

The Urban Quality, Public Space, and Social Capital: Departing from Comparison of Three Cities

M. Syaom Barliana

Diah Cahyani P.

Beta Paramita

Architectural History

Theory and Dwelling Culture Research Group

Department of Architectural Education

Indonesia University of Education

Dr. Setiabudi street No. 207 Bandung, West Java, Indonesia 40154

Abstract

Some social problems in urban areas are the implications of social capital weakening of urban community. The combination of good urban design and structuring and cultural essence of being urban is important to reinforce social capital. This article reveals the results of pilot study in first year, which focuses on the description of measurement result of urban objective quality and the level of social capital. The research was also conducted to examine the differences of each city's variables by comparing three cities in Indonesia namely Surabaya, Bandung, and Surakarta. The results show that, firstly, Surabaya generally has a very high urban objective quality, while Bandung and Surakarta have no significant differences and are included in low to moderate category. Secondly, social capital level of the community members and the public space users generally are included in high category. However, it does not happen to ordinary residents. Thus, social capital reinforcement supposedly occurs due to the community involvement and the intensity of activity in public spaces.

Keywords: Being Urban, Urban Objective Quality, Social Capital, Public Space

1. Introduction: The Beginning of Social Problem

Most people in big cities in Indonesia at this time are suffering from various symptoms of social disorder; social conflict, violence, social unrest, vandalism, alienation, anomie, social apathy, crime, and even suicide. Even academicians such as vocational students and college students are involved in violence such as brawls which often end with the fall of the dead. The issue has become a chronic problem¹

Social problem is partly a symptom of social capital weakening implications in urban community. In fact, social capital is very important in social life. It refers to the norms of trust, reciprocity of mutual benefit, and joint action to achieve common prosperity. Cohen and Prusak state, "Social capital consists of the stock of active connections among people: the trust, mutual understanding, and shared values and behaviors that bind the members of human networks and communities and the make cooperative action possible"².

Accordingly, in regard to social scale, Hughes and Stone (2002) state, "Social capital can be understood as a resource to collective action, which may lead to a broad range of outcomes, of varying social scale. For individuals, this can mean access to the reciprocal, trusting social connections that help the processes of getting by or getting ahead. For communities, social capital reflects the ability of community members to participate, cooperate, organize and interact".

¹From 1992 to 2011, there are at least 69 cases of violence involving students in Makassar (See: *Kacung Marijan: Memotong Reproduksi Kekerasan Mahasiswa*, Kompas, October 17, 2012). Recently, the brawl between students of Senior High School 60 Jakarta and students of Senior High School 70 Jakarta on September 24 killed one person. (Reuters, September 24, 2012). In Makassar, the fight between students of Makasar State University (UNM) on October 11, 2012 killed two people (Reuters, October 11, 2012).

² D. Cohen and L. Prusak (2001). *In Good Company. How social capital makes organizations work*, Boston, Ma: Harvard Business School Press. Page 4.

Thus, social capital in individual scale will provide an easy access for community members to get information, become a media of power division in community, develop solidarity, and enable mobilization of community resources. In community scale, social capital will reflect the ability of community members to interact, collaborate, and organize themselves. Both levels – individual and community scale – will ultimately shape the behavior of togetherness to promote the achievement of common good.

There are many reasons designated as a trigger of social capital reduction and degradation. Some examples relate to factors of economic pressure, politics, social and culture. In regard to the context of city and urban life culture (urbanity), the causes of social capital poverty of urban community can be examined from two sides. The first is the poor spatial setting system of city. The increasing population as the effect of migration, urbanization, and economic growth has encouraged the growth of big cities in Indonesia. However, the growth is incremental, unplanned, and no vision – just like what happens in many developed countries. Thus, a comprehensive setting system is not created. As the result, many irregular and uncontrolled cities with low quality of physical environment, inadequate infrastructure, poor sanitation, spatial fragmentation and segregation, public space degradation and others are developed. The condition is also driven by weak implementation of city regulations and law enforcement.

The second is the unpreparedness and ignorance of the cultural essence of being urban. Understanding the urban culture, it means people should ready to negotiate to the four aspects of urban life: density, heterogeneity, anonymity and social intensity (Kamil, 2008). Many cities in Indonesia, such as Jakarta, often regarded as the city, but it is not in the true sense. Cities formed as an agglomeration of enlarged villages. Meanwhile, people who live in there still have thinking patterns and behaving village congenital. The lower-middle class people are not ready to dive into the social context of urban daily life with extreme intensity.

