Research Paper

Place-making in Indonesian Kampung: A Case Study of Bustaman, Semarang

Creating Urban Spaces that Enhance Local Empowerment

Poeti Nazura Gulfira AKBAR, Erasmus University Rotterdam; The Netherlands

Jurian EDELENBOS, Erasmus University Rotterdam; The Netherlands

Abstract

For almost a decade, there has been a grassroots movement in the country that adopts place-making in kampungs (Indonesian urban informal settlements) through cultural and contemporary art festivals. The common issues that have been faced by almost every kampung are to maintain their existence in the city where they tend to be excluded, marginalized, and demolished. Place-making has been held with the hopes of improving the aesthetic appeal of the kampungs, creating new opportunities for the residents to develop creative output relevant to their neighborhood and communities' specialties, and strengthening the local identity to protect kampungs from the demolition threat (Kustiawan et al. 2015; Lieshout 2014; Prasetyo and Iverson 2013). Although many pieces of research from a different part of the world have shown that "temporal" place-making through cultural and art festivals provides many social benefits to the individual and their communities, it seems to be unclear from the global South context. Consequently, uncertainties exist whether place-making brings positive impacts on social aspects of residents in the context of developing countries, particularly those who live in problematic areas such as urban informal settlement dwellers. It is indeed an area that has been little explored in the place-making literature (Lew 2017). Therefore, this study will contribute to understanding the implications of place-making towards the public life of informal settlers, particularly in Indonesia. The main purpose of this study was to examine the impacts of place-making on the local capacity in Indonesian kampung. The research was carried out using a sequential mixed-methods in Bustaman, Semarang. Results from multiple regression analysis showed that place-making through regular "everyday life" and temporal "festivals" have significantly influenced local empowerment. While the qualitative findings further explained that place-making can promote local empowerment by encouraging youth's participation, increasing the organizational and mobilizational capacity of the local community, providing knowledge exchange, and broadening local community's perspectives about their place and community. This study also demonstrated that different types of place-making bring a different kind of impact towards particular socio-economic groups. Therefore, to achieve a better quality of place-making, the enhancement of relational resources between different age group is necessary. Finally, these findings raise important questions and suggestions for incorporating place-making into neighborhood planning efforts.

Keywords

Place-making, kampung, urban informal settlements, empowerment, mixed-methods

1. Introduction

The rationale for developed countries to introduce various arrangements of place-making from a neighborhood to a city level is multifold. It was said by previous researchers who investigated place-making in developed countries that place-making can promote local empowerment by increasing capacity of local community (Douglas 2016; Goldstein 2016; Main and Sandoval 2014), providing knowledge exchange between stakeholders (Rios and Watkins 2015; Dukanovic and Zivkovic 2015), broadening local community's perspectives about their city and communities (Houghton et al. 2015). Several authors observed that place-making also helps fostering social connection in communities, which is found explicitly in the form of strengthening network between different social groups (Ho and Douglas 2008; Peng 2013; Rota and Salone 2014), break down cultural barriers (Sandoval and Maldonado 2012), and create new friendship between local communities (Piribeck and Pottenger 2014). In addition, place-making can contribute to the improvement of quality of life, such as building positive image to place (Andres 2013; Chan 2011b; Knight 2010; Lombard 2014), increasing safety (Lazarevic 2006; Teernstra and Pinkster 2016a), liveability (Cilliers et al. 2015; Semenza 2003), and well-being (Foo, Martin, et al. 2015) while other researchers found that place-making is an essential factor to reinforce the identity of both place and its inhabitants. For instance, enhancement of individual and communal confidence towards their cultural identity (Rota and Salone 2014), higher sensitivity to place histories (Ho and Douglass 2008; Lazarevic et al. 2015), and cultural regeneration (Andres 2012; Chan 2011).

Similar to other cities in the developed world, the use of place-making as a tool to redevelop and reimage areas, particularly that are perceived as problematic, has become increasingly popular in Indonesia. For almost a decade, there has been a grassroots movement in the country that adopts place-making for kampungs. The terms 'kampung' is equivalent to an urban village, which refers to an informal settlement area that exists in a city and mostly associated with the slum. Kampung is the smallest administrative unit in the urban area that can be classified as a neighborhood unit. The common issues that have been faced by almost every kampung are to maintain their existence in the city where they tend to be excluded, marginalized, and demolished. Therefore, place-making through art and creative festivals has been held with the hopes of improving the aesthetic appeal of the kampungs, creating new opportunities for the residents to develop creative output relevant to their neighborhood and communities' existing assets, and strengthening the local identity to protect kampungs from the demolition threat (Kustiawan et al. 2015; Lieshout 2014; Prasetyo and Iverson 2013).

