely, given the urgent need for urban design knowledge that is responsive to Asia’s urban problems. The challenges faced by these cities are growing as land is consumed under urbanisation pressures. In this context the value of and processes of green urban space is paramount, which is why this study becomes very important for many Asian cities in the present and future.

7.2 Contribution to Practice
The practical contribution of this research can be grouped into two parts, firstly the contribution to policy development related to the provision on green space and low income settlement, and secondly, the possibility of a strategy to improve the quality of built environment in urban kampung by injecting green ideas/initiatives into neighbourhoods in ways that learn from the three case examples.

The implications of this research for policy development in Jakarta and other cities in Indonesia which has similar social, economy and cultural conditions with Jakarta, are as follows:
- Adding to current policy debate on housing and settlement in Indonesia, especially on the approach for the improvement of low income settlements for medium to big cities with population between 1-5 million inhabitants, where in-situ improvements can be achieved through community involvement.
- Provide an alternative policy for the provision of green space for Indonesian cities, one approach that can be learned from this research is that community-based green space should be considered as an effective tool in providing urban green space.
- As an input for policy or decision makers in creating a socially inclusive urban society, where communal activity at local/grassroot level can be used as an instrument for social capacity building, especially in heterogenous urban societies like Jakarta.

7.3 Research Limitation
The limitations and constraints faced by the researcher in carrying out this research are as follows:
- The research focuses on three neighbourhoods in the municipality of South Jakarta, where these samples do not represent all low income communities in the Province of Jakarta; additional cases would inevitably further enlightened the knowledge gained from this research.
- In terms of the research respondents, the researcher did not explicitly ask for their monthly income or expenditure, by knowing their average income, it could accurately help to better understand the sum of money that they would spend to improve the quality of their neighbourhood.

7.4 Further Research
Based on the research limitations and constraints, further research is needed to better understand the nature of urban kampung from various perspectives, especially the relation between social and spatial aspects. The following are further researches that could be developed.
- The role of women in the placemaking process in low income settlement, focusing on the decision making process.
- Green initiatives in urban kampung as a means to provide food sustainability at neighbourhood level.
- The economic benefits of green initiative in urban kampung and how it could leverage the livelihood of the community, while at the same time reducing the poverty rate in the city.
7.5 Closing Statement

Urban kampung is an integral and inseparable part of the formation of Indonesian cities, and despite its close association with slums, disorder and informal settlement, it is imperative to recognise that this type of settlement provides basic infrastructure for a significant proportion of disadvantaged city dwellers. So long as appropriate settlement has not been provided by the Government, especially for poor city dwellers, the most feasible short term solution is to improve the quality of environment of these settlements; including through the provision of green space. Although green placemaking processes conducted by low income communities in urban kampung seems to be informally and sporadically carried out, in fact, it follows clear rationales and processes, and in so doing, strengthens notions of togetherness and inclusiveness in its implementation, reflecting basic principles that underly local values of communality.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A Research Instrument

The following are details of each survey instrument:

INTERVIEW
Interviews were conducted with several resource persons, which are grouped into three categories, namely government officials, community leaders, and community members.

A. Government Officials
The interview with government officials were set out to find out the current and future policies on the provision of Jakarta’s urban green space in general, and specifically policies related to quality improvement of urban kampung with a focus on green initiative and infrastructure. The interviewees consist of government officials of different government levels from provincial to sub-district level.

1. Provincial Government, consisted of:
   - Park and Cemetery Agency of Special Capital Region of Jakarta.

2. Municipal Government, consisted of:
   - Park Agency of the Municipality of South Jakarta.

3. District Governments, consisted of:
   - District of Mampang Prapatan;
   - District of Cilandak;
   - District of Jagakarsa.

3. Sub-district Governments, consisted of:
   - Sub-district of Mampang Prapatan;
   - Sub-district of Cilandak Barat;
   - Sub-district of Srengseng Sawah.
B. Community Leaders

Community leaders are one of the important elements in promoting and implementing green space initiative. Through their leadership several urban kampung in Indonesia has succeed in creating greener environment for their settlement. In this research, the interviewees are leaders at grassroots level, such as religious leader, community elders, head of Harmonious Neighbourhood / Rukun Tetangga (RT) and head of Harmonious Citizen / Rukun Warga (RW) of each kampung.

C. Community Members

Interviews were conducted on community members who are active in the green initiative programme implemented in their neighbourhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Main Research Questions</th>
<th>Supporting Questions</th>
<th>Interviewees*</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How and why is urban green space shaped and maintained in urban kampung?</td>
<td>- Who are the prominent actors in safeguarding &amp; providing green space in urban kampung?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Identification of stakeholder</td>
<td>Criteria for the provision of green space in urban kampung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- What are the technical requirements for developing green space in urban kampung?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical requirements for developing green space in urban kampung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- How is the community involved in the process of developing &amp; managing green space in urban kampung?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Ways that the community is involved in the provision of green space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- What is the role of government in supporting the provision of green space in urban kampung?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Identification of government’s role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- In what capacity NGO supports the green initiative in urban kampung?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identification of non-government organization’s role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Main Research Questions</td>
<td>Supporting Questions</td>
<td>Interviewees*</td>
<td>Expected Outcomes</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What is the meaning and significance of open green space for the community living in urban kampung?</td>
<td>- What is the ideal structure of community governance system that is supportive of the green initiative in urban kampung?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- How is the role of community governance in ensuring the success of green initiative in urban kampung?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- How does the community participate in the community governance?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- How is the relation between government and community governance in ensuring the success of green initiative in urban kampung?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What factors influence the creation of open green space by the community in urban kampung?</td>
<td>- How does the community living in kampung benefit from the green space in their settlement?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Does the green space improve the quality of the built-environment?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) Information:
A: Government
B: Community Leaders
C: Community
**LOGBOOK**