In the middle-up society class, the issue is different, but equally shows unpreparedness of urban life. Some groups are notable to tolerate the heterogeneity and negotiate with the density, which is often negated and unable to blend perfectly within the group and their outside groups. Spatially, they make an exclusive gate community. It leads to social conflict. “A gated community is a housing development on private roads closed to general traffic by a gate across the primary access. The developments may be surrounded by fences, walls, or other natural barriers” (Grant and Mittelsteadt, 2004).

Based on this background, it can be concluded that the design and arrangement of the city is good in one hand, and cultural essence being urban in the other hand. Both aspects become important to encourage the social capital strengthening. However, this article reveals the results of pilot study in first year, which focuses on the description of measurement result of urban objective quality and the level of social capital. Quality refers to the city’s urban objective quality. Social capital refers to the cognitive and structural social capital. Research was also conducted to examine the differences of each city’s variables by comparing the three cities in Indonesia.

Urban objective quality is based on the measurement of the physical dimensions, specially urban architecture. Indeed, the urban is not solely related to physical problems, but also non-physical. Thus, a city is a living entity, even when talking about the urban form. However, talking about the urban quality is certainly talking about the physical qualities. The structure of the physical environment of the city is formed by structural elements and natural. According Topcu and Kub at (2009), natural environment in the city composed by elements such as rivers, sea, topography, vegetation, air pollution, and temperature. In such a setting, an artificial environment that covers the entire structural elements such as houses, government buildings, commercial buildings, recreational buildings, and various other technical infrastructures connected differently from others.

Jenks and Burgess (2000), stated that the general shape of the city includes a number of physical characteristics such as size, shape, scale, allocation and land use, type of building, the layout of urban blocks, the distribution of green space, as well as non-physical characteristics such as density configurations form the social environment and forms of social interaction. Finally, in summary, the shape of the city can be described as urban morphological attributes at all scales (Williams et al, 2000).

Correspondingly, Ibrahim (2000) stated, the factors that influence the shape of the city consists of several physical variables that are directly influenced by the built environment itself, ie: open space, street hierarchy, allocation patterns, city, district, building demarcation line, density , layout, street patterns, block size, boundaries, nodes, network space, wide roads, form / shape blocks, unity, mass, material, color, focal point, shape, landmark, rhythm, stretch ceiling, texture, elevation, cover, gate variations, human scale, and others.

Thus, when we talk about the shape of the city, then surely we are talking about city's quality to accommodate the quality of life of its citizens. The parameters of urban objective quality refer to the concept of physical form criteria, is developed by Smith, Enlister, Perkins (1997). In general, the physical quality of the city's categories is including aspects of the following physical dimensions: *Community, urban blocks, streets, parking, pedestrian ways, open space, and vegetation.*

Back to the theory of social capital, broadly speaking, there are three main approaches in the study of the social capital level, namely cognitive social capital, structural social capital, and institutional social capital. As described earlier, this research involves cognitive and structural social capital.

In the concept of World Bank (Grootaert and Van Bastelaer, 2002), cognitive social capital is intangible source, which according to Uphoff & Wijayaratna (2000), Bain & Hicks (1998), refers to the values, norms, solidarity, reciprocal relationships, attitudes, beliefs, and social behaviors that support individuals to connect with others in collective action are mutually beneficial. The base values of cognitive social capital is civic engagement, an "encounter between people that is based on deep emotional affinity, a warm, close feeling psychologically, and the bonds of solidarity that is built on the basis of empathy and universal brotherhood" (Amich Alhumami, 2005).

Structural social capital is emphasis on instrumental structures, which facilitates the collaboration. This approach refers to the premise that social capital does not distinguish between individuals or communities, but rather an emerging characteristic of interdependence between individuals and groups in a society. Therefore, social capital is seen as an emerging source of social bonds and then used by the members (individuals and groups) in the social network. Adopt from Bain & Hicks (1998) and the World Bank (Grootaert and Van Bastelaer, 2002), the social network including in the **structural social capital** category. In this structural social capital, the position of the members of a social network, this type of interaction, and the conditions which occurs, is all factors that determine the form of resources and how the circulation of resources occurs. In the same context, Norman Uphoff & Wijayaratna (2000), Bain & Hicks (1998), stated the structural social capital include the social networks and structures of role, that facilitate collective action to reach the mutual benefit, through the rules, procedures, and specific precedent, the horizontal organization structure, participation and transparency in decision-making process, accountability, social leadership and responsibility and social action.

