JOURNAL OF CULTURAL ANALYSIS AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change,
2025, 10(1), 96-107
ISSN: 2589-1316

Leadership Behavior as the Determinant of Organizational Engagement: A Review of Managerial Character and Employee Retention

Alwi Rubidium Sjaaf[1*], Gumilar Rusliwa Somantrib[2], Paulus Wirutomo[3]

[1,2,3] *Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia*

***Corresponding Author:** alwi@alwisjaaf.com

Citation: Sjaaf, A. R., Somantrib, G. R. & Wirutomo, P. (2025). Leadership Behavior as the Determinant of Organizational Engagement: A Review of Managerial Character and Employee Retention, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 10(1), 96-107. https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v10i1.3415

Published: December 18, 2025

ABSTRACT

This study investigates how community empowerment processes influence urban planning outcomes in Jakarta's pursuit of global city status, examining the dialectical tension between top-down infrastructure development and bottom-up community participation. Integrating Saskia Sassen's global city theory with Susan Fainstein's just city framework and AT Kearney's Global Cities Index, this research analyses how infrastructure projects serve as both instruments of social control and mechanisms for community empowerment, drawing on classical sociological frameworks of power, social stratification, and urban modernization. The study focuses on Jakarta, Indonesia, analysing the city's transformation from DKI (Daerah Khusus Ibukota) to DKJ (Daerah Khusus Jakarta). This research employs a mixed-methods approach combining qualitative case study analysis of community-led planning initiatives, policy document analysis, and ethnographic observation of grassroots movements, with data collection including semi-structured interviews with community leaders. The findings reveal that community empowerment emerges when residents successfully negotiate meaningful participation in urban planning processes. Grassroots movements, grounded in local wisdom and traditional mutual aid practices (gotong royong), demonstrate that participatory governance can transform communities from passive recipients to active urban stakeholders, indicating that Jakarta's path toward global city status requires justice-oriented planning prioritizing community rights alongside economic competitiveness metrics.

Keywords: Community, Infrastructure, Urban Planning, Justice, Global City

INTRODUCTION

Jakarta's transformation into a global city is marked by deep contradictions. On one hand, the city continues to expand rapidly within global capitalist networks, attracting major infrastructure investment and urban renewal projects. On the other hand, this growth has intensified spatial inequalities, housing insecurity, and socio-economic exclusion for many of its residents. Pacione (1990) identified two major challenges that cities will face in the future. The first concerns the effects of urban size and population density on the urban environment, including issues such as crime rates. The second relates to the city's internal spatial structure, encompassing the distribution of welfare services and physical infrastructure, and their implications for transportation, mobility, and overall patterns of interaction within the city. This trajectory reflects a broader tension in urban development between growth-driven planning and the need for social equity (Roitman and Rukmana, 2022). The benefits of urbanization have been distributed unevenly both within cities and across the nation, prompting calls for a paradigm shift in urban planning and design to ensure that all social groups can share in its gains, leaving no one behind (Roberts et al., 2019). Urban development processes have generated multidimensional transformations encompassing changes in economic structures, social structures, value systems, and generational dynamics within the context of global

change. While a strong sense of national identity has become more widespread, globalization has simultaneously triggered what Naisbitt describes as the "global paradox," in which heightened interconnectedness coincides with the resurgence of solidarity based on group, ethnic, racial, and religious identities (Budiharjo, 2009).

Jakarta's vision to become a global city, shaped by frameworks such as the Global Cities Index (Kearney, 2022) and influenced by transnational development models carries both opportunities and risks (Sassen, 1991). Without strong mechanisms to ensure accountability and equity, infrastructure can become a tool of exclusion. However, when residents are given the opportunity to co-create and shape urban projects, infrastructure can also become a powerful tool for empowerment and justice. In response to these dynamics, Fainstein (2010) offers the Just City framework, which challenges the dominance of market logic in urban development. She argues that cities must strive not only for economic efficiency and global competitiveness but also for justice, defined through equity, diversity, and democracy. From this perspective, urban planning must actively ensure a fair distribution of resources, democratize decision-making, and recognize the diverse voices within the city (Arnstein, 1969). Fainstein develops a method to investigate justice in the provision and redistribution of goods and services within cities. Fainstein (2010) highlights the need to encourage planners and policymakers to adopt a normative perspective in urban planning and theory, assessing how the traditional emphasis of progressive planners on equity and material well-being can be integrated with newer priorities such as diversity, participation, and sustainability. When applied to Jakarta, these frameworks raise urgent questions: Who truly benefits from the infrastructure projects tied to the city's global ambitions? Who has the authority to decide what gets built, where, and for whom? And crucially, how can communities be genuinely empowered to shape the future of their city in the face of market-driven urban development?