The logbook is used to record any information related to the research. This logbook was used during participant observation, and also when distributing the questionnaire and interviewing the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Logbook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Respondent identity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Address :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT/RW :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phone :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Email :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Variable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>- the percentage of green space compared to build up space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- variety of plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- indigenous/native plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- composting site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Additional information</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Logbook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Respondent identity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Address :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT/RW :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phone :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Email :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Variable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>- the percentage of green space compared to build up space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- variety of plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- indigenous/native plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- composting site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Additional information</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF DOCUMENTS
The list of documents are needed to guide researcher in finding the appropriate document to support the research process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title of Document</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jakarta’s Master plan (Rencana Tata Ruang Wilayah Provinsi DKI Jakarta)</td>
<td>2010-2030</td>
<td>Provincial Government of Jakarta (Pemerintah Provinsi DKI Jakarta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Statistic of Jakarta 2013 (Jakarta dalam Angka 2013)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Jakarta Statistic Bureau (Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi DKI Jakarta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Statistic of South Jakarta 2012 (Jakarta Selatan dalam Angka 2013)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>South Jakarta Statistic Bureau (Badan Pusat Statistik Kota Administratif Jakarta Selatan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Detail Plan for District of Cilandak (Rencana Detail Tata Ruang Kecamatan Cilandak)</td>
<td>2013-2018</td>
<td>Planning Agency of Jakarta (Dinas Tata Kota Provinsi DKI Jakarta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Detail Plan for District of Jagakarsa (Rencana Detail Tata Ruang Kecamatan Jagakarsa)</td>
<td>2013-2018</td>
<td>Planning Agency of Jakarta (Dinas Tata Kota Provinsi DKI Jakarta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Master Plan for Green Space in Jakarta (Rencana Pengembangan Ruang Terbuka Hijau di Provinsi DKI Jakarta) ****</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Provincial Government of Jakarta (Pemerintah Provinsi DKI Jakarta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Master Plan of Betawi Cultural Village Developing at Setu Babakan (Rencana Pengembangan Perkampungan Budaya Betawi Setu Babakan) ****</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Provincial Government of Jakarta (Pemerintah Provinsi DKI Jakarta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Master Plan of Kampung Improvement Program in Jakarta (Rencana Perbaikan Kawasan Perkampungan di Provinsi DKI Jakarta) ****</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Provincial Government of Jakarta (Pemerintah Provinsi DKI Jakarta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ciliwung River Management Plan (Rencana Pengelolaan DAS Sungai Ciliwung)****</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment (Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B Fieldwork Logbook

Saturday, 19 April 2014
Landed in Jakarta and continued with weekend holiday.

Sunday, 20 April 2014
Weekend holiday.

Monday, 21 April 2014
Pre-survey stages (translating research questions and all the necessary documents to Bahasa Indonesia, creating research guidelines, and finalizing the selection of research methods).

Tuesday, 22 April 2014
Pre-survey stages (translating research questions and all the necessary documents to Bahasa Indonesia, creating research guidelines, and finalizing the selection of research methods).

Wednesday, 23 April 2014
Pre-survey stages (translating research questions and all the necessary documents to Bahasa Indonesia, creating research guidelines, and finalizing the selection of research methods).

Thursday, 24 April 2014
Pre-survey stages (translating research questions and all the necessary documents to Bahasa Indonesia, creating research guidelines, and finalizing the selection of research methods).

Friday, 25 April 2014
Pilot survey to three kampung settlements; (1) Kampung Mampang Prapatan, (2) Kampung Banjarsari, Cilandak, and (3) Kampung Setu Babakan, Jagakarsa.

Saturday, 26 April 2014
Weekend holiday – data analysis.

Sunday, 27 April 2014
Weekend holiday – data analysis.
Monday, 28 April 2014
Revision and improving article for book chapter at Peking University, Beijing, China.

Tuesday, 29 April 2014
Revision and improving article for book chapter at Peking University, Beijing, China.

Wednesday, 30 April 2014
Conducted interview with community member Mrs. Hj. Siti Shoimah, who lives at RT 011/RW 05, she has a significant portion of green space in her small house.

Thursday, 01 May 2014 (Labour Day)
Conducted interview with community member Mrs. Unaesyah, (Mrs. Icha), who lives at RT 011/RW 05, who along with Mrs. Siti Shoimah are active members of ‘kader lingkungan’ (environmental cadres). Aside from that interview were also conducted with community leader, Head of RT 007/RW 05, Mrs. Rosmita (Mrs. Emi). Site visit to RT 011’s composting area located at the house of the Head of RT 011.

Friday, 02 May 2014
Conducted interview with government official at Sub-district level. The respondent was Mr. Abdul Manaf (Chief of Environment & Cleanliness for the Sub-district of Mampang Prapatan) at the Sub-district office.

Saturday, 03 May 2014
Conducted interview with community member from RT 007/RW05, Mr. Sarjono. He is very active in taking care of the environment in his neighbourhood, although he didn’t have any greenery in his house.

Sunday, 04 May 2014
Conducted interview with leader of RT 008 / RW 05, Mrs. Hj. Djuraidah Machmud (Idha). She is very active and persistent in persuading the community in her neighbourhood to be actively involved in the greenery programme.
Monday, 05 May 2014
Conducted interview with leader of RT 011 / RW 05, Mrs. Bastiana (Ana) and Mr. Heru Santoso as the secretary of RT 011 / RW 05.

Tuesday, 06 May 2014
Conducted interview with community members from RT 008 / RW 05, Mrs. Iramiyati and Mrs. Sri Wimujati. Both of them are active members of the community who are very much concerned about greenery in their neighbourhood. Continued with making appointment with Mrs. Ani (Chief of park & greenery for the district of Mampang Prapatan) on Thursday (08 May 2014) around 8.00 am.