It is still unclear, however, whether temporal place-making through art and cultural festivals have made any real contribution to these aspects. While there is a growing concern about the use of art and cultural festivals in Indonesian kampung, many of them paid much more attention to explain the festivals using perspective of cultural tourism (e.g. Podlaszewska 2017; Puspitosari 2015; Silver et al. 2017; Susetyo 2015), physical and spatial outcomes (e.g. Hutama 2016; Nasution 2015; Roychansyah 2014; Safira 2012; Surya, 2008), and stakeholder interrelations (e.g. Ekomadyo et al. 2013; Rahmany and Djajadiningrat 2014). The investigations of art and cultural festivals in kampung within the place-making context using residents perspective is indeed understudied. Meanwhile, regardless of a wide arrange of research from a different part of the world have shown that place-making provides many social benefits to the individual and their communities, the benefits of place-making have been less evident within the global South context. Most of the researches on place-making conceptualizations and applications have been done in the western cultures and developed countries, mainly from North America, Europe, and Australia. An example is given from a current literature study about methodologies for quantifying the value of place-

making in which Cohen et al. (2018) explicitly stated that the study was limited to the developed countries. Given that socioeconomic, physical, and institutional contexts in those groups are distinctly different from the former ones, their outcomes might also differ. This argument is supported by Lew (2017, p.461): "The world-making context (cultural dynamics, political economy, and social values) of Asia, Africa, and South America, especially at the regional and local scales, can be quite different from those of the West, resulting in different community challenges, needs, and solutions".

Consequently, uncertainties exist whether place-making brings positive impacts on social aspects of residents in the context of developing countries, particularly those who live in problematic areas such as urban informal settlement dwellers. Therefore, an investigation on social outcomes of place-making towards residents in Indonesian kampung will contribute to understanding the implications of place-making. The main purpose of the study is to understand the effects of place-making through regular and temporal practices on local empowerment of residents in Indonesia urban informal settlements. The following research question is addressed to guide the study: *To what extent place-making influences social aspect of kampung residents?*

With three sub questions:

- a. *How is the relationship between regular and temporal place-making towards local empowerment?*
 - b. *How do the relationships come about in the two kampung cases?*
 - c. *To what extent the socio-economic aspect of kampung residents influence the relationship between place-making and local empowerment?*
-

2. Literature Review

This section will present literature review on place-making as a social process, classification of regular and temporal place-making, and its impact on local empowerment.

2.1. Place-making as a Social Process

A large and growing body of literature has investigated the concept of 'place-making', and yet, the notion and definition of place-making within discourses reviewed appear nebulous and contested. It ranges from a stable definition of place, as is the case of a 'locale' or physical settings of social activity, to one that encompasses the dynamic human and non-human agents influencing site character (insert references). To frame this study on a clear definition, the latter perspective on place-making is taken into consideration.

The concept views that urban places are embedded in the built environment and come into being through 'reiterative social practices' (Cresswell 2004). Many earlier authors has described place-making as an on-going process of enhancing the quality of places through creation and transformation, which are in these cases, refer to build environment and physical area in various scales from public places, urban open space, neighbourhood, town, city, to region (Benson and Jackson 2013; Brunnberg and Frigo 2012; Buser et al. 2013; Douglas 2016; Elwood, Lawson, and Nowak 2015; Lombard 2014; Quayle and Driessen Van Der Lieck 1997). Franz et al. (2008, 316) defined place-making as "collective appropriation of the own environment by the residents that has the potential to create new 'places' of identification for the local residents". Therefore, remaking a public place is a social activity of involved people (Arefi 2014; Lombard 2014). Many claims that the right to make space is not designated to expert and professionals, but also a right to residents and other stakeholders (Lepofsky and Fraser 2003). Friedmann (2010, 159) for example claims that "making places is everyone's job." Individuals make spaces, and these are socially negotiated, constantly

changing and contingent (Pierce et al. 2010). Lepofsky and Fraser (2003, 132-133) argue with their concept of 'flexible citizenship' that place-making is not only for professionals and neighborhood residents, but must be open for 'external' stakeholder groups that have a decision-making role even though they are not residents of the particular target neighborhood. In this case, place-making is viewed as a social process in which local activities construct place (Pierce et al. 2010; Silberberg 2013). While some authors called this approach as 'place-making as a process', it has also been known as 'bottom-up place-making' (Arefi 2014; Bendt et al. 2013), 'organic place-making' (Lew, 2017; Sofield et al. 2017), and 'community-led place-making' (Pierce et al. 2016; Silberberg, Lorah, et al. 2013). These authors, although using different terms, confirmed the capability to attain positive results from place-making that does not rely on targeted and advanced skills, but mainly on the full effectiveness of influential mutual relationship of places and their communities in generating those desirable results. To summarise, place-making is defined as an activity of integrating various actors, functions, means, and dimensions in order to transform urban places.

2.2. Classification of Regular and Temporal Place-making

In this study, regular place-making refers to some characteristics of place-making that is the collective 'mundane' activities of ordinary residents in their neighborhoods. In the literature where the characteristic was found, some scholars, either partly or wholly, drew upon 'everyday life' to explain place-making (Douglas 2016; Elwood et al. 2015; Friedmann 2010; Lombard 2014). Everyday life was defined as a process where places are claimed and shaped through everyday social practices. This concept of everyday life was acknowledged as the essence of 'lived space' by Lefebvre (1991, p. 362), identified as a representational space inhabited or used by people imposing their "private worlds upon the public realm." Drawing from his idea, more recent scholars of place-making have put forth the ideas of the 'lived place-making' which is defined as "those bottom-up processes by which people appropriate space for daily living through small, individual gestures, and social relationships that attach meaning to space" (Balassiano and Maldonado 2014, p. 647). While Lew (2017, p. 49) called it as 'place making', or "how a culture group imprints its values, perceptions, memories, and traditions on a landscape and gives meaning to geographic space." Together, these scholars emphasize on the ability of ordinary citizens or users to become involved in the formation of space.