To address these questions, the research focused on three main areas:

1. How does Jakarta's transition from DKI to DKJ reshape the dynamics of community participation in urban planning?
2. Under which circumstances can community participation effectively challenge the forms of exclusion produced by global city projects?
3. How can local communities be genuinely empowered to influence and shape the future of their city amid the dominance of market-driven urban development?

The aim of the study investigates how infrastructure development in Jakarta functions as both a mechanism of control and a potential vehicle for community empowerment. It explores the conditions under which communities successfully assert their agency in urban planning processes and aim to highlight policy pathways that support more inclusive, just, and resilient urban development in Jakarta.

RELATED RESEARCH

Recent scholarship on urban justice and participatory planning in the Global South has increasingly emphasized the tension between global city-making projects and grassroots struggles for inclusion. In the twenty-first century, the "century of the city," resilience has emerged in policy discourses surrounding urban planning and design as a pre-emptive and holistic concept that challenges conventional regimes of governance (Huck et al., 2020; Pitidis and Coaffee, 2020). Increased focus has been placed on the uneven deployment of such city-based resilience policies, with a view toward enhancing future inclusivity and equity within urban planning processes (Matin et al., 2018). These debates converge on the central issue of how community empowerment can act as a counterforce to neoliberal urbanism and exclusionary planning. Salama and Grierson (2016) argue that cities in the Global South, including those in Southeast Asia, must be understood as sites of experimentation where informal practices, resilience strategies, and grassroots organizing intersect with global capitalist dynamics.

Empirical cases support this view. Gerbeaud (2018), for example, demonstrates that spontaneous settlements in Bangkok, once stigmatized as slums, have become laboratories of urban transformation. Through networks and collective action, residents asserted their right to the city, appropriated social housing to fit their economic and cultural needs, and infused neighbourhoods with functional diversity. Such practices not only contested state-led relocation schemes but also reshaped the visions of planners and authorities, illustrating how everyday spatial practices can redefine urban futures from below. Similarly, Ruiqi (2019) shows that in Singapore, participatory design in public housing renewal has evolved through a historical layering of strategies that balance state control with community adaptation. By reflecting on the intersections of history, strategy, and practice, Ruiqi highlights how participatory frameworks can both legitimize state planning goals and empower residents to transform standardized housing into socially meaningful spaces. Building on these insights, this study seeks to examine Jakarta's transition from DKI to DKJ not only as an administrative and symbolic shift but also as a site where the possibilities of community empowerment, participatory planning, and urban justice are being contested.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, participatory observation, and analysis of planning documents and spatial regulations. Guided by the understanding that stories are powerful tools for communicating lived experience (Dyson & Genishi, 1994) the study engaged with 5 respondents, including community leaders, local activists, and municipal officials, selected through purposive sampling to capture diverse perspectives on participatory planning. Semi-structured interviews were transcribed to identify recurring patterns of empowerment, exclusion, and negotiation. Policy documents provided critical contextual grounding, these included Law No. 2/2024, which redefined Jakarta's status from *Daerah Khusus Ibukota* to *Provinsi Daerah Khusus Jakarta*, as well as the Governor's Decree No. 294/2025, which established a roadmap for Jakarta to enter the ranks of the world's top 20 global cities. In addition, Governor Regulation No. 90/2018 on settlement quality improvement and Governor Regulation No. 33/2024 on kampung empowerment, together with *Musrenbang* reports, were systematically reviewed to triangulate interview findings against formal planning frameworks. Ethnographic observations were conducted during community meetings and protest rally with detailed fieldnotes analysed alongside interview transcripts to ensure validity through cross-comparison.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Urban Life in the Era of Global Cities