Wednesday, 07 May 2014
Went to the Directorate General of High Education, Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs Republic of Indonesia to report study progress at RMIT but failed to meet the person in charge.

Thursday, 08 May 2014
Conducted interview with government official at District level. The respondent was Mrs. Aris Setiani (Chief of Park & Greenery for the District of Mampang Prapatan) at the district office and continued to the Municipal office but couldn’t meet the person in charge of the community programme.

Friday, 09 May 2014
Went to the Directorate General of High Education, Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs Republic of Indonesia to report study progress at RMIT.

Saturday, 10 May 2014
Weekend holiday – data analysis.

Sunday, 11 May 2014
Weekend holiday – data analysis.
Monday, 12 May 2014  
Conducted interview with government official at Municipality level. The respondent was Mrs. Dra. Euis Mulyawati (Chief for Community Participation, Bureau of Park, Municipality of South Jakarta) at the City Town Hall and continued to the Park and Cemetery Agency for the Special Capital Region of Jakarta but failed to meet the person in charge, instead I handed over survey letter which will be processed within 2 days.

Tuesday, 13 May 2014  
Went to Kampung Banjarsari, Cilandak to organize interview session with the green initiator of the neighbourhood, followed by visit to Kampung Setu Babakan to find potential contact person.

Wednesday, 14 May 2014  
In the morning went to the Bureau of Park and Cemetery for the Special Capital Region of Jakarta to meet with the head of the community involvement. The permission letter to conduct interview with him has been submitted on Monday, 12 May 2014 to the administration, but unfortunately he has not received the letter and he was also in the middle of a meeting. In the afternoon continued with visiting the office of Cilandak Barat Sub-district and had an interview with several government officials, namely: (1) Mr. H. Abdul Rachman, Chief of Environment & Cleanliness for the Sub-district of Cilandak Barat; (2) Mrs. Lumiat Sinaga, Chief of Infrastructure & Facilities for the Sub-district of Cilandak Barat; (3) Mrs. Triyas Mindriyati, S.Sos., Chief of Public Welfare for the Sub-district of Cilandak Barat; and (4) Mrs. Tri Septianingsih, Secretary of PKK (Guiding for Family Welfare) for the Sub-district of Cilandak Barat.

Thursday, 15 May 2014 (Vesak Day)  
National Holiday – data analysis.

Friday, 16 May 2014  
In the morning visited community at RW 02, Kelurahan Cilandak Barat, Kecamatan Cilandak, Jakarta Selatan and joined a community gathering organized by PKK (Family Welfare Movement) organization which discussed one of the community activity in the neighbourhood. Which was then continued by meeting with members of PKK and visited the PKK’s garden and conducted interviews with five members of PKK, namely: (1) Mrs. Yayah
Rohaniyah; (2) Mrs. Susilowati; (3) Mrs. Naimah; (4) Mrs. Sri Wahyuningsih; and (5) Mrs. Hj. Kamsiyah. In the afternoon conducted interview with government officials at Bureau of Park & Cemetery, Special Capital Region of Jakarta, namely: (1) Mr. Surya Wargo (Secretary for the Head of Bureau of Park & Cemetery, Special Capital Region of Jakarta); and (2) Mrs. Verly Indah Natalia (Staff at Community Involvement Section, Bureau of Park & Cemetery, Special Capital Region of Jakarta).

Saturday, 17 May 2014
Weekend holiday – data analysis.

Sunday, 18 May 2014
Weekend holiday – data analysis.

Monday, 19 May 2014
Went to the Cilandak District office to conduct interview with the head of Park, but apparently the division of park is separated from the main district office. Later in the evening went to the Park division office, but unfortunately the head was having a meeting at the Town Hall.

Tuesday, 20 May 2014
Conducted interview with leaders of PKK (Guiding for Family Welfare) RW 002, namely: (1) Mrs. Suhartinah and (2) Mrs. Hj. Kamsiyah related to PKK’s programme which concerns green space in their dwellings. Later in the afternoon continued to the Cilandak District office to conduct interview with the head of Agriculture & Forestry, but apparently she was absent.

Wednesday, 21 May 2014
Went to the Cilandak District office to conduct interview with the Head of Agriculture & Forestry, but apparently she was absent.

Thursday, 22 May 2014
Day off – data analysis.
Friday, 23 May 2014
Supposed to have an interview session with the head of Agriculture & Forestry for the District of Cilandak, but then she cancelled.

Saturday, 24 May 2014
Weekend holiday – data analysis.

Sunday, 25 May 2014
Conducted interview with Mrs. Harini Bambang Wahono head of GAPOKTAN (Gabungan Kelompok Tani) for the Sub-district of Cilandak Barat.

Monday, 26 May 2014
Went to Kampung Setu Babakan to make an appointment with the management of the kampung, but apparently the management office was closed.

Tuesday, 27 May 2014 (Ascension of the prophet Muhammad)
National Holiday – data analysis.

Wednesday, 28 May 2014
Joined a workshop conducted by Mrs. Bambang Wahono head of GAPOKTAN Sub-district of Cilandak Barat, which then followed by interview with member of community that used to reject the idea of greenery in their neighbourhood, Mrs. Fransiska R. Eka Wahyuni.

Thursday, 29 May 2014 (Ascension Day)
National Holiday – data analysis.

Friday, 30 May 2014
Went to Bandung to report study progress to Institute Technology of Bandung (ITB).

Saturday, 31 May 2014
Went to Bandung to report study progress to Institute Technology of Bandung (ITB).