In the literature, place-making is also characterized as 'temporary' to refer its uses of urban space (Andres 2012; Marshall and Bishop 2015; Silberberg et al. 2013). Besides 'temporary,' this characteristic of place-making is applied in different terms by other scholars. While Till and McArdle (2015) chose 'interim space' to consider short-term projects such as a pop up event in Dublin's park by an artistic collective, 'temporality' was adopted by Rota and Salone (2014) and Kern (2015) to categorize several formally organized activities by local neighborhood-level organizations, such as annual music festivals. These terms, albeit called differently, are principally the same in explaining the 'temporary' characteristic of place-making as place activations through occasional events at the neighborhood or block level. A number of authors also used 'temporary' to describe a specific approach of place-making which called 'tactical' (Douglas 2016; Lew 2017; Lydon et al. 2012; Wyckoff et al. 2015). This approach is described as "a bottom-up approach led by community groups looking to test, change, improve aspects of their locale and often using temporary, low-technology interventions" (Cohen et al. 2018, p. 13).

Some early authors also include the distinguishing characteristic between the place-making daily by residents and the place-making that is enabled by people or organizations who are not necessarily the residents but have the power to control a place. For instance, in their study about place-making in rural communities, Balassiano and Maldonado (2014) used

the dichotomy of 'lived' and 'facilitated' place-making to differentiate between everyday life activities by residents and place-making intervention by government. Another example was from Kern (2015) who differentiate the everyday life and temporality based on the time occurrence and involved actors. While everyday life place-making refers to daily activity by ordinary residents such as talking, smoking, playing cards, or drinking coffee while sitting in the corner of a parking lot in neighborhood; weekly farmers markets and music performances, occasional flea markets, one-off events, and annual summer festivals were grouped under 'temporal events'. By this, the temporal place-making, refers to place activations through occasional events, both small and large scale, in public spaces. His intention to divide the two was because he found that the latter one, which was more formally organized by local neighborhood-level organizations, had influenced the 'everyday life' of a particular group of residents.

Table 1. Regular and Temporal Place-making Characteristics

Characteristics	Regular	Temporal
Frequency	Daily, weekly, monthly, occasionally	Annual, biannual
Scale	Individual, group, community, block, neighborhood level	Neighborhood or block level
Facilitation	Mundane, everyday life	Facilitated
Involved actors	Local residents, including neighborhood organizations	Individual or local organizations other than residents
Nature of Activity	Promoting well-being, establishing infrastructure, caring for public spaces, promoting social cohesion, and empowering women	Promoting art and culture, social cohesion, recreational activities, and supporting young people

2.3. Place-making as a Tool to Enhance Local Empowerment

Local empowerment is defined as a process of change in which individuals or groups of local community, who initially has little or no control, have gained more power and capacity to intervene in particular things that affect their lives. This capacity can be in forms of solving problems, motivating and persuading other residents to involve, participate and work collectively for making and remaking their places. The indicators of local empowerment were mainly based on a study by Stewart (2010) about measuring community empowerment for place-making in forestry and Peng (2013) who used the same indicators to measure the effect of institutional capacity in place-making practices towards local sustainability.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, one of the basis of empowerment is local knowledge. Regarding this, De Carteret (2008) found that place-making through everyday life activities support residents in gaining informal knowledge as a result of their involvement in the activities and also from ordinary conversations they have with their neighbors. He also found that the character and purpose of the activity itself were the two main factors from the everyday activities that can be a bridge to facilitate an exchange of information and opportunity to learn by one another. The relationship between everyday life activities and empowerment were also investigated by Balassiano and Maldonado (2014). They argued that empowerment could be reached when people perceive themselves to have a high level of control towards their spaces. By this, they further stated that the degree to which people perceive they have 'control over spaces' can be determined by their contributions to the maintenance or improvement of these space and their participation in community activities or events.

Several studies discussed the value of place-making as a process, mainly the temporary, event-based, and tactical initiatives by grassroots and community-driven, that

brings positive benefits to community empowerment and engagement through deliberative discussion and collaboration (Cilliers et al. 2015; Silberberg et al. 2013). This argument was supported by Flanagan and Mitchell (2016), stating that the social networks formed through project participation also facilitated knowledge-sharing and peer-to-peer learning. One specific example by Dukanovic and Zivkovic (2015) underlined the importance of two temporal and experimental projects in central riverfront of Belgrade as vehicles for community participation. They found that the project not only brought positive changes in the physical aspect of the place but also offered a learning experience to the participants through active involvement during the project, from preparation to implementation. In this case, the participants were also given the opportunity to become tutors and project managers of the next event. As a result of the arrangement of temporal activities, the participants were able to gain knowledge and skills in interdisciplinary and collaborative work. This study concluded that enthusiasm for improvement of city spaces through temporal place-making was rooted in a synergy of the citizen, expert, and public sector.

