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Abstract
Recent concern has risen for Chinese immigrants who lived in Java, Indonesia, following an effort to recognize their existence and cultural uniqueness as part of local potential since a major change in political realm that nullified the law that restricted Chinese from having equal right with the other culture groups during New Order era (1966-1998). This paper is addressing particular housing issue, (1) establishing shop house and (2) land ownership of shop houses. This paper is aiming at revealing the strategy of developing shop house building by Chinese or native Javanese in various period up to recent time, in order to see the respond toward those housing issues and how these issues have impacted their choices. Finally, this investigation resulted in some underlying principles that govern their physical environment despite of some changes.

Introduction
The primary motivation of this paper is the relationship between minority-majority group in society which may affect and be represented through the physical environment of their living space. We are particularly addressing Chinese minority group and native Javanese majority group in their current housing issue based upon recent observation and interview. For immigrants and during periods of rapid culture change or culture contact, the process learning may occur later in life is then known as acculturation (Rapoport, 1982: 65). As there are numerous examples of ethnic groups who managed to revive their ancestral language and culture (Fisherman, 2001 in Padilla, Perez, 2001: 38), acculturation was not solely seen as a process of cultural change but as a more complex process with multiple outcomes (Padilla, Perez, 2003: 38).

Parallel to what Rapoport said that dwelling is the primary setting for most people (2005: 19), the house is also where cultural life styles are expressed (Ng, 1998: 63). House forms, the internal layouts, and the cultural dwellings in a neighborhood can be disruptive or supportive of the life styles and values of their occupants (Bochner, 1975 cited in Ng, 1998: 63). Buildings can symbolically represent an attitude about what is taking place inside (Sanoff, 1991:37).

Method of Study and Context
Yogyakarta is located in Middle Java, within an hour drive from Surakarta, and is considered as having a close relationship with Surakarta and Semarang in terms of development of Chinese settlement particularly after the construction of the first railways in Middle Java connected Semarang, Surakarta, and Yogyakarta (Zahnd, 2008: 36). An analysis of house layouts was done by Pratiwi (2010: 255) in comparing Javanese and Chinese house mentioned that the Chinese house in Lasem, near Semarang, and probably throughout Java, is more likely to be the result of acculturation which is unique and apart from the original Chinese architecture and traditional Javanese. A study by

---

1 Berry (in Padilla, Perez 2003, 39) prefers to use the term cultural group rather than minority.
Mutari (2010) emphasized that the political factor is the main actor to the changes of Chinese houses in Surakarta, Middle Java. Through the combination of literature study of various documents and site observation, this study is trying to analyze the physical condition of the existing shop house buildings and their neighborhood in two separated areas, Ketandan where Chinese settlement existed and formed the old urban center and Seturan where Javanese lived and formed new urban center. Even though these two areas were different in both period of establishment and thus its historical relevance, this paper is focusing on the current situation and problems under the context of socio-cultural change and its continuity. According to Sanoff (1991: 27) there are two ways in which we can examine the structure of the physical world, or two fundamental operations for sorting out meaningful relations among words: contrast and grouping. Thus, redrawing from the photographs and some sketches was necessary to reinterpret the condition of the area and capture the atmosphere in order to get the holistic approach to understand the condition through mainly house plan, facades, and sections.

An open-ended interview to the owner/occupants was conducted in 2004, 2006 and again in 2010 in separate sequences alongside the observation to record the changes. There were several houses that were undergone in-depth interview, but it would not underestimate the other houses. This paper is not comparing one house to another house from different culture, but selecting some random house in Ketandan and in Seturan without trying to make statistical approach. Therefore, this study method is more qualitative approach and is considered as preliminary study for further meaningful research.

The Establishment of Shop House in Yogyakarta

Chinese immigrants who came to Yogyakarta were from Southern part of China such as Yunnan who originally made their living on farming (Pratiwo, 2010: 11, 15). Due to some limitation in acquiring land to work, they had no choice but to engage in trade and business (Ong Eng Die in Pratiwo, 2010: 11), and lived close to market place (Surjomihardjo, 1988: 55). The ethincal segregation during the colonialism prevented Chinese from living in separate space by law (Wijkenstelsel) so they were concentrated in certain area like most cities in Java until 1915 (Pratiwo, 2010: 38) when they started to spread and lived in some other areas such as Ketandan. Their early houses were small and dirty which grew bigger and higher (Surjomihardjo, 1988: 56), occupying lands around the Malioboro street (Zahnd, 2008: 114) which flourished as the urban center in 1930 until now (figure 1).