2. Methods: Perception-Based Measurement

There are various ways to measure the urban physical qualities. The most objective measurement of course is the physical measurement, through direct observation, plot by plot, and compared with the theoretical parameters of the considered city quality standards. However, for a city, which is so vast, with many physical dimensions, in practice, measurements of this kind, it would be very expensive. On the other hand, the perceived quality of city residents is not only about the physical size, but also perception. On this basis, developed a number of parameters based on perceptual quality measurement town.

This study uses the measurement concept based on the perception, the urban objective quality measurement through the observation of the physical elements of the city. Measurements were performed by three experts, using the observation quality parameters such as optional answers covered by numerical rating scale and a *semantic differential scale*³. In addition, the observation was also made on-site analysis, maps and photographic analysis. In practice, each object study divided into four areas of measurement. Thus, each expert will assess all four areas. Than overall are 12 number. In the analysis of the data, the number 12 is an N samples.

As mentioned above, the objective quality indicator refers to Smith, Nelischer, Perkins (1997), which included aspects of the physical dimensions: *community. general structure and pattern; urban general block. Structure and pattern; general buildings, civic, community, institutional, commercial, industrial, residential; general streets, byways, main streets, residential streets, laneways; general parking; pedestrian ways: general, sidewalks, formal trails; general open space., primary areas, secondary and tertiary areas, semi-public and private areas; vegetation: general; feature areas. natural resources, views.*

³For observational questionnaire urban objective quality, inductive analysis (validity), since measurements are made directly by the experts, namely: (1) M. Syaom Barliana, Professor of Sociology in the Architecture, Indonesia University of Education, (2) Diah Cahyani, Master of Architecture in the Housing and Settlement, Indonesia University of Education (3) Adi Ardiansyah, Master of Architecture and Urban Design, Indonesia University of Education

The research was conducted in three cities, Bandung, Surabaya and Surakarta. The selection is based on the research object purposive considerations. Bandung selected based on a preliminary study, a form of cultural city and urbanity with relatively poor quality. Surakarta, with the leadership and vision of Joko Widodo as the leader, is being transformed into a city with better urban quality. Surabaya chosen as a model city recognized as the benchmark of success in resettlement implementation that won a national championship. Another award was achieved in the environmental field, Adipura, Adiwiyata, and the Special Allocation Fund of City Management. Successes in managing the city and supported by people participation, a collaboration of stakeholders exemplary.

To measure the level of social capital, conducted through a questionnaire with the Likert scale has been done in previous studies, and tested its validity and reliability (Barliana, 2008). Respondents are selected based on two categories. First, respondents are members of a community or club formed by a group of people based on common interests, hobbies, social sensitivity, or profession, especially those associated with urbanity. In each city, was chosen between three and four community⁴. Second, the public respondents selected by systematic sampling accidental, that members of the public who are being and experience of urban space, especially in the city public space.

To perform data analysis using parametric statistics, the first data should be interval data or ratio. The study was designed using ordinal scale data, so it does not meet those requirements. Then, the samples must be taken at random. This study purposively sampled and accidental, so it does not also meet these requirements. On that basis, this study does not require the testing requirements of the parametric test for normality and homogeneity, and immediately decided to use non-parametric statistics.

To give you an idea of each variable urban objective quality and social capital used descriptive analysis, the display data frequency, means, mode, and median. Furthermore, the tendency test is to interpret the data. Interpretation through trend based on each variable (X) is compared with the parameters Ideal Means (Mi) and Standard Deviation (SD). Ideal Means is affixed parameter determined by the calculation: $\frac{1}{2} \times (\text{minimum} + \text{maximum})$.

The minimum score is the result of multiplying the value (1) with the number of question items within the scope of indicator of variables. The maximum score is the result of multiplying the value (4) with the number of items. Ideal means parameter include comparative scale of three cities, Bandung, Surabaya and Surakarta. The parameter is not based on theoretical parameters of each city, but ideal mean applies to all cities. Thus, for example, an indicator of the city in clueing the quality is very high or low only when compared to other city.

Criteria for interpretation, formulated as follows:

Table 1: Criteria of Descriptive Interpretation Measurement

Very low = $X < Mi - 1.5 SD$
Low = $Mi - 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 1.5 SD$
Moderate = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
High = $Mi + 1.5 SD > X \geq Mi + 0.5 SD$
Very High = $X \geq Mi + 1.5 SD$

The differences hypothesis test among variables through Wilcoxon sign test. Meantime, to see the significance of differences between variables are analyzed using the parameters: (1) If the probability/Sig(two-tailed) $< \alpha = 0.05$, then the difference between the two significant variables, (2). Conversely, the value of Sig > 0.05 , then the difference between the two variables is not significant.