3. Methodology

3.1. Area of Study

Data collection was done in an urban kampung in Indonesia, Bustaman, which is a high-density urban settlement located in Purwodinatan sub-district, Semarang City. It consisted 0.6 ha with a population density equal to 590 people per ha. The kampung consists of 2 RT, namely RT 04 and RT 05, where approximately 400 inhabitants live. Despite its limitation as city's slum area, it has high productivity level based on its goat-trading and culinary activity. It is popular with its Gulai Kambing or goat curry making, which has been a local tradition since the Dutch colonial period. Most residents rely on goat trading with various jobs, from butchers, goat merchant to catering that specializes in the goat curry. Besides the goat, Bustaman is well-known with its historical value. This kampung got its name from Kyai Bustam, a religious leader and a communicator between the Dutch government and the locals in the 18th century. He was also the great-grandfather of the most internationally known Indonesian painter, Raden Saleh Bustaman. The rich history and tradition makes this kampung become an important part of the history of Semarang, especially with the fact that the kampung was built at the time of Semarang formation.

3.2. Place-making Practices in Two Kampung Cases

Temporal place-making in Bustaman was started by Hysteria, a local organization who has involved in Bustaman since 2013. The organisation was officially formed in 2011 and focused on youth empowerment, art, and urban issues. Since then, Hysteria has coordinated with various grassroots communities, artists, and students in Semarang and surround. Their activities included discussions, exhibitions, workshops, festivals, and other type of community facilitation based activities. As a commitment to their main aim to contribute in solving city's issues, along with other communities including Rujak Centre for Urban Studies, Hysteria formed Peka Kota which means, literally translated, "sensitive city". The core program of the platform was to raise kampung issues at the city scale, including how to use everyday life knowledge of the dwellers to be considered by the government for making city's master plan. By then, they started the program in several Semarang kampungs, which one of the first was Bustaman.

3.3. Sampling, Data Collection, and Analysis

To answer the study research questions, mixed methods approach is used, specifically based on the sequential explanatory mixed method. This study begins with a quantitative strand

and then conduct a second qualitative strand to explain the results obtained from the quantitative data and analysis. It is also important to mention that the two approaches were connected when selecting the interview participants and developing the interview protocol based on the results from the questionnaire results from the first phase. In the last stage of the research, the results of the quantitative and qualitative phases were integrated during the discussion of the outcomes of the entire study.

Quantitative Phase

Since the type and number of place-making practices were implemented differently in a particular block (RT) of the kampung, there is a high possibility that the perception of residents would be different in each block, and therefore, the population of kampung does not comprise a homogenous group. Regarding this, a proportionate stratified random sampling was chosen since it involved a process of dividing the population into homogenous subgroups, which in this study, the participants were divided per RTs before doing the sampling. After the number of households in each block (RT) was selected, the next stage of the sampling process involved identifying the eligible households and household members to be surveyed. To randomly select households, the researcher acquired documents by the local RT leaders which contained a list of addresses in every RT in Bustaman. The document was then enumerated and organized in sequence. By using a computational method from www.randomizer.org, some random numbers were generated and used as a sample. It is also important to note that the survey respondent is limited only to residents who ever participated in at least one of the regular activities in the kampung and/or the art festival. That is to say, the survey respondents were either active, inactive, and former participants of regular and temporal place-making activity in Kampung Bustaman. Residents who never participate or attend regular and/or temporal place-making in kampung are not included in the sampling and were substituted instead. Regarding the sample size based on Yamane's formula, the 67 respondents were residing in Bustaman.

Qualitative Phase

To further understand and elaborate survey results, 15 in-depth interviews with purposefully selected residents of the selected kampungs were conducted using semi-structured interviews. The face-to-face interviews were done between August – September 2017 and were digitally recorded. For this phase, the interviewees were selected from those who responded and completed the survey in the quantitative phase. The participants, who consisted of residents with different level of participation in a different type of place-making practices, were asked to participate in having an interview on the given study subject. All semi-structured interview were transcribed, coded and analysed using the software of Atlas.ti. After all the important statements and words had been coded, the codes were grouped by similarity, and a theme was identified and documented based on each grouping.

4. Results

In this study, quantitative data and results provided a general picture of the research problem through unpacking the various constructs that link to two types of place-making and investigate them separately, measure the relationship between influential factors and social outcomes of place-making, and gather socioeconomic data of local residents. While the qualitative data and its analysis refined and explained those statistical results by exploring the participants' views in more depth and further explaining why certain relationships tested in the first phase were significant and why some were not significant.