The emergence and expansion of large cities during industrialization and globalization have profoundly transformed urban society's social, economic, and cultural structures, with these changes continuing to influence contemporary cities like Jakarta (Roitman and Rukmana, 2022). Sassen (1991) defines global cities as urban centres that hold significant economic, political, and cultural influence on the international stage. She identifies New York, London, and Tokyo as prime examples of such cities, which serve as key nodes in the global system. Sassen (1991) explains that these cities operate as command and control centres for the global economy, particularly in finance and advanced corporate services. Their connections with other cities are shaped less by competition and more by mutual interdependence within global networks. Moreover, global cities function as primary sites where the processes of globalization, across economic, political, social, and cultural dimensions are concentrated and made visible. Importantly, Sassen (2005) argues that a global city is not merely a large metropolis or a historically significant world city, but a distinct outcome of the growing integration of the global economy. Sassen (2016) examines the profound transformations occurring in cities as a result of the emergence and influence of a new phenomenon: intermediaries. These intermediaries require specific types of spaces designed to facilitate the production of tools and capabilities. One example is outsourcing work. The global city serves as an extreme site for the production and/or implementation of highly diverse and complex intermediary capabilities.

In this context, the role of the state has shifted. Rather than acting as a centralized planner and regulator, it increasingly functions as a facilitator for market forces. Harvey (2006) observes that under neoliberalism, urban governments have adopted entrepreneurial strategies, rebranding and promoting their cities to attract global capital. neo liberalization plays a key role in shifting the core principles of urban governance in megacities—from technically oriented "managerialism" to market economy-oriented "entrepreneurialism" in order to compete with other urban centres on a global scale (Sheppard, 2014). This transformation has led to urban planning decisions that align with market logic, often at the expense of the public interest. Policies related to zoning, permits, and infrastructure development are frequently reshaped to accommodate the needs of investors and business interests, rather than local residents. Consequently, informal settlements and low-income urban communities are often pushed to the margins (Hellman and van Voorst, 2018). Robinson (2009) similarly critiques this model, warning that without deliberate efforts toward justice and inclusion, the global city risks producing spatial and social apartheid, where affluent enclaves flourish alongside neglected zones of urban poverty.

The concept of the "right to the city" (Lefebvre, 1968) remains highly relevant in this context, particularly when global city aspirations threaten to marginalize local voices. Henri Lefebvre's (1968) concept of *The Right to the City*, rooted in a Marxist approach, has been a highly influential reference in discussions on justice and the city. The argument behind *The Right to the City* is built on three pillars: (1) spatially just resource distribution, (2) political agency, and (3) socio-cultural diversity. This concept defines space as a social construct and asserts that every citizen deserves the right to the city. Lefebvre (1968) stated, "the right to the city cannot be conceived of as a simple visiting right or as a return to traditional cities. It can only be formulated as a transformed and renewed right to urban life." This idea later inspired Dikeç (2001) and Purcell (2003). It introduced elements of philosophy and political economy into debates on social and urban justice (Harvey, 1996; Forester, 1989; Campbell and Marshall, 2006). The common thread in these works is the attempt to identify ways to create a more just city for

its inhabitants. Social justice is the cornerstone of any democratic society, which upholds the right to actively participate in a free and tolerant community that practices inclusive politics (Merrifield and Swyngedouw, 1996).

According to Sassen (1991), globalization in the late 20th century triggered widespread privatization and deregulation, shifting control over urban assets from the state to the market. This marked a transformation in urban governance, from managerialism to entrepreneurialism, where city governments increasingly adopt the role of market-oriented actors focused on attracting investment, often aligning state interests with those of corporations (Harvey, 1989). As a result, private capital has become the primary driver of global city development, frequently sidelining local communities from critical decision-making processes.

Geeomschaft and Gesellschaft as Foundation of Community Empowerment

Ferdinand Tönnies foundational typology of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*, introduced in 1887, remains a vital theoretical lens for understanding how communities evolve and empower themselves within modern urban life. Tönnies (1940) distinguished *Gemeinschaft* as traditional, kinship-based social formations grounded in shared values and emotional ties, commonly found in agrarian societies and feudal structures. In contrast, *Gesellschaft* refers to societies shaped by urbanization, industrialization, and market-driven relations, where social bonds are instrumental and impersonal. While *Gemeinschaft* represents unity despite separation, *Gesellschaft* reflects separation despite unity (Tönnies, 1940). In rapidly transforming cities like Jakarta, this framework helps explain the tensions between organic, community-rooted social life and the impersonal logics of the global market. As cities compete globally through economic liberalization and infrastructural megaprojects, local communities often risk marginalization in decision-making processes (Sassen, 1991; Harvey, 1989). The transformation from traditional to modern urban society in Jakarta echoes this shift, raising critical concerns about who gets to shape the city, and for whose benefit.