⁴In Bandung, the communities chosen were The Ontel Community, Aleut Community, Sahabat Kota Community. In Surakarta, the communities chosen were Sepeda Onthel Community, Solo Kota Kita Community, Kampung Kita Community, and Rebon (Diskusi Arsitektur) Community. In Surabaya, the communities chosen were Kami Arsitek Jengki Community, Manic Street Walkers Community, Jurnalis Pecinta Lingkungan Community, Komunitas Surabaya Tempo Doeloe Community.

3. Results: Sense of Community and Public Space

In Table 2, the overall objective quality measurement results are shown in the cities of Bandung, Surabaya and Surakarta.

Bandung, in general it can be concluded in the low category. It seen on each indicator, it appears that the variations are scattered on all categories of indicators, with following details. Very low quality indicator shows in the general parking, byways, general pedestrian, pedestrian sidewalk, and formal trails. Low quality indicators appear in general street, residential street, and vegetation. Medium or high quality public space, urban blocks, general buildings, civic buildings, residential buildings, laneways, general public open space and open space on the primary areas. Furthermore, there is only one indicator in the high quality category, namely commercial buildings.



Figure 1: (left) The public transport park in the side of the street which is not belongs to a Parking Area; (right) The Example of public space situation in Bandung

The research results of the **objective quality of Surabaya**. In general, it appears that the Surabaya including in the very high category. If seen on each indicator, it appears that the variations are scattered on all categories of indicators, but there is no indicator with very low quality. The details are as follows. Low quality indicators appear only in the general parking area. Moderate or fairly high quality shows indicators of byways, residential streets, laneways, formal trails, general open space. The high quality is in the general buildings, civic buildings, residential buildings, general streets, general pedestrian, and vegetation. Furthermore, indicators are very high quality category, the public space, urban blocks, commercial buildings, general streets, pedestrian sidewalks, and open spaces in primary areas.



Figure 2: The condition of residential street and the open space within the community

The objective quality of Surakarta. In general it can be concluded Surakarta including in medium category. If seen in each indicator, it appears that variations scattered in all categories of indicators, but there is no indicator with high category. Very low quality indicator appears in the general parking area, laneways, byways, formal trails, and general open spaces. Low quality indicator shows the residential building and open space in primary area. Moderate quality is seen in public spaces, urban blocks, general buildings, civic buildings, residential buildings, general streets, byways, general pedestrian, pedestrian sidewalk, and vegetation. Furthermore, there is only one indicator of a very high quality category, which is the main street.



Figure 3: Sidewalk situation in the part of Surakarta. not only use for walking, but also to make a social relationship by the people

Table 2: The Results of Urban Objective Quality Measurements: Bandung, Surabaya and Surakarta

Descriptive Statistics: Bandung - Urban objective quality					
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mi	Conclusion
KO_All_Bandung	12	371.67	51.18	405	Low = $Mi - 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 1.5 SD$
Public space	12	51.75	9.34	55	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Urban_block	12	30.42	2.75	30	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Building_general	12	48.75	4.99	47.5	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Building_civic	12	19.08	2.35	20	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Building_comercial	12	21.42	3.20	17.5	High = $Mi + 1.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 1.5 SD$
Building_residential	12	36.58	6.43	37.5	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Street_general	12	17.17	2.72	20	Low = $Mi - 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 1.5 SD$
Parking_general	12	10.75	1.66	15	Very low = $X < Mi - 1.5 SD$
Streets: byways	12	5.83	1.19	7.5	Very low = $X < Mi - 1.5 SD$
Streets: main streets	12	21.75	2.73	22.5	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Streets: residential streets	12	10.67	1.83	12.5	Low = $Mi - 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 1.5 SD$
Streets: laneways	12	7.00	1.41	7.5	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Pedestrian ways: general	12	16.42	2.19	22.5	Very low = $X < Mi - 1.5 SD$
Pedestrian ways: sidewalks	12	9.75	1.48	12.5	Very low = $X < Mi - 1.5 SD$
Pedestrian ways: formal trails	12	6.92	1.83	10	Very low = $X < Mi - 1.5 SD$
Open space: general	12	12.42	4.70	15	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Open space: primary areas	12	17.83	5.92	17.5	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Vegetation	12	29.67	5.58	32.5	Low = $Mi - 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 1.5 SD$
Valid N (listwise)					
Descriptive Statistics: Surabaya - Urban objective quality					
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mi	Conclusion
KO_All_Surabaya	12	486.00	45.12	405.00	Very high = $X \geq Mi + 1.5 SD$
Public space	12	70.75	7.81	55	Very high = $X \geq Mi + 1.5 SD$
Urban_block	12	38.50	3.29	30	Very high = $X \geq Mi + 1.5 SD$
Building_general	12	55.17	5.37	47.5	High = $Mi + 1.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 1.5 SD$
Building_civic	12	21.75	3.11	20	High = $Mi + 1.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 1.5 SD$
Building_Comercial	12	22.67	2.42	17.5	Very high = $X \geq Mi + 1.5 SD$
Building_Residential	12	44.67	5.19	37.5	High = $Mi + 1.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 1.5 SD$
Street_general	12	24.92	3.75	20	High = $Mi + 1.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 1.5 SD$
Parking_general	12	13.58	2.84	15	Low = $Mi - 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 1.5 SD$
Streets: byways	12	9.67	2.35	7.5	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$