Even though the fact that minority status of the immigrant is the heart of the problem in terms of smaller numbers and lower status in society as in the case of immigrants in America (Padilla, Perez, 2003), in this particular case, Chinese in Indonesia took advantage of their cultural traits (Abdurrahman, 2008:52) to gain more economic benefit than the native Javanese during colonialism at the end of 18th century which resulted in “ethnic jealousy” (Pratiwo, 2010: 11). Chinese in Java was always considered as minority yet their influence was extensively embedded in everyday life that it is impossible to recognize in certain period of time.
(Zahnd, 2008: 29-30). Their cultural group gave some economic benefit that triggered social jealousy from native Javanese during colonial period in 1602-1945 (Pratowo, 2010:11-12) that later turned out to be sharpened during the reign of New Order era in 1966-1998 by enacting the law that restricted Chinese in Indonesia, effective in Java, by abolishing the use of Chinese language, Chinese name, etc. In fact, the repression underwent in Chinese in Yogyakarta prompted acculturation to take place by force (external cause) (Pratwo, 2010: 13). However little study relates how Chinese may respond through their physical environment in accordance with activity compared to Javanese in the current situation.

A study by Sarwadi (2001: 210) in Sumatra, Indonesia mentioned that there are two types of raft and pillar houses, one is for living and another for both living and working. This is also applicable to different culture, such as in Java. However, unlike Chinese, Javanese traditional houses do not have the type of shop house (Pratwo, 2010: 243). Thus the development of shop house in Java must have been influenced by Chinese (Angraini, 2007: 2), which has existed in Southern China over a long period of time (Kohl, 1984 in Pratwo, 2010: 85).

Chinese has developed shop houses extensively as urban center in Yogyakarta that has reinforced their existence and their ethmical identity (Zahnd, 2008: 30).

The native Javanese who have been practicing agriculture for generations were also opening their house for a shop as economic gain after 1970s when people began to sell their land or build upon their land buildings (Tionawati, 2007). This has been a great change in the lifestyle, occupational area, following the change in physical environment which continued and served as the basic change today in society.

Both cultures were exposed to the changing in social and economic when urbanization took place and engaged in trade and business as their alternative way of living. Although both cultures have the same purpose to make their own living in the house, they have carried out different strategy in their shop house plan based on their values, which is both visually observed through facades, spatial arrangement, and house structure.
Land and House Ownership

Along with urbanization came the housing issue of utilizing land. Recently, this is becoming an important issue in Yogyakarta city when the special status of Kingdom began to dissolve. The land utilization has been based upon a concept that all lands belong to Sultan (Sultanate ground), the King, from whom people obtained permission to occupy and build in certain area. This has slowed down the speed of housing development as people keep their reverence for Sultan. For instance, the height of buildings was kept to low height for ordinary building even though for some commercial buildings, it could not help to raise the level of height. It also affected the practice of owning property which is not as free as in other region in this country. Even though recent changes in economic situation has prompted people to ignore the traditional value and follow the profit or economic beneficial value, somehow it represented in the way people divide their land, for both Javanese and Chinese in Yogyakarta.

According to some interviews, it is quite long period of owning and living in the house (two or three generations) before the passed it to another party which has no family or background relationship. Some shop houses in Ketandan has changed its owner or leased for business purpose to different culture group such as Javanese. This was quite a change after a long "gap" among these two culture groups during the New Order era. The same attitude also happened for Javanese, as now more carefree to sell the property to other party for the business purpose and noted change also from living to working and living as mentioned in the case study of Karangmalang (formerly farming land) in Yogyakarta by Tisnawati (2007). Javanese culture also has considered a house as a place as in term of Javanese language, there is only one word referring to 'place' which referred to space, time, and ritual (Kartono, 2005: 131). 'Place' might mean attachment toward community, the city, the country as a whole, apart from the home, which may not necessary to Chinese for they were once immigrants in Yogyakarta (as suggested by Ng, 1998: 64).

Besides influencing the formal exchanging act of property among the owners, according to some interviews, many had considered the land they occupied as an inheritance and precious gift which was not supposed to be sold to outsiders, only among families. This also supported the fact that Javanese tended to stay where they are living then moving to another place or region. Chinese family was rather carefree in moving out and selling/leasing the house/property to another party (also in Pratiwo, 2010: 93). According to the interview, those who had enough money would buy new house or move to another more spacious area/better environment rather than staying. On the other hand, native
Javanese would rather consider passing the land as an inheritance by dividing the land and the house.