Table below displays the results from the MLR analysis and indicating that among respondents from involved households that both of regular and temporal place-making had

positive relationships with local empowerment. They significantly influenced the empowerment, which were found significantly at $F(5, 221) = 25.172$, $p = .000$, with an R^2 of .363 (See Table 4.6). The score of partial correlation coefficient (β) implied that the temporal place-making ($\beta = .530$) affected empowerment more than regular place-making ($\beta = .261$). Meanwhile, the predictive equation suggesting that the respondents' empowerment increased by 0.363 and 0.179 for each point of the arrangement and participation in temporal place-making and regular place-making consecutively.

Table 2. Results of Multiple Regression Analysis

Independent variables	B	β	t-value	P	Tol.	VIF
Constant	3.820		23.428	.000***		
Age	-.080	-.162	-2.922	.004**	.938	1.066
Temporal Place-making	.363	.530	6.712	.000***	.463	2.161
Regular Place-making	.179	.261	4.570	.000***	.882	1.134
Regression equation:						
Empowerment = 3.820 + .363 (Temporal Place-making) + .179 (Regular Place-making)						
$R^2 = .363$ $F(5, 221) = 25.172$ ($P = .000$) ***						

Taking into consideration the complex nature of Indonesian kampungs, particularly on the process of making and using public space, statistical relationships as outlined above seemed to not adequately capture this complexity, and thus, the following paragraphs go further to look at how these relationships between two types of place-making and local empowerment are shaped.

4.1 Impacts of Temporal Place-making on Local Empowerment

According to the quantitative findings, temporal place-making positively and significantly influenced local empowerment of residents in the kampung. In response to this, there were two positive views on temporal place-making recurred throughout the qualitative analysis, namely youth capacity and opportunities to transfer knowledge.

Many respondents commented that youth organizations in Bustaman have been more active ever since temporal place-making took place in the kampung. One respondent who is a leader of Ikatan Remaja Bustaman (IRB), or Bustaman Youth Organization, explained that the organization had been deactivated for eight years long until finally Hysteria came and persuaded the youth to revive IRB. Since then, not only IRB has been active, but also youth have played an active and vital role in Bustaman. Furthermore, the majority of participants demonstrated that temporal place-making provided participation opportunities in mainly three aspects: concept development, public relations, and operation. Most of the interviewees confirmed this positive impact of temporal place-making by saying that throughout the concept development and framing stage, it offers a knowledge exchange process between the residents and Hysteria. While the residents gained a clearer understanding of their kampung's issues, the local organization also obtained new knowledge about the kampung and the community. Some other interviewees made more point that now they can make things that they could not before participating. In the current event, some youth claimed that they made a booklet, flyer, some DIY decoration equipment, sponsorship proposals and invitations, all mainly by themselves. A few other youths also explained that the concept of the current event was developed mainly by the residents, while the local organizations only helped them for advisory. Lastly, the evaluation that was held by the local organization and residents after the festival was also a way of empowering. In this case, through sharing feedback and lessons learned from the festival, the residents learn how to make the better ones in the following year. All those interviewees stated that

the dominant role of youth in temporal place-making only happened currently. While in the previous events, Hysteria was the one who executes most of the festival preparation to the end of its implementation. From all the statement above, it indicates that there is an increased capacity among residents, particularly youth, to volunteer and participate in their communities.

The other opportunity to transfer knowledge is offered through open discussions with experts, academia, and city officials which were held as part of the festival and targeted for broader groups of residents. For instance, during the first festival in Bustaman, a former rector of the local university and a representative of local art institution were invited to talk about the importance of the kampung in historical context. In return, residents were offered chances to share their stories, opinions, and aspirations during the discussions. The other evident came from the Forum of 12 Art Activists Semarang Kampung which was started in 2017. On this meeting, there were twelve representatives from different kampungs including Bustaman, where the representative of each kampung explained their kampung's condition, both issues and potentials. Sometimes they also invited experts such as architect and urban planner. This kind of discussion can be an excellent opportunity for knowledge exchange between expert and locals. For the residents, not only it can lead to gaining more understanding towards their kampung's issues, but also benefitting knowledge of self-professed experts in a broader context such as demolishment issue in cities. As one interviewee of women neighbourhood organization put it, *"This discussion reminded me that Bustaman is just like other urban kampungs, like those demolished kampungs in Jakarta... if we do not have a strong foundation, we will get demolished too."* Another interviewee also stated that this kind of discussion was needed because it did not only make the residents more aware of their kampungs but also an excellent start to building strong communal identity and organizational foundation in the kampung. *"I hope this discussion will be continuous, and we can support each other and be the strong basis for the kampung which is not less powerful than private sectors"*.