Streets: main streets	12	31.93	2.15	22.5	Very high = $X \geq Mi + 1.5 SD$
Streets: residential streets	12	11.75	2.26	12.5	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Streets: laneways	12	6.83	2.69	7.5	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Pedestrian ways: general	12	26.33	3.06	22.5	High = $Mi + 1.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 1.5 SD$
Pedestrian ways: sidewalks	12	15.67	1.67	12.5	Very high = $X \geq Mi + 1.5 SD$
Pedestrian ways: formal trails	12	11.08	3.09	10	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Open space: general	12	15.50	1.83	15	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Open space: primary areas	12	24.17	3.01	17.5	Very high = $X \geq Mi + 1.5 SD$
Vegetation	12	41.08	5.21	32.5	High = $Mi + 1.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 1.5 SD$
Valid N (listwise)					
Descriptive Statistics: Surakarta - Urban objective quality					
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mi	Conclusion
KO_All_Surakarta	12	391.08	31.39	405.00	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Public space	12	54.00	11.02	55	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Urban_block	12	28.92	2.71	30	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Building_general	12	41.25	4.49	47.5	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Building_civic	12	24.08	2.97	20	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Building_Comercial	12	18.75	3.14	17.5	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Building_Residential	12	41.67	3.03	37.5	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Street_general	12	20.33	2.46	20	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Parking_general	12	9.92	1.38	15	Very low = $X < Mi - 1.5 SD$
Streets: byways	12	9.50	1.57	7.5	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Streets: main streets	12	26.83	2.66	22.5	Very high = $X \geq Mi + 1.5 SD$
Streets: residential streets	12	10.50	2.43	12.5	Low = $Mi - 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 1.5 SD$
Streets: laneways	12	5.75	0.75	7.5	Very low = $X < Mi - 1.5 SD$
Pedestrian ways: general	12	21.00	5.74	22.5	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Pedestrian ways: sidewalks	12	12.92	3.34	12.5	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Pedestrian ways: formal trails	12	5.33	1.72	10	Very low = $X < Mi - 1.5 SD$
Open space: general	12	11.75	1.86	15	Very low = $X < Mi - 1.5 SD$
Open space: primary areas	12	15.00	3.10	17.5	Low = $Mi - 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 1.5 SD$
Vegetation	12	33.58	4.21	32.5	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Valid N (listwise)					

Based on the results of descriptive with tendencies measurements test, it can be concluded that Surabaya has a very high objective quality, Surakarta is medium, and Bandung is low. (see table 3). If seen by an indicator of the city, the quality is very high aspect present in the public space, urban blocks, commercial buildings, major roads, pedestrian walkways, and open spaces downtown (see table 2). However, based on differences test results, except Surabaya, are indicating no significant difference between the objective quality of the Surakarta and Bandung, so the difference is negligible levels.

Table 3. The Results of Urban objective quality: Total

Descriptive Statistics: ALL - Urban objective quality					
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mi	Conclusion
KO_Bandung	12	371.67	51.18	405.00	Low = $Mi - 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 1.5 SD$
KO_Surabaya	12	486.00	11.0245.12	405.00	Very high = $X \geq Mi + 1.5 SD$
KO_Surakarta	12	391.39	2.7131.39	405.00	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Valid N (listwise)	12		4.49		

The results described in Table 4 shows: (1) There are significant differences between the quality of Bandung and Surabaya, (2) There are no significant differences between the quality of Bandung and Surakarta, (3) There is a significant difference between the quality of Surabaya and Surakarta.