Kusno (2013) highlights that Jakarta's urban development has long been characterized by top-down state interventions that often neglect everyday urban struggles. He argues that the politics of visibility frequently obscures the contributions and rights of informal, working-class communities. In Jakarta, neoliberalism co-evolves not only with long-standing, resilient oligarchic power structures (including practices of elite informality; Herlambang et al., 2018). Herlambang et al. (2018) shows how politicians mobilize State-Owned Enterprises in "public-public partnerships" to support capital accumulation that they rationalize as benefitting national interests, while also attempting to provide affordable housing and infrastructure for urban citizens (often against the market-based logic of the Public-Private Partnership). Meanwhile, Kusumawijaya (2004) advocates for "city as a living space," emphasizing the centrality of *warga kota* (urban citizens) in urban planning. Sustainable global city must be built upon active civic participation, cultural continuity, and local wisdom, not merely physical infrastructure or global branding.

Historically, Indonesia has rich traditions of *Gemeinschaft*, like social cohesion. Prior to the influence of Japanese administrative structures like *Tonarigumi* in 1943, communities in Java already practiced forms of mutual aid such as *sinoman* and *pralenan*, voluntary associations rooted in *gotong royong* (collective work) (Suwarno, 1995). These localized social formations demonstrate how indigenous practices of cooperation and solidarity have long underpinned community resilience and empowerment in the archipelago. Empowerment as a process that runs continuously to improve the capability and independence of the community in improving their standard of living (Dewi, 2013).

This insight emerges from an in-depth interview conducted with G. Muhammad, a resident of Kampung Tongkol who has become one of the pioneering voices in advocating for urban village justice. The interview, conducted on August 7 2025, reveals the lived experiences of communities navigating the tensions between global city aspirations and local social realities. In the context of Jakarta's aspiration to become a global city, these historical and contemporary experiences underscore the vital role of empowered communities. While the global city discourse often centres on infrastructure, capital flow, and inter-city competition, it is ultimately the residents, their shared identity, civic organization, and participation that determine the social sustainability of such aspirations. Without inclusive governance that places community at the heart of urban development, the risk is that Jakarta's global ambitions will deepen inequality and displace the very people who animate the city (G. Muhammad, Personal Interview, August 2025).

Thus, Jakarta is not, as many of its critics and inhabitants argue, a city "without a plan." (Kusno, 2013). Rather, it is a city of uneven development, where the discourse and practice of urbanization have long been captured by state and elite interests, leaving limited room for genuine community participation. Kusno (2013) highlights how the peri-urban is often constructed as a "space of exception," functioning as a buffer zone of negligent governance where the poor and working classes are tolerated but denied substantive citizenship rights, perpetually promised the prospect of the city yet rarely integrated into its formal structures.

This uneven governance has been further entrenched by Jakarta's embrace of neoliberal urbanism, privileging deregulation, privatization, and market facilitation over the protection of citizen rights. The outcome is the

emergence of a "dual city," where elite enclaves tied to global capital exist alongside marginalized kampungs facing displacement, environmental risk, and legal precarity. This phenomena particularly draws attention to the crucial role of local citizens in decision-making for enhancing community resilience (Allen et al., 2022; Lam et al., 2020).

The DKJ transition thus carries both opportunities and risks. Autonomy could enable Jakarta to adopt inclusive, justice-oriented governance, but without institutional safeguards, it risks exacerbating exclusion through what Kusno (2015) terms "creative destruction." Integrating local values—such as Pancasila's *Sila Kelima* as proposed by Seto and Najicha (2023)—into the Just City framework offers a moral foundation to reconcile global pressures with local priorities. Ultimately, whether DKJ deepens inequality or fosters empowerment depends on whose voices are recognized and institutionalized in the city's planning processes.

Historical Trajectories of Jakarta's Urban Planning

Over the past six decades, Jakarta has undergone significant transformation influenced by political, market, and social changes that reflect broader global transitions from industrial to post-industrial society. Douglass (2010) presents an analytical framework through his examination of the relationship between global connections and the morphology of Mega Urban Regions (MUR) across four distinct eras of Jakarta's urban transformation, which parallels the theoretical evolution described by various scholars of contemporary urbanism.