Despite the formal preparation meetings, the core concept development process, which called as 'framing,' was started long way before and done through informal discussions. During the framing process, Hysteria helped the residents to elaborate their needs and unidentified issues in the kampung into coherent themes. For instance, there were some negative comments about the motorcycle parking spaces which scattered around in almost every narrow streets in the kampung; the unhealthy multi-functioned spaces that was used as slaughterhouse and gathering; and the most populous alley in the kampung, *Gedong Sepuluh*, which has about ten houses with a combined population of 140 inhabitants. For people who obtain higher education or work in community services might easily see that the recurrent problems in the comments mentioned above from the residents were related to public spaces. However, that was not the case for kampung dwellers who have limited educational background and career field. In the beginning, before Hysteria gives them guidance and coherent framework, most of the residents were clueless in developing a comprehensive understanding of the issue they faced. As a member of Hysteria explained, *"Residents are aware of their problem because they have been facing it for a long time, but they don't know how to refine it."*

According to the quantitative findings, it was found that age is one of the controlled variables that has significantly and negatively influenced local empowerment of residents in the kampung. The interview findings, could only partly supported this relationship. Based on the analysis, temporal place-making was found to have a more positive impact on young people and young adult than any other age groups. One of the possible reasons is related to task divisions during temporal place-making, in which a more significant part of the tasks is given to youth. Many interviewees from both kampungs confirmed the dominant role of

youth, while there is minimum participation amongst kids, housewives, and elderly. Most of the youth, with some help of a male adult group, is mainly in charge of all the preparation stages including internal funding resource. For housewives group, however, was only responsible for catering services. Several respondents explained that these tasks divisions were not randomly appointed. Indeed, it was done through the willingness of each group to participate during the place-making. For instance, one respondent argued that she must take care of her little daughter because no one would watch the kid if she joined too. Commenting on this issue, another respondent said:

"The problem is that my husband doesn't work here, he works outside of the city, so I also need to work to support my family. But my son is active in the youth organization, so he almost always updates some news to me."

This view was supported by youth participants explaining that it was a practical way of thinking for participant who already has a family to not participate in temporal place-making, given that the nature of the activity itself is energy and time consumption and not to mention dominated with contemporary art.

4.2 Impacts of Regular Place-making on Local Empowerment

Similar to the poor neighborhoods where their dwellers are struggling to make ends meet, making and remaking their place through spatial and physical interventions is essential for kampung residents. The corollary of this is that there are always improvements that can be made, especially on the basis of the necessity that refers to the residents' needs upon the presence of those spaces in their kampung. In Bustaman, regular place-making through physical activity is clearly seen through the development of various facilities and infrastructure, particularly in recent years. For instance, constructing adequate public sanitation, paving streets that during the rainy season creates big puddle everywhere, and creating community spaces that are more comfortable for regular meetings and daily gatherings.

Empowerment is also evident by the record that within eleven years (2006 – 2017), residents were able to mobilize themselves in handling ten important physical improvements around public spaces in the kampung with limited environmental and economic resources. Not to mention, from 2009 until 2017, the improvement was arranged every year by the community who was in charge of initiation to maintenance. It is not surprising therefore that the development process has cultivated the practice of mutual self-help based on cooperation through sharing responsibilities. This is not suggesting that place-making is always unequivocal or even peaceful. Indeed, conflict occurred several times during the process, mainly because of different opinions among residents, from discussion on design and planning, task divisions during construction, to the management of contribution. Nonetheless, the diversity of opinions in deciding the community needs reflects the empowerment and collaboration process. In this matter, decision-making is made as to the interplay amongst residents in determining their future, while collaboration can be seen through the fact that the community has been able to embrace diverse perspectives without compelling conflicts into various collective actions.

As the development of public space cannot be carried out by the community itself, mainly in the financial sense, some alliances and partnerships with external agencies also took place to ensure the permanence and quality of the public spaces. In this way, not only residents extend and strengthen their external networks through collaboration that

occurred during the development process, but it also provides opportunities to transfer knowledge among the stakeholders. Among the various subjects taught by non-profit organization and government, a good example as a result of the high learning process can be seen related to financial management assistance. Until the year when the fieldwork was conducted, residents have independently managed the sanitation contribution so they can pay all the maintenance costs, and some public spaces were even financed partly through the contribution.

Another form of empowerment is palpable during the process of daily social activities. In this case, Bustaman shows its potential to be a self-supporting kampung since all the process along with necessary skill and materials for the goat trading are available in this kampung every day. In addition to empowerment, the fact that residents have done the business until today means that they help in preserving Bustaman's identity as kampung of goat where it holds cultural heritage in the form of all essential knowledge for running the business. Interestingly, another identity has emerged through everyday life, which includes two other activities, in this case, are culinary business and *guyub* tradition. The diverse movement and nature of those activities, that run every day for almost 24-hours, have enlivened the kampung while also given a distinctive character and meaning to it. Altogether, they created a place identity for those who dwell in. At the same time, the presences of those daily enterprises also contribute in sustaining the self-help practices within the community, in the sense that the local's struggle to support their livelihood does not stop them to help each other. For that reason, these activities undoubtedly cannot be overlooked if one talks about the self-help practice of Bustaman residents.

Taken all these practices of regular place-making in Bustaman, their wider impacts can be seen through how they simultaneously bring positive impacts on the quality of life in kampung through the creation of socially favorable public spaces. Several qualities such as accessibility, security, and liveability were attributed. In this case, regular place-making has not only able to improve the local environment which resulting in better health and safer environment, but also bring social benefits that were perceived to improve the well-being of the kampung residents such as the vibrant environment.