Sunday, 01 June 2014
Went to Bandung to report study progress to Institute Technology of Bandung (ITB).
Monday, 02 June 2014
Joined community meeting at RW 03, Sub-district of Cilandak Barat, District of Cilandak, South Jakarta Municipality to discuss urban farming in their neighbourhood. Continued interviewing community leaders, namely: (1) Mr. Slamet Prayitno, Head of RT 004/RW 03; (2) Mr. Willy N. Poluan, Head of RT 009/RW 03; and (3) Mr. Benyamin Kuhu from the Village/Sub-district Community Representative. Later in the afternoon continued to City hall of South Jakarta to obtain interview permit to conduct interview with the Head of Agriculture for the District of Cilandak.

Tuesday, 03 June 2014
Conducted interview with government officials from the District of Cilandak, namely: (1) Mrs. Eti Rohaeti (Head of Agriculture for the District of Cilandak) and; (2) Mr. Sarno (Agriculture Instructor for the District of Cilandak) regarding community based agricultural activity in District of Cilandak.

Wednesday, 04 June 2014
Went to District of Cilandak office to collect a book about productive greenery in Jakarta, then continued to Statistical Bureau of Jakarta to find statistical data from 2013 on the Municipality of South Jakarta and the Province of Jakarta. In the afternoon went to Maritime and Agricultural Agency for the province of Jakarta to make an interview appointment with the head of Agricultural Division.

Thursday, 05 June 2014
Went to the Sub-district office of Srengseng Sawah and conducted interview with the vice Head of Srengseng Sawah Sub-district namely Mr. Suwarto.

Friday, 06 June 2014
Conducted interview with the Head of Setu Babakan Cultural Village regarding government programme in that village and efforts that the government has done to improve the environment in Setu Babakan.

Saturday, 07 June 2014
Weekend holiday – data analysis.
**Sunday, 08 June 2014**
Weekend holiday – data analysis.

**Monday, 09 June 2014**
Day off.

**Tuesday, 10 June 2014**
Went to tourism and cultural agency for the DKI Jakarta Province and handed over permission letter to conduct interview.

**Wednesday, 11 June 2014**
Went to Maritime and Agriculture Agency for the DKI Jakarta Province to check the progress of permission letter to conduct interview.

**Thursday, 12 June 2014**
Day off.

**Friday, 13 June 2014**
Went to Surabaya to visit family and relatives – data analysis.

**Saturday, 14 June 2014**
Went to Surabaya to visit family and relatives – data analysis.

**Sunday, 15 June 2014**
Went to Surabaya to visit family and relatives – data analysis.

**Monday, 16 June 2014**
Went to Surabaya to visit family and relatives – data analysis.

**Tuesday, 17 June 2014**
Flying back to Melbourne
Appendix C List of Interviewees

1. Interview with Community Leaders

District of Mampang Prapatan

The community leaders interviewed in Mampang Prapatan were selected from three different neighbourhood / rukun tetangga (RT) in the area, namely RT 007, RT 008 and RT 011. For the purpose of this research, five community leaders were interviewed, namely Mrs. Rosmita (Emi) leader of RT 007, Mrs. Djuraidah Machmud (Idha) leader of RT 008, and Mrs. Bastiana (Ana) leader of RT 011 along with her secretary Bapak Heru Santoso and her treasurer Mrs. Unaesyah (Icha). The community leaders from Kampung Mampang Prapatan interviewed for this research are all female, and actively involved in the early childhood education in their neighbourhood.

Table 3 Profile of Community Leaders in Mampang Prapatan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Rosmita (Emi)</td>
<td>Head of Community</td>
<td>RT 007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Djuraidah Machmud (Idha)</td>
<td>Head of Community</td>
<td>RT 008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Bastiana (Ana)</td>
<td>Head of Community</td>
<td>RT 011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Heru Santoso</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>RT 011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mrs. Rosmita (Emi) is the head of RT 007 since 2013. Before becoming the head of the community she used to be treasurer of RT 007 and also actively involved in Family Welfare Movement (Pembinaan Kesejahteraan Keluarga – PKK), which is an organization which promotes family welfare through women’s active role in family and in the community. Currently, she is teaching toddlers in an early childhood centre in the neighbourhood which is aligned with her degree in teaching.

Mrs. Djuraidah (Idha) is the head of RT 008 and has served in that position for more than a decade. Aside from being a community leader, Mrs. Idha also works as an early childhood teacher and a travel agent. She developed communication with the community through house visit each morning every day.
Mrs. Bastiana (Ana) is the head of RT 011 and has been in the same position for more than a decade. She is a housewife and works at the early childhood centre. She used to be an environmental cadre for a private company (PT. Unilever) in Indonesia. By being environmental cadres, she is actively advocating the benefits of protecting and preserving the environments in her neighbourhood.

**Figure 17 Community Leaders in Mampang Prapatan**

*(Left to Right: Mrs. Emi, Mrs. Idha and Mrs. Ana & Mr. Heru)*

*Source: Personal Collection, 2014.*

**District of Cilandak**

The community leaders interviewed in Cilandak lived in the different area or known as *Rukun Warga* - RW (Harmonious Citizen) with the selected RWs are RW 002, RW 003 and RW 008. Green spaces in this neighbourhood come in different shape and sizes. In RW 002 the community cultivate vacant land that was donated by one of the community members for the purpose of agriculture/urban farming, whilst in RW 003 the community enjoy a considerable amount of green space in their neighbourhood, donation from Indonesian former first lady, Mrs. Fatmawati Soekarno. Whereas community living in RW 008 could only provide greenery in their houses and along the street and alleys due to land shortage.

**Table 4 Profile of Community Leaders in Cilandak**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Suhartinah</td>
<td>Former Head of PKK</td>
<td>RW 002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Hj. Kamsiyah</td>
<td>Secretary of PKK</td>
<td>RW 002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Willy</td>
<td>Head of Community</td>
<td>RW 003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mrs. Suhartinah and Mrs. Hj. Kamsiyah was the former head of PKK RW 002, Sub-district of Cilandak Barat, the municipality of South Jakarta. In their community they routinely organized activities that aim to empower women and housewives in the neighbourhood. One of which is through community-based urban farming. The initiatives are conducted in a space provided by one of the community members.