Table 4: Results of Differences Hypothesis Test of Urban objective quality

Test Statistics			
	KO_Total_Surabaya - KO_Total_Bandung	KO_Total_Surakarta - KO_Total_Bandung	KO_Total_Surakarta- KO_Total_Surabaya
Z	-3.062	-1.020	-3.061
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.308	.002

Furthermore, according to the social capital variable, Table 5 shows the social capital level of Bandung community members, in general are high. Likewise, if seen in the indicators of cognitive and structural social capital are also in high category. Furthermore, the social capital level of Surabaya community members, in general are very high category. If seen on each indicator, visible social capital is very high, cognitive and structural social capital is high.

The results of social capital in the Surabaya and Surakarta community members are similar, that is very high category. If seen in each indicator, cognitive social capital was very high, and structural social capital was high.

Table5: Results Measurement Social Capital Level: Bandung, Surabaya, Surakarta (Sample: Community Members)

Descriptive Statistics: Social Capital Level: Bandung (Community)					
	N	Mean	SD	Mi	Conclusion
MS All	43	198.14	21.67	172.5	High = $Mi + 1.5 Sd > X \geq Mi + 0.5 SD$
MS cognitive	43	96.77	10.28	82.5	High = $Mi + 1.5 Sd > X \geq Mi + 0.5 SD$
MS structure	43	108.18	15.27	90	High = $Mi + 1.5 Sd > X \geq Mi + 0.5 SD$
Valid N (listwise)	43				
Descriptive Statistics: Social Capital Level: Surabaya (Community)					
	N	Mean	SD	Mi	Conclusion
MS All	42	198.14	15.66	172.5	Very high = $X \geq Mi + 1.5 SD$
MS cognitive	42	101.36	12.61	90	High = $Mi + 1.5 Sd > X \geq Mi + 0.5 SD$
MS structure	42	96.79	8.10	82.5	Very high = $X \geq Mi + 1.5 SD$
Valid N (listwise)	42				
Descriptive Statistics: Social Capital Level: Surakarta (Community)					
	N	Mean	SD	Mi	Conclusion
MS All	42	133.33	9.94	82.5	Very high = $X \geq Mi + 1.5 SD$
MS cognitive	42	202.90	18.43	172.5	Very high = $X \geq Mi + 1.5 SD$
MS structure	42	102.50	13.33	90	High = $Mi + 1.5 Sd > X \geq Mi + 0.5 SD$
Valid N (listwise)	42				

Meanwhile, regarding to social capital variables with user of public space sample, Table 6 shows that the social capital level of Bandung generally high. Likewise, if seen in the cognitive social capital indicators also high, while structural social capital is high.

Similarly, the social capital level of Surabaya in general is high, including when seen in indicators of cognitive and structural social capital also high category.

Similarly, the social capital level of Surakarta, in general is high. Likewise, if seen in the cognitive social capital indicators also high, while structural social capital were high.

Table 6: Results Measurement Level Social Capital: Bandung, Surabaya, Surakarta (Sample: User of Public Space)

Descriptive Statistics: Social Capital Level: Bandung (Public)					
	N	Mean	SD	Mi	Conclusion
MS All	53	93.17	12.52	82.5	High = $Mi + 1.5 Sd > X \geq Mi + 0.5 SD$
MS cognitive	53	189.45	24.39	172.5	High = $Mi + 1.5 Sd > X \geq Mi + 0.5 SD$
MS structure	53	96.28	15.80	90	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Valid N (listwise)	53				
Descriptive Statistics: Social Capital Level: Surabaya (Public)					
	N	Mean	SD	Mi	Conclusion
MS All	56	95.89	10.89	82.5	High = $Mi + 1.5 Sd > X \geq Mi + 0.5 SD$
MS cognitive	56	197.21	22.18	172.5	High = $Mi + 1.5 Sd > X \geq Mi + 0.5 SD$
MS structure	56	101.32	14.13	90	High = $Mi + 1.5 Sd > X \geq Mi + 0.5 SD$
Valid N (listwise)	56				
Descriptive Statistics: Social Capital Level: Surakarta (Public)					
	N	Mean	SD	Mi	Conclusion
MS All	66	97.20	13.12	82.5	Very high = $X \geq Mi + 1.5 SD$
MS cognitive	66	195.18	26.12	172.5	Very high = $X \geq Mi + 1.5 SD$
MS structure	66	97.98	16.33	90	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$
Valid N (listwise)	66				

The results of descriptive research, with sample members of the community, in line with differences in test results, namely: (1) There is no significant difference between the social capital level of the community members of Bandung and Surabaya, (2) There is no significant difference between the social capital levels of Bandung and Surakarta community group members, (3) There is no significant difference between the social capital level of the Surabaya and Surakarta community members. See table 7.