Figure 4. The Use of Terrace in front of Chinese Shop House

Particularly in Ketandan where shop houses were closely constructed both to the side and street, terrace or the passage way in front of the shop had turned into the transition space which according to observation was used by public. Hawkers may use the space to keep their things (figure 4). Another report mentioned that along Malioboro street hawkers may claim space not only as territory, but also as ‘formal’ property among hawkers with prices as the sign even without the agreement with the shop owner. This showed the common/mutual understanding in using space, based on an informal agreement, and probably a consequence of the fact that nobody really owns the land except Sultan. Therefore there is no clear public and private house even inside the house for Javanese, but this has been a slight problem for Chinese when there is no gate and therefore entrance was only through shop opening door that also marked the transition to the house. While this has not been a problem in Javanese shop house which does not need transition and clear separation of private from public space. The penetration of private in the public space is significantly high in this particular area of Ketandan as part of urban commercial center, where Chinese were living. While Javanese were

Physical Feature Analysis

Chinese shop house has inclination to expand their space vertically and inwardly because the acquired land was already enclosed, so the house would get bigger and more complex in its spatial arrangement. On the other hand, the native Javanese has tendency to expand their house outwardly and horizontally, because their houses were surrounded by land/garden and sometimes without clear circumference.

According to the plan of the house, the Chinese shop houses in Yogyakarta resembled those in Semarang (Pratowo, 2010: 88-90). There is shop enlargement to the terrace at the first floor. First wing consisted of shop and bedroom, next wing consisted of living room and air well, and third wing consisted of service area, and another bedroom. Upper floor (right above the shop) was storage and sleeping room (also in Pratowo, 2010: 91). This spatial arrangement was similar to the study conducted in Taiwan about traditional shop house which consisted of three elements of main structure, secondary structure and courtyard (cited in Ellisa, 1999: 317-318) (cited in Pratowo, 2010: 119-120). Rooms or spaces within the house were the multiplication of this basic unit of spaces called “One Wing Form” (in Ellisa, 1999: 317).

One piece of land with one unit of building of Chinese shop house had apparent boundary that separated private from the public space both visually and physically. With regard to the circulation area and apparent control to the street as public space through the sole entrance that mark the transition between private and public. Shared or continuous structure of the facades served the apparent edge of territory between private and public as Habraken put it as the edge of domestic territory (1998:164).

One piece of land with one unit of building of Javanese shop house would sometimes have no clear demarcation to mark the private space belonging to the building. Therefore, no strong orientation to the street as public space and showed some visual connection with the public road.
Enclosed structure was found apparently in Chinese shop house. In addition, some shop house units were built with party wall or shared wall, meaning one structure wall supporting two units. Not only that, the houses were having outward impression of one single house when in fact, it consisted of two or three separate unit (figure 5). Roof construction and façade construction emphasized that impression. This was not necessarily house compounds or family-related reasons. Structurally separated for each unit was found in Javanese shop houses with the orientation to the land surrounding the building. Unlike traditional Chinese house in southern China that has inner yard, traditional Javanese house has yards mainly in the front and at the back (Pratiwo, 2010: 243, 252). The fence whenever existed was visually transparent made of plants or bamboo. This reflected the openness to the surrounding/neighborhood by reducing the privacy level compared to Chinese. According to observation, mostly in Javanese shop house, there’s always room for guest apart from shop to receive guess and also terrace for social gathering. Therefore traditional Javanese house has orientation to the yard in the front that also served as the entrance to the building, contrary to the traditional Chinese house that has orientation to the street with entrance through the gate.

Table 1. Physical Feature Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Javanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structurally</td>
<td>Structurally separated front part from back part with separate access.</td>
<td>No apparent structural separation, nor separate access, clustered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>separated front</td>
<td>Linear composition.</td>
<td>composition,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part from back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part with separate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access. Linear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>composition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation inside</td>
<td>Relation inside building is vertical. Movement/division inside building</td>
<td>Relation inside building tended to be horizontal, focusing on the plan 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building is vertical.</td>
<td>vertical, focusing on both horizontal and vertical (3 dimensional).</td>
<td>dimensional). Movement is considered horizontal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement/division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inside building is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vertical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure 5. Façade of Chinese Shop House (author, 2007)
Relation to the street is rather regular, straight, predictable, planned in a sharp line, building orientation follow the street pattern by the entrance.

Relation to the street is rather unplanned, indirect, spontaneous, surrounded with open spaces, building orientation do not always follow the street pattern.

Property boundary is clearly demarcated, never overlapping with public space that is street. Only one entrance from street at the front.

Property boundary is not clearly demarcated, sometimes overlapping with street, small street, or passerby.

Conclusion

By contrasting the two cultures against housing issue, roughly we can get some basic ideas of what is going on in urban society. This is expected to help to understand the problem that may be hidden, the way of living, the way of thinking that may be different, but we must respect in order to live in harmony. The consequences that apply to our physical environment may start from the very basic understanding of being culturally different. The process of acculturation that took place in the society regarding the cultural differences may happen elsewhere and triggered by and result in different outcome that one may expected, but there is no right or wrong about culture, it is just about how we choose to live. This paper may conclude that understanding different culture is not enough but realizing that acculturation may happen both ways not only one way is the basic idea for any physical development of housing, therefore we cannot neglect the burden of being cultural group.
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