Mrs. Harini Bambang Wahono (Harini) was the former head of PKK RW 008, Sub-district of Cilandak Barat, the municipality of South Jakarta. She has been actively promoting green initiative movement in her neighbourhood since 1986. Aside from that she has received numerous awards and recognition both from the Indonesian government and from international organization due to her continuous effort in educating the community on the importance of the green environment in her neighbourhood.

Mr. Willy, Mr. Slamet Prayitno (Slamet) and Mr. Benyamin Kuhu (Benyamin) are community leaders in RW 003, Sub-district of Cilandak Barat, the Municipality of South Jakarta. RW 003 has a neighbourhood green space that was given by former Indonesian first lady, Mrs. Fatmawati Soekarno. Now this space is used for various community activities ranging from community meeting to garden training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Slamet Prayitno</td>
<td>Head of Community</td>
<td>RW 003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Benyamin Kuhu</td>
<td>Community representative in the local government</td>
<td>RW 003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Harini Bambang Wahono</td>
<td>Former head of PKK &amp; Head of Urban Farming Association</td>
<td>RW 008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District of Jagakarsa

Meanwhile in the district of Jagakarsa, *Perkampungan Budaya Betawi* (PBB) or Betawi Cultural Village (BCV) is selected as the case study, due to its consistency and endless effort in preserving and maintaining open green space in their settlement. The settlement consists of several RT and RW that are protected by a governor decree which makes any structural and significant changes to the built environment need to consult with and be approved by the BCV administrator.

The Head of BCV is Mr. Indra Sutrisna, who is ethnically a Betawi and is considered an important and influential community leader in the village, and is also native to the area as he was born and raised in the cultural village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Indra Sutisna</td>
<td>Head of the Administrator of Betawi’s Cultural Village</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The village green initiative consists of numerous green projects and kampung upgrading, implemented both by the Provincial government and the community living in the village. This includes, preservation of traditional houses, development and improvement of waterfront area, replantation of local and indigenous plants and vegetations, and preservation of traditional culture and way of life.
2. Interview with Members of the Community

District of Mampang Prapatan

There are five members of the community that were interviewed in Mampang Prapatan. One of the most influential community members in Mampang Prapatan is Mrs. Hj. Siti Shoimah (Shoimah). Mrs. Shoimah is known for her significant contribution in promoting green initiatives in the neighbourhood; she also open her garden for public use. She decorated the garden’s landscape with various plant and hardscape, one of which is traditional medicinal herbs known as *TOGA (Tanaman Obat Keluarga)* in Bahasa Indonesia.

Other community members who did not have adequate space for greenery in their houses usually will plant in small pots outside their houses or along the alleyways. Aside from that they could also contribute to community works, which is usually conducted every weekend. These activities include neighbourhood cleaning, processing recycle waste into handicrafts and processing solid waste.

![Figure 19 Community Leaders in Jagakarsa](image1)

*Figure 19 Community Leaders in Jagakarsa
Source: Personal Collection, 2014.*

![Figure 20 Members of the Community in Mampang Prapatan](image2)

*Figure 20 Members of the Community in Mampang Prapatan
Source: Personal Collection, 2014.*
Table 6 Profile of Community Members in Mampang Prapatan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Hj. Siti Shoimah</td>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>RT 011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Unaesyah (Icha)</td>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>RT 011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sarjono</td>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>RT 008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Iramiyati</td>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>RT 007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Sri Wimujati</td>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>RT 007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District of Cilandak
A community in Cilandak conducted green initiatives in their neighbourhood through various ways. An example is the community living in RW 002, where through PKK the community that mostly consisted of women and housewives created a farming area in a vacant land owned by one of the community members. By having a farming garden in their neighbourhood, they find that they are able to reduce food costs because they can grow it by themselves. Furthermore, the presence of farming area in their neighbourhood also helps to strengthen the community.

Figure 21 Community Activity in RW 002, Cilandak
Source: Personal Collection, 2014.

Meanwhile, the community in RW 003 with the help and guidance from the local government started to plant an economically viable fruit in their neighbourhood, namely the dragon fruit. This is due to its attractive selling price and easy to nurture compared to other fruit. Aside from that, they would also like to make dragon fruit as the icon of the neighbourhood.
Meanwhile community in RW 008 known as Kampung Banjarsari has started the green initiative program as early as 1990, which was initiated by one of the PKK leaders. Currently Kampung Banjarsari has become an example for other kampungs in Jakarta for its implementation of community-based green kampung initiatives and also a learning center for PKK all over Indonesia that teaches environmental protection and preservation at neighbourhood level. Although the community in Kampung Banjarsari does not have adequate space for green space, but it did not stop them in providing greenery in their neighbourhood through various means, such as medicinal herbs garden in every house, waste recycling and greenery along sidewalk and alleyway.

### Table 7 Profile of Community Members in Cilandak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Yayah Rohaniyah</td>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>RW 002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Susilowati</td>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>RW 002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Naimah</td>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>RW 002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Sri Wahyuningsih</td>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>RW 002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Interview with Government Officials

The Provincial Government of Jakarta

At the provincial level, the Park and Cemetery Agency is responsible for the creation of open green space in low-income settlements.

Park & Cemetery Agency

Park and Cemetery agency is one of the government bodies that are working closely with the community in urban kampung to ensure that neighbourhoods are environmentally livable. They will work together with the community and assist them in every green initiative the community developed. This includes providing various logistical needs such as the right plant and gardening equipment for each neighbourhood, assistance in nurturing the plant and processing the solid waste that are produced by the plant. Aside from that, the agency also tries to promote clean and healthy lifestyle through various community activities.