5. Conclusions and Implications

This paper underscores the relationship between regular and temporal place-making on local empowerment. Overall, the qualitative analysis revealed two positive impacts of regular place-making, which are the improvement of organizational and collective capacity. The importance of temporal place-making was seen through the opportunities to transfer knowledge with external stakeholders and general improvement among residents, particularly youth, to actively participate in the kampung festivals and to revive the youth organization in both kampungs. Interestingly, the analysis showed that while temporal place-making had a more positive impact on young people and young adult than any other age groups, most participants who involved in regular place-making are the older generation.

However, regarding the impacts mentioned above, the overall results demonstrated that the organizational capacity and the opportunities to transfer expert knowledge are mainly obtained by a few of active groups of residents who play fundamental roles in running and organizing place-making practices in the kampung. These active groups were known as cadres of social organizations in the kampung, members of youth organization, and individual activists without any assigned responsibility. The analysis of

interviews with key informants also demonstrated that place-making process creates an opportunity for these core group of residents to empower and develop themselves.

This study also revealed some challenges that could affect the impact of place-making on the empowerment, mainly the lack of financial and human resources in the kampungs. The relatively low socioeconomic conditions of kampungs not only hinders many residents from participating in place-making but also create dependency on external stakeholders. Another barrier to the implementation of place-making in kampung is to generate interest in their kampung improvement programs amongst other residents, in order to implement and sustain regular and temporal place-making. More considerable efforts are needed to ensure a higher level of enthusiasm and participation in place-making.

6. References

- Andres, L (2013) Differential spaces, power hierarchy and collaborative planning: A critique of the role of temporary uses in shaping and making places. *Urban Studies*, 50(4), 759-775.
- Arefi, Mahyar (2014) *Deconstructing Placemaking: Needs, Opportunities, and Assets* Routledge.
- Balassiano, Katia and Marta Maria Maldonado (2015) "Placemaking in Rural New Gateway Communities." *Community Development Journal* 50 (4): 644-660.
- Bendt, P., S. Barthel, and J. Colding (2013) "Civic Greening and Environmental Learning in Public-Access Community Gardens in Berlin." *Landscape and Urban Planning* 109 (1): 18-30.
- Benson, M., & Jackson, E (2013) Place-making and place maintenance: Performativity, place and belonging among the middle classes. *Sociology*, 47(4), 793-809.
doi:10.1177/0038038512454350
- Brunnberg, L., & Frigo, A (2012) Placemaking in the 21st-century city: Introducing the funfair metaphor for mobile media in the future urban space. *Digital Creativity*, 23(2), 113-125
- Buser, M., Bonura, C., Fannin, M., & Boyer, K (2013) Cultural activism and the politics of place-making. *City*, 17(5), 606-627. doi:10.1080/13604813.2013.827840
- Chan, S. C (2011) Cultural governance and place-making in taiwan and china. *The China Quarterly*, 206, 372-390.
- Cilliers, EJ, W. Timmermans, F. Van den Goorbergh, and JSA Slijkhuis (2015) "The Story Behind the Place: Creating Urban Spaces that Enhance Quality of Life." *Applied Research in Quality of Life* 4 (10): 589-598.
- Cohen, M., Gajendran, T., Lloyd, J., Maund, K., Smith, C., Bhim, S. and Vaughan, J. (2018). Valuing creative placemaking: development of a toolkit for public and private stakeholders. NSW Government, Landcom: Sydney, Australia.
- De Carteret, P (2008) "Diverse Pleasures: Informal Learning in Community." *Australian Journal of Adult Learning* 48 (3): 502-521.
- Douglas, Gordon CC (2016) "The Formalities of Informal Improvement: Technical and Scholarly Knowledge at Work in do-it-Yourself Urban Design." *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability* 9 (2): 117-134.
- Dukanovic, Zoran and Jelena Zivkovic (2015) "Public Art & Public Space Programme: Learning, but Doing!" *Annales-Anali Za Istrske in Mediteranske Studije-Series Historia Et Sociologia* 25 (1): 49-64.
- Ekomadyo, A., Prasetyo, F., & Yuliar, S (2013) Place construction and urban social transformation: an actor network theory analysis for creative-kampung phenomena in Bandung. Paper presented at the "Habitechno International Seminar", Institut Teknologi Bandung, Indonesia.