These transformations in Jakarta reflect the broader societal shift beyond the epoch of urban industrialism into what scholars have variously characterized as the "age of high mass-consumption" (Rostow 1960), the "post-industrial society" (Bell, 1973), "Post-Fordism" (Harvey, 1989), the "postmodern condition" (Harvey, 1989; Jameson 1984; Lyotard 1984), or a society dominated by "globalization" (Sassen, 1991). These interconnected theoretical frameworks, comprehensively reviewed by Scott (2007), provide essential context for understanding how Jakarta's urban development trajectory embodies the global transition from industrial production systems to post-industrial formations characterized by flexible accumulation, knowledge economies, and global interconnectedness.

Jakarta's urban development reflects a layered and uneven historical trajectory that spans from its colonial past as Batavia to its current aspirations as a global city. Infrastructure decisions in Jakarta are often centralized and top-down, reflecting elite interests rather than grassroots needs. Yet, local resistance and community mobilization have challenged these dynamics, demanding more inclusive urban governance (Padawangi, 2012; Silver, 2007). Historians identify five major phases in this transformation: (1) the initial settlement in the Old Town (Kota Tua) envisioned as an "ideal city," (2) the expansion to Weltevreden for colonial elites, (3) the integration of Meester Cornelis, (4) the development of Kebayoran Baru, and (5) sporadic and uncoordinated suburban expansion (Nas and Grijns, 2000). Each phase marks a spatial and social restructuring, reinforcing fragmentation and deepening urban inequality (Dorleans, 2000). From its earliest stages, Jakarta's global orientation was evident in its role as a key port in international trade. Sunda Kelapa and later Batavia functioned as major commercial hubs in Southeast and East Asia (Pires, 1944; Lombard, 1990). By the 18th century, Batavia was renowned for its shaded canals, Dutch colonial architecture, and bustling trade. However, rapid population growth triggered severe public health crises. Environmental degradation, water pollution, and the spread of endemic diseases accompanied the city's demographic boom (Silver, 2007). The transformation of Batavia from a "healthy city into a graveyard" was not due to poor urban planning or natural disasters, but rather to pollution caused by the sugarcane cultivation industry, which contaminated the drainage system (Blussé, 1986). Van der Brug (1994) further argues that fishpond development along muddy coastlines worsened malaria outbreaks, contributing to the decline of Old Batavia.

The opening of the Suez Canal (1859–1869) accelerated global trade and catalysed the construction of Tanjung Priok Port (1870), which spurred industrial and informal residential expansion in Northern Batavia. The Dutch colonial government introduced the *Welthoudende Decentralisatie* policy in 1903, followed by the establishment of *Gemeente Batavia* in 1905, granting local autonomy in urban administration (Sadikin, 1977). Toward the end of the 19th century, the Dutch launched the Ethical Policy (*Ethische Politiek*) in response to mounting international criticism of colonial exploitation (Abeyasekere, 1989). This reform initiated changes across three sectors: (1) establishment of native education institutions such as STOVIA (School for Javanese Physicians); (2) expansion of healthcare and irrigation infrastructure; and (3) construction of affordable housing for native workers in neighbourhoods such as Senen and Tanah Abang.

Urban planning in Batavia saw further formalization through the *Kringen en Typen Verordening* (KTV) in 1941, introducing zoning regulations that laid the foundation for modern Indonesian spatial planning. Batavia was envisioned as an acropolitan city integrating both urban and agrarian functions, a transformation from a canal city to a street city, a shift largely attributed to the ineffective management and maintenance of its canal infrastructure (Dewi et al., 2022).

During the Japanese occupation, Huff and Huff (2015) note that food-deficit regions like Jakarta experienced rapid population growth. The Japanese administration implemented two lasting urban governance policies: the division of the city into seven administrative subdistricts (*shiku*) and the *tonarigumi* neighbourhood unit system—