With this agency, In-depth interviews were conducted with two government officials that work closely with policies on community initiatives. The officials are Mr. Surya Wargo, Deputy Head of the Bureau and Mrs. Vely Indah Natalia, a staff at the Department of Partnership Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Fransiska</td>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>RW 008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Surya Wargo</td>
<td>Deputy head of the Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Vely Indah Natalia</td>
<td>Staff at the Department of partnership development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Municipality of South Jakarta

At the municipal level, data and information regarding community-led green initiatives were gathered from various sources, namely the Municipality Park Agency, District of Mampang Prapatan, Sub-district of Mampang Prapatan, District of Cilandak, Sub-district of Cilandak Barat, and Sub-district of Srengseng Sawah.
Municipality of South Jakarta

Table 9 Profile of Government Officials at the Municipality of South Jakarta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Dra. Euis Mulyawati</td>
<td>Deputy Head of Park Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District of Mampang Prapatan

Table 10 Profile of Government Officials at the District of Mampang Prapatan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Abdul Manaf</td>
<td>Sub-district of Mampang Prapatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Aris Setiani</td>
<td>District of Mampang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District of Cilandak

Table 11 Profile of Government Officials at the District of Cilandak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. Abdul Rachman</td>
<td>Sub-district of Cilandak Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lumiati Sinaga</td>
<td>Sub-district of Cilandak Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Triyas Mindriyati, S.Sos.</td>
<td>Sub-district of Cilandak Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Tri Septianingsih</td>
<td>Sub-district of Cilandak Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Eti Rohaeti</td>
<td>District of Cilandak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sarno</td>
<td>District of Cilandak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District of Jagakarsa

Table 12 Profile of Government Officials at the District of Jagakarsa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Suwarto</td>
<td>Vice Head of the Srengseng Sawah’s Sub-district</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

This Survey Guidebook was developed as part of the research conducted by Mr. Bagas Dwipantara Putra with the title of 'Community Participation in the Procurement and Provision of Open Green Space in Urban Kampung', where the purpose of the research is as a prerequisite to obtain a doctoral degree from RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia.

The data collection will be carried out in two (2) stages. The initial stage of data collection will be carried out in three (3) months, i.e. from April 2014 to June 2014, which at this stage, the focus of data collection will be on the interview instrument of semi-structured interviews with related stakeholders, including: (1) community leaders, policy makers (2), and (3) members of community/society that inhabited the kampung. Moreover, research-related documents related will also be collected at this stage. Whereas, in the second phase, data collection will be more emphasised on questionnaires as the survey instrument. Questionnaires will be distributed to the people who inhabit the kampung area of the to examine their perception of green space provision in their neighbourhoods. The second stage will be held over the following two (2) months by the end of 2014, i.e. from November 2014 to December 2014.

This guidebook is divided into several sections, the first part is an introduction or explanation of the creation of this survey guide book, then followed by the second part that describes the pilot survey which will be tested against the defined research instruments. The third and fourth sections describe the research instruments that will be used i.e. interview and questionnaires as well as with whom the survey will be conducted along with the time when the survey is conducted. Whereas the fifth section of this guidebook describes the documents that will be used to support the research and where the documents can be obtained from. The last part of this guidebook comprises of attachments associated directly with the research conducted by Mr. Putra.
SECTION 2 PILOT SURVEY

Pilot survey is the initial stage of the implementation of this research, which at this stage all the instruments of research that have been completed will be tested to some of the respondents who are not the core respondents.

The purpose of the pilot survey is to obtain feedback of the survey instruments from non-core respondents. This is also intended to identify the deficiencies and weaknesses of survey instruments, so that when the survey instruments are tested on the core survey respondents, the shortcomings of the survey instruments are not repeated. In addition, the pilot survey is intended to improve the survey instruments by capturing important questions that have not been included in the instruments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilot Survey Schedule</th>
<th>INTERVIEW</th>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time of Conduct</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>3 people</td>
<td>5 people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3  INTERVIEW

Purpose
Interview is one of the survey instruments that will be used in the research. The interview will be focused on three (3) key stakeholders, namely: (1) Community leaders, (2) Policy Makers/Government, and (3) Community. The purpose of the interview is to examine and acquire input from key stakeholders regarding the procurement and provision of open green space in the neighbourhoods of low income communities (MBR).

Key Questions
For easy and direct course of the interview, some Main Research Questions and Supporting Questions have been compiled. The following are some main research questions and supporting questions:
- What are the factors that contribute to the success of the provision of open green space in the neighbourhoods of low income communities (MBR) in the Megacities of Asia?
- What is the process of institutional and community involvement in the procurement of open green space in the neighbourhoods of low income communities (MBR) in Megacities of Asia?
- What are the benefits to the public of the existence of open green space in their neighbourhoods?
- What are the forms of the policies that accommodate institutional and community involvement in the procurement of open green space in the neighbourhoods of low income communities (MBR) in Megacities of Asia?

Location and Duration
Interviews will be held in several different places. For community leaders and residents of urban kampungs, interviews will be held at the participant’s residence while the interviews with policy makers/Government will be adjusted in advance according to the time availability of the participant. The duration of the interview takes 1 to 1.5 hours.

Interview Questions
The following are some interview questions that will be posed to key informants.
A. Questions for Community Leaders

Date/Month/Year : ..........................................................
Time of Interview : Starting at ... ... ... ... ... ... EDT
to .................................... EDT

Information on Respondent
Name : ..........................................................
Occupation : ..........................................................
Age : ..........................................................

Information on Community Leader
Head of RT/RW : ..........................................................
Number of Households (KK) : ..........................................................

The following are some interview questions that will be posed to the community leaders.

Introduction
1. What is your position in the society/community? Please explain.
2. Can you explain your role and responsibility towards the community/society?
3. How did you arrive at your current position? Please explain in detail.