Table7: Rate Difference Hypothesis Test Results of Social Capital (Sample: Community Member)

Test Statistics			
	MS_Kom_Surabaya Bandung	–	MS_Kom_Surakarta Bandung
Z	-279		-1.121
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.781		.262
			MS_Kom_Surakarta Surabaya
			-1.252
			.210

The results from the user of public space. Table 8 shows that: (1) There is no significant difference between the social capital level of its respondent in Bandung and Surabaya, (2) There is a significant difference between the social capital levels of its respondents in Bandung and Surakarta, (3) There is no significant differences between the social capital level of respondents in Surabaya and Surakarta.

Table 8: Rate Difference Hypothesis Test Results of Social Capital (Sample: The user of Public Space)

Test Statistics ^c			
	MS_Pub_Surabaya Bandung	–	MS_Pub_Surakarta Bandung
Z	-1.567 ^a		-2.031 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.117		.042
			MS_Pub_Surakarta Surabaya
			-.256 ^b
			.798

Refer to the descriptive data analysis and differences test measurement results above, it can be concluded as follows.

There are significant differences in urban objective quality between Bandung, Surabaya and Surakarta. Objective quality of Bandung and Surakarta are low-medium category, Surabaya is very high. On the other hand, there are no differences in the social capital level of community members. It means, the urban objective quality is not suddenly determine or parallels with the level of social capital. Although not directly, in line with the view of Montgomery (1998), that "The physical-spatial or built-up environment is necessary but in itself insufficient condition for urbanity.

Without activity there can be no urbanity". Urbanity, which is understood as a cultural activity urban life, in which there are shared values and social networks, are also included in the scope of social capital. "Developing urban it means increasing life together system, starting from the smallest group of the nuclear family, extended family, community housing blocks, to the community at the quarter, and ended on community residents at the city level"(Santoso, 2006:2001). This means urbanity part of social capital.

Thus, besides the spatial physical urban objective quality, it is very important to increase the activity of urban life. In connection with this, the results of the study can be understood, because the sample is a community member who loves, a relatively conscious, have an appreciation, and often conduct activities to maintain and revive their city. They are generally more familiar, understand, and appreciate the city environment (sense of place). The reality: "The stronger the sense of place, indeed the more someone understanding and have strong relationship to the environment, then it will increase the sense of community" (Barliana, 2010:122)

Furthermore, the user of public space sample, the general social capital level in the category is quite high and high, but high in the category of cognitive social capital. In connection with this there are two analyzes that can be presented. First, people often use the public space, generally have high levels of social capital, particularly with regard to cognitive social capital that includes values, norms, and beliefs. This does not happen to ordinary residents of the housing, as shown by the results of previous studies Barliana (2008), which shows the results of measuring the social capital level in the ordinary housing residents in the city. It was only in the medium category (see table 9). Second, it proves the thesis that many public spaces that accommodate a variety of activities and social interaction, are a good vehicle for fostering social capital. This also explains why there is a significant difference between social capital users of public space in the city of Bandung with Surakarta. Surakarta, does not have significant differences objective quality compare with Bandung, but the users of public space is relatively more open to interact intensively. This fits with the statement Krklješ, et al (2009: 146), that: "Public spaces in a city have vital role in an urban area. Numerous functions which they have, services they offer to their consumers, directly affect quality of life. By studying three basic components: character, structure and importance of public spaces, we may obtain a clear picture of the existing condition of the city. The role of these spaces is not only to establish the environmental quality, but also the necessary psycho-social relations in a society. "

Table 9: Results of Social Capital Level Measurement of Community Housing Residents in Bandung

Descriptive Statistics: Social Capital Level of Housing Residnet in Bandung					
	N	Mean	SD	Mi	Conclusion
Social Capital_Total	208	220.246	24.148	210	Fairly high = $Mi + 0.5 SD > X \geq Mi - 0.5 SD$

Resources: Barliana (2008).

4. Conclusion: The Importance of Public Spaces

The first, Surabaya generally has a very high quality of city. If seen by an indicator of the city, the quality is very high aspect present in the public space, urban blocks, commercial buildings, main streets, pedestrian sidewalk, and open spaces in primary area. Objective quality of Bandung and Surakarta did not have significant differences, including the low to moderate category.

The second, in general, the social capital level of the people who use the public space is high category. This does not happen to ordinary residents of the housing society. Thus, it is suspected, the strengthening of social capital occurs because of the involvement of the community and the intensive activity in the public sphere.

Third, the urban objective quality is very important to continuously improved, and it is the responsibility of local governments. Surabaya city, with a leader who has a good vision of the town, has been proved.

On the other hand, the public must be increased involvement in community activities to love and appreciate the city, as well as interaction and interrelation in public spaces.