- Elwood, S., Lawson, V., & Nowak, S. (2015). Middle-class poverty politics: Making place, making people. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 105(1), 123-143.
- Flanagan, M., & Mitchell, W. (2016). *An Economic Evaluation of the Renew Newcastle Project*. Newcastle: Centre of Full Employment and Equity, University of Newcastle.
- Foo, K., D. Martin, C. Polsky, C. Wool, and M. Ziemer (2015) "Social Well-being and Environmental Governance in Urban Neighbourhoods in Boston, MA." *Geographical Journal* 181 (2): 138-146.
- Franz, M., Güles, O., & Prey, G. (2008). Place-making and 'green' reuses of brownfields in the Ruhr. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie*, 99(3), 316-328. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9663.2008.00464.x
- Friedmann, John (2010) "Place and Place-Making in Cities: A Global Perspective." *Planning Theory & Practice* 11 (2): 149-165.
- Goldstein, S. R. (2016). "Planning the Millennium City: The Politics of Place-Making in Gurgaon, India." *International Area Studies Review* 19 (1): 12-27.
- Kirralie Houghton, Marcus Foth & Evonne Miller (2015) Urban Acupuncture: Hybrid Social and Technological Practices for Hyperlocal Placemaking, *Journal of Urban Technology*, 22:3, 3-19.
- Ho, K., & Douglass, M. (2008). Globalisation and liveable cities: Experiences in place-making in Pacific Asia. *International Development Planning Review*, 30(3), 199-213.
- Hutama, I. (2016). *Exploring the sense of place of an urban kampung. Through the daily activities, configuration of space and dweller's perception: Case study of kampung code, Yogyakarta* (Master).
- Kern, L. (2016). Rhythms of gentrification: Eventfulness and slow violence in a happening neighbourhood. *Cultural Geographies*, 23(3), 441-457. doi:10.1177/1474474015591489
- Knight, D. (2010). Culture, the Arts and New Foundland Place-Making." *Plan Canada* 50 (2): 38-41.
- Kustiawan, Iwan., Ukrin, Ibrahim., Aulia, Astri (2015) Identification of the Creative Capacity of Kampong's Community towards Sustainable Kampong (Case Studies: Cicadas and Pasundan Kampong, Bandung): A Preliminary Study. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 184, 144 – 151.
- Lazarević, E. V., Koružnjak, A. B., & Devetaković, M (2016) Culture design-led regeneration as a tool used to regenerate deprived areas. Belgrade—The savamala quarter; reflections on an unplanned cultural zone. *Energy and Buildings*, 115, 3-10.
- Lepofsky, J. and J. C. Fraser (2003) "Building Community Citizens: Claiming the Right to Place-Making in the City." *Urban Studies* 40 (1): 127-142.
- Lew, Alan (2017) Tourism planning and place making: place-making or placemaking?, *Tourism Geographies*, 19:3, 448-466.
- Lieshout, Valerie (2014) The creative kampung: bridging the gap. A creative placemaking approach to empower poor Bandung communities. University of Amsterdam.
- Lombard, M (2014) Constructing ordinary places: Place-making in urban informal settlements in Mexico. *Progress in Planning*, 94, 1-53.
- Main, K., & Sandoval, G. F (2014) Placemaking in a translocal receiving community: The relevance of place to identity and agency. *Urban Studies*, , 0042098014522720.
- Marshall, N. and K. Bishop (2015) "Is there any Correlation between Placemaking and Place Attachment? A Challenge for Interdisciplinary Research." 9 (3-4): 1-10.
- Peng, Li-Pei (2013) "Effects of Anti-Dam Campaigns on Institutional Capacity: A Case Study of Meinung from Taiwan." *Paddy and Water Environment* 11 (1-4): 353-367.
- Pierce, J., D. G. Martin, and J. T. Murphy (2011) "Relational Place-Making: The Networked Politics of Place." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 36 (1): 54-70.
- Piribeck, J., & Pottenger, M (2014) Good fences for good neighbors: A "Meeting place" intervention. *Journal of Poverty*, 18(1), 73-81.

-
- Prasetyo, F., & Martin-Iverson, S (2013) Planning in the era of uncertainty. Art, activism and the 'Creative kampung': A case study from Dago pojok, Bandung, Indonesia. Paper presented at the *Planink International Conference*,
- Quayle, M., & van der Lieck, Tilo C Driessen (1997) Growing community: A case for hybrid landscapes. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 39(2), 99-107.
- Rios, Michael and Joshua Watkins (2015) "Beyond "Place" Translocal Placemaking of the Hmong Diaspora." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 35 (2): 209-219.
- Rota, F. S., & Salone, C (2014) Place-making processes in unconventional cultural practices. the case of Turin's contemporary art festival paratissima. *Cities*, 40, 90-98.
- Roychansyah, M. S (2010) *Kampung as core model of urban compaction development: Yogyakarta initiative* Unpublished manuscript.
- Safira. (2012) KAMPUNG KREATIF sebuah solusi spasial pemenuhan kebutuhan dasar manusia (Bachelor).
- Sandoval, Gerardo Francisco and Marta Maria Maldonado (2012) "Latino Urbanism Revisited: Placemaking in New Gateways and the Urban-Rural Interface." *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability* 5 (2-3): 193-218.
- Semenza, J. C (2003) "The Intersection of Urban Planning, Art, and Public Health: The Sunnyside Piazza." *American Journal of Public Health* 93 (9): 1439-1441.
- Silberberg, S., K. Lorah, and R: Muessig Disbrow A (2013) *Places in the Making: How Placemaking Builds Places and Communities*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Teernstra, AB and FM Pinkste (2016a) "Participation in Neighbourhood Regeneration: Achievements of Residents in a Dutch Disadvantaged Neighbourhood." *Urban Research & Practice* 9 (1): 56-79.
- Till, K. E., & McArdle, R. (2015). The improvisational city: Valuing urbanity beyond the chimera of permanence. *Irish Geography*, 48(1), 37-68. doi:10.2014/igj.v48i1.525.