Community Development
4. Is there any community development program in your neighbourhood? If there is, could you explain in detail.
5. How is the program carried out? Please explain in detail.
6. Do you engage actively in the program? How are you involved in it? Please explain in detail.

Community Structure
7. What does the structure of the community/society in your neighbourhood look like? Please explain in detail.
8. Is there any institutional system in your community? Please explain in detail.
9. How far does the institutional system affects the people in your neighbourhood?
The Meaning of Space

10. How does the community use the empty spaces in your neighbourhood? Please explain in detail.

11. Does the community discuss these issues together? If yes, please explain.

12. Have you ever consult the use of empty spaces/land in your neighbourhood with expert/professional advisers (such as: architects, city planners or designers and landscape architects)?

B. Questions for Policy Makers/Government

Date/Month/Year : ..........................................................
Time of Interview : Starting at ................................... EDT
to ................................... EDT

Information on Respondent
Name : ..........................................................
Age : ..........................................................

Information on the Agency of Policy Makers/Public Official
Central Government/Local Government : ..........................................................
Ministry/Department/Agency : ..........................................................
Position : ..........................................................

The following are some interview questions that will be posed to policy makers/public officials.

Introduction
1. What is your position in the Government?
2. Can you explain your role and responsibilities?
3. How is the relationship between the agency that you are working for and community development program? Please explain in detail.

Policies Related to Community Development Program
4. Does the Central/Local Government supports the community development program?
5. Could you please specify and describe the policies that support community development programs at the national, provincial or city/regency level?
6. How is the implementation of the policy?

**Government's Role in Community Development Program**

7. What are the steps undertaken by the Government to collaborate with the community in the context of societal/community development program?
8. According to you, what is the role of the Government in supporting societal/community development program?

**C. Questions for Community Members**

Date/Month/Year : ........................................................
Time of Interview : Starting at ................................... EDT
to ........................................... EDT

**Information on Respondent**

Name : ..............................................................
Age : ..............................................................
Occupation : ..........................................................
Address : ..........................................................
RT/RW : ...........................................................

The following are some interview questions that will be posed to community members.

**Introduction**

1. How would you describe your relationship with other community members?
2. Are you actively involved in the programs/activities held by your community?
   Please explain in detail.

**Community Involvement**

3. In what form does the community contributes to community empowerment programs?
4. Could you explain, how the people in your neighbourhood can be involved and participate in the community empowerment program?
Public Perception

5. Does the community empowerment programs provide significant benefits towards your community? Please explain in detail.

6. Does the quality of the built environment in your neighbourhoods improve after the community development program is held? Please explain in detail.
SECTION 4  APPENDICES

The following are several attachments in this survey guide book.

Appendix A. Invitation to Participate in the Research Project.
Appendix B. Interview.
Appendix C. Research Participant Consent Form
APPENDIX A

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH PROJECT

INFORMATION FOR PARTICIPANT

Research title: Community Participation in the Procurement and Provision of Open Green Space in Urban Kampung

Researcher:

1. Prof. Ralph Horne
   B.Sc (Hons), M.Sc (Salford, UK), PhD (SHU, UK)
   Email: ralph.horne@rmit.edu.au
   Phone: xxxxxxxxxx

2. Dr. Joe Hurley
   B. Eng (Civil) (Hons) (Melbourne, Australia), PhD (RMIT, Australia)
   Email: joe.hurley@rmit.edu.au
   Phone: xxxxxxxxxx

3. Bagas Dwipantara Putra
   B. Arch (Tarumanagara University, Indonesia), M. UD (ITB, Indonesia)
   Phd Candidate, RMIT University, Australia
   Email: bagasdwipantara.putra@rmit.edu.au
   Phone: xxxxxxxxxx

Dear ... ... ... ... ...,

You are invited to participate in a research project conducted by RMIT University, Melbourne. You are required to read this sheet thoroughly and carefully before you decide to participate in this research. If there are questions related to this research project, please contact our researchers.
Who is involved in this research? The reason in implementing this research?

This research will be carried out by Mr. Bagas Dwipantara Putra as part of the doctoral programme that is currently being pursued at the RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia. In carrying out the study, Mr. Putra will be guided by two supervisors, namely, Prof. Ralph Horne and Dr. Joe Hurley from RMIT University, Australia. The supervisors will guide Mr. Putra until the completion of his doctoral degree at RMIT. They will supervise, provide input and feedback to ensure a smooth completion of the course of his study, yet Mr. Putra himself will conduct the collection and analysis of data. This research has also been approved by RMIT Human Research Ethics Committee and will be run based on the directives and instructions of the Committee.

Why were you chosen to be involved in this research?

You are selected to be involved in this research due to your community leadership and community membership in the implementation of green space initiative in your neighbourhood. This is due to your ability and experience in inviting other community members in the implementation of the initiative, and we believe that the information you will provide is a very valuable input to our research. We have acquired information regarding you through news coverage in the mass media concerning the green kampung movement.

What is the intent of this research? What questions will be asked in this research?

The purpose of this research project is to find out the role of the community in creating a green space in their neighbourhoods, primarily in the megapolitan cities of Asia. It is expected that the respondents that can get involved in this research will range from policy makers, community leaders, and members of the community who are involved in the green kampung initiative.

If I want to be a participant in the study, what do I need to prepare?

If you agree to participate in this research, then the next step is to have the interview that will be tailored to your time availability. Interviews will take place between 1 to 1.5 hours. The interview will be recorded and then translated to English. By participating in this research project, you allow the use of your name in our thesis and other publications.
**Will there be any risks incurred when I am involved in this research?**

There is no significant risk when you decide to become respondents in this research. If you feel that your answers in the interview makes you anxious and you are concerned of the risks posed, you can directly contact Mr. Bagas Dwipantara Putra. Mr. Putra will address your issue personally and when necessary will perform the necessary actions.