5. Acknowledgements

Very high appreciation for those who helped research, particularly research funding schemes to sponsor the National Strategic 2012, the Ministry of Education and Culture, Higher Education Directorate-Republic Indonesia.

Our appreciation is also conveyed to the members of the Ontel Community, Aleut Community, and Sahabat Kota Community in Bandung; Sepeda Onthel Community, Solo Kota Kita Community, Kampung Kita Community, dan Rebon Community (Diskusi Arsitektur) in Surakarta; Kami Arsitek Jengki Community, Manic Street Walkers Community, Jurnalis Pecinta Lingkungan Community, Surabaya Tempo Doeloe Community in Surabaya, as well as members of the public space users sample. Also for the Planning Department of Bandung, Surabaya and Surakarta, which has allowed us to access the data arrangement of city policy. The last, we would like to thank our students, Intan Permatasari, Rani, and Siti Kurniasih who helped in field data collection.

References

- Alhumami, A. (2005). *Modal Sosial Untuk Rekonstruksi Aceh*. Jakarta: Kompas
- Bain, K. and Hicks, N. (1998). *Building Social Capital and Reaching Out to Excluded Groups: The Challenge of Partnerships*. in *Paper presented at CELAM meeting on The Struggle Against Poverty Towards the Turn of the Millenium*. Washington D.C.
- Barliana, M. S. (2010). *Arsitektur, Komunitas, dan Modal Sosial*. Bandung: Metatekstur. pp. 122.
- Barliana, M. S. (2008). *Kontribusi Tata Atur Lingkungan dan Perilaku Spasial terhadap Modal Sosial*. Disertasi. Bandung: Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Cohen, D. and Prusak, L. (2001). In *Good Company How Social Capital Makes Organizations Work*. Boston, Ma: Harvard Business School Press. pp. 4.
- Grant, J. and Mittelsteadt, L. *Types of Gated Communities*. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 2004, 31, pp. 913- 930.
- Grootaert, C. and van Bastelaer, T. (2002). *Understanding And Measuring Social Capital: A Multi-Disciplinary Tool For Practitioners*, Washington DC, The World Bank.
<http://www.publication.worldbank.org/research/journal>. 6/6/2006
- Ibrahim, H. (2000). *An Analytical Comparative Approach To The Relationships Between Spontaneous And Vernacular Settlement*. SEP. Egypt: Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University. On Tamer Abdel Aziz and Indjy M. Shawket. *Energy Procedia*, 6 (2011), pp. 228–235. On 1876–6102 © 2011 Published by Elsevier Ltd. doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2011.05.026.
- Jenks, M. and Burgess, R. (2000). *Compact Cities : Sustainable Urban Forms for Developing Countries*. New York: Spon Press.
- Kamil, R. (2008). 8 Catatan Kaki Isu Urbanitas Kita. <http://bintangtenggara.multiply.com/>.
- Krklješ, M., Kubet, V., & Hiel, K. (2009). *Interrelationship of Public Spaces and Built-in Corner Buildings Based on the Examples of Modernism in “Mali Liman” Area in Novi Sad*. *FACTA UNIVERSITATIS. Series: Architecture and Civil Engineering*, 7(2), pp. 146.
- Montgomery, J. (1998). *Making A City: Urbanity, Vitality And Urban Design*. *Journal of Urban Design*, 1, pp. 93–116.
- Santoso, J. (2006). *Menyiasati Kota Tanpa Warga*. Jakarta: Kepustakaan Populer Gramediadan Centropolis. pp. 201.
- Smith, T., Nelischer, M., & Perkins, N. (1997). *Quality of An Urban Community: A Framework For Understanding The Relationship Between Quality And Physical Form*. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 39, pp. 229-241. Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Stone, W., and Hughes, J. (2002). *Social Capital: Empirical Meaning And Measurement Validity*. *Research Paper*, 27, pp. 1. Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies – Commonwealth of Australia
- Topcu, M., and Kubat, A., S. (2009). *The Analysis of Urban Features that Affect Land Values in Residential Areas*. *Proceedings of the 7th International Space Syntax Symposium*. Daniel Koch, Lars Marcus and Jesper Steen (eds.). Stockholm: KTH.
- Uphoff, N., and Wijayaratna, C.M. (2000). *Demonstrated Benefits from Social Capital: The Productivity of Farmer Organizations in Gal Oya, Sri Lanka*. *World Development*, 28(11).
- Williams et al., (2000). on Jenks, M. and Burgess, R. (2000). *Compact Cities : Sustainable Urban Forms for Developing Countries*. New York: Spon Press.