**What are the advantages when I am involved in this research?**

This research is voluntary, and participants will not receive lump sum for the participation. However, your participation will contribute to the data that will be used in this research, in other words, will help in the effort to develop green space in crowded settlements/kampung.

**What will happen with the information I provide?**

The information you provide, will be maintained confidential, only Mr. Putra and the two supervisors have access to the data.

The information you provided can be removed from our database, if: (1) the information you provided may harm you; (2) if there is a warrant from the Court; and (3) if you provide written permission to the researchers.

The results of this research will be disseminated in RMIT University's doctoral dissertation, in academic journals and other publications. By participating in this research, you agree to disclose your name and of your identity.

**What are my rights as a participant?**

- The right to withdraw from the research;
- The right not to be recorded in the interview;
- The right to ask for the data that is not processed to be demolished, during which the participant has the evidence that such data is related to him and that the demolition of data will not harm the participant;
- The right to not be identified in photographs that are intended for public consumption;
- The right to answer any questions asked.
**Who should I contact if I have questions related to this research?**
If there are still unclear questions, please contact Mr. Bagas Dwipantara Putra.

**What issues should I consider before I decide to get involved in this research?**
Participants need to pay attention to the norms of decency and Eastern culture which is still held by Indonesians so as to not cause any inconvenience that might be occur in the future.

Yours sincerely,

Bagas Dwipantara Putra, ST., MT.
Doctoral Candidate

If you feel there is a problem in your participation in the study and did not want to discuss it with the researcher, then you can contact the Ethics Officer, Research Integrity, Governance and Systems, RMIT University, GPO Box 2476V VIC 3001. **Phone:** (03) 9925 2251 or email: human.ethics@rmit.edu.au
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW

A. Questions for Community Leaders

Date/Month/Year : ..........................................................
Time of Interview : Starting at ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... .... EDT
to ........................................ EDT

Information on Respondent
Name : ..........................................................
Occupation : ..........................................................
Age : ..........................................................

Information on Community Leader
Head of RT/RW : ..........................................................
Number of Households (KK) : ..........................................................

The following are some interview questions that will be posed to the community leaders.

Introduction
1. Can you explain in detail, your position in the community?
2. How did you attain the position?
3. What are your obligations towards members of the public?

Community-Based Programs
4. Can you explain the community-based programs that have been or are being implemented in the environment where you live?
5. Can you please explain your involvement and responsibility in the program?
6. Can you explain more about the participation of the community in the program?

Society Structure
7. Could you please describe the local/informal institutional structure in your settlement?
8. Can you explain the linkages and relationships between government agencies (governing bodies) and other community members?

The Meaning of Space

9. Can you explain the use of green space in your neighbourhood?
10. Can you explain the benefits and advantages of the green space in your neighbourhood?

Others

11. Have you ever had to consult a Planning Consultant or the like about utilisation and management of green space in your neighborhood?
B. Questions for Policy Makers/Government

Date/Month/Year : ..........................................................
Time of Interview : Starting at ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... .... EDT
to ................................... EDT

Information on Respondent
Name : ..........................................................
Age : ..........................................................

Information on the Agency of Policy Makers/Public Official
Central Government/Local Government : ..........................................................
Ministry/Department/Agency : ..........................................................
Position : ..........................................................

The following are some interview questions that will be posed to policy makers/public officials.

Introduction
1. Can you explain your position in Government?
2. Does your institution affect policies that can then influence decision making at the community level?

Policies related to Community-Based Programs
3. Can you please list and describe your institution's policies that support community-based programs?
4. How is the implementation of the policy so far?

Government's Role in Community Development Program
5. Do you think the Government already plays an active role in support of community-based programs?
6. Is there any step that can be done by the Government to increase its involvement in the programs?
Others

7. According to you, should the Government increase its involvement in the program?
C. Questions for Community Members

Date/Month/Year: ..........................................................
Time of Interview: Starting at ...................................... EDT
to ..................................... EDT

Information on Respondent
Name: ..........................................................
Age: ..........................................................
Occupation: ..........................................................
Address: ..........................................................
RT/RW: ..........................................................

The following are some interview questions that will be posed to community members.

Introduction
1. How long have you lived here? And based on observations during your stay in the area, what change can you observe or experience?
2. Can you explain the sense of attachment/relationship you have with the area?

Community Involvement
3. What do you know about the community-based programs?
4. Can you explain your form of engagement and participation in the program?

Public Perception
5. Can you explain your views and opinions about community-based programs that have been or are being implemented in the environment where you live?
6. Can you explain the advantages and benefits of the program for your environment?
7. Do you have feedback or suggestions for the development of such programs in the future?

The Meaning of Space
8. Can you explain the use of green space in the neighbourhood/residence?
9. Can you explain the benefits and advantages of the presence of green spaces for your settlement/residence?
APPENDIX C

RESEARCH PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

1. This research has been properly and correctly described to me and I have read the sheet describing the research.

2. I agree to participate in the described research project.

3. I agree (please cross the box that corresponds to your choice)
   - To provide data anonymously (without a name);
   - To be interviewed and/or fill in the questionnaire;
   - That the conversation will be recorded;
   - That I will be photographed.

4. I understand that:
   (a) My participation in this project is voluntary and I can withdraw anytime in this research and I can also retract any form of information that I have given;
   (b) The purpose of this project is solely for research where I get no direct benefit from the research;
   (c) The privacy of the personal information I provide will be safeguarded and only disclosed where I have contested to the disclosure or as required by law.
   (d) The confidentiality of information I provide will be guarded and maintained. Such information will be disclosed upon consent from me and/or in compliance with the law and applicable provisions;
   (e) The security of research data will always be maintained, either during or after the study ends. The data collected during the research progress can be published, and report on the results of this research will be sent to … … … … … And any form of information that mentions me will not be used.

Research Participant Consent
Research Participant: __________________________ Date: __________________________
(Signature)