Table 1. Trajectories of Jakarta's urban planning

Period/phase	Key features & policies	Main actors	Implications for urban planning
Colonial Batavia (17th–19th c.)	Establishment of Kota Tua; expansion to Weltevreden; integration of Meester Cornelis; Dutch zoning regulations (KTV 1941).	VOC, Dutch colonial state	Top-down spatial control; elite-centred planning; health & sanitation crises; marginalization of native communities.
Late Colonial Reforms (1900s–1942)	Ethical Policy: native schools, housing for workers; Tanjung Priok port (1870); decentralization policy (1903).	Dutch state, colonial elites	Some social improvements (education, housing) but largely maintained colonial hierarchies and inequality.
Japanese Occupation (1942–1945)	Division into shiku subdistricts; tonarigumi neighbourhood unit system (RT/RW precursor).	Japanese military administration	Introduced grassroots administrative units; strengthened control but laid groundwork for community-level governance.
Early Independence (1945–1966)	Master Plan by Soewirjo; relocation policies; municipal struggles against informality.	Jakarta Municipality, Ministry of Public Works	Attempted inclusive planning but weak institutional support; informal settlements expanded.
New Order (1966–1998)	Large-scale state-developer alliances; mega projects; centralized planning; PPP experiments.	Suharto regime, property developers	Reinforced exclusionary development; displacement of kampungs; limited community participation.
Post-Reformasi (1998–present)	Decentralization; influx of global capital; mega real estate projects; MRT/LRT via PPP; neoliberal governance (shih, 2019; Colven, 2020).	Jakarta Provincial Govt, private developers, global investors	Growth of neoliberal, market-led planning; symbolic participation (Musrenbang); communities resist & grassroots organizing.

early versions of today's RT and RW structures in Indonesia. These micro-level administrative units, such as *ban* and *chome*, were led by a *kucho* (village chief) who acted as an intermediary between residents and the military regime (Kurasawa, 2015). After independence, Jakarta became a municipality with Soewirjo as its first mayor (Sadikin, 1977). Working with the Department of Public Works, Soewirjo initiated a Master Plan to address forced relocations and illegal land occupations, aiming to mitigate urban planning challenges (Nas and Malo, 2000). Jakarta continued to struggle with its colonial spatial legacy, unregulated urbanization, inadequate infrastructure capacity, and widespread informality (Roy, 2005). National-scale urban plans developed by Bappenas lacked strong institutional support at the municipal level. As a result, planning authority was increasingly supplanted by market forces, particularly politically connected property developers. Under the New Order regime, state-developer alliances drove major urban projects, often undermining social justice and equitable spatial access (Kusno, 2023).

The post-Reformasi period (post-1998) introduced decentralization, granting more autonomy to regional governments, including the Jakarta Provincial Government. Paradoxically, this shift created greater opportunities for private—both local and transnational—actors to influence urban development agendas (Mi Shih (2019); Colven, 2020). Since the early 2000s, Jakarta has experienced a surge in real estate investment, marked by the proliferation of mega-developments, exclusive business districts, and luxury housing complexes (Winarso and Firman, 2002). Major developers such as Agung Podomoro, Ciputra, and Sinarmas Land have dominated Jakarta's urban expansion, facilitated by pro-investment policies and expedited permit processes (Shih, 2019). In terms of governance, the Jakarta government increasingly embraced Public-Private Partnership (PPP) schemes for major infrastructure projects such as the MRT, LRT, and coastal reclamation. These PPP models reflect what Miraftab (2004) describes as the "Trojan horse of neoliberal development", a strategy that rhetorically promises collaboration and empowerment, but in practice enables market interests to dominate public space and infrastructure agendas.

Infrastructure is not a neutral entity. It reflects and reproduces power relations. Infrastructure governance is marked by bureaucratic rationality and elite-driven legitimacy (Téllez Contreras, 2025), especially in Jakarta. Major urban projects often prioritize global competitiveness at the expense of local needs. Scholars like Harvey (2006) and Sassen (1991) argue that neoliberal urbanism tends to favour privatization, displacement, and the commodification of space. In Jakarta, this pattern has been evident in infrastructure development that frequently acts as a tool for social stratification and exclusion.

Participatory Design as a Pathway to Urban Justice

In the discourse on equitable urban development, civil society plays an essential and non-substitutable role. Fainstein (2010) argues that a just city can only emerge when citizens are actively involved in shaping development trajectories. In terms of housing and community-building, participatory design emerged in 1950s when

professionals collaborated with urban poor in developing countries such as Peru, and then developed respectively in the USA and the UK from 1960s to 1970s. Since then, the principles and methods of participatory design have been empirically concluded3 with a number of projects practiced in multiple countries (Sanoff, 1999; Wates, 2014). Conyers (1986) classified community development into three types based on the approach "top-down", "bottom-up" and "partnership". According to Finger (1994), the bottom-up approach emphasizes community participation, grassroots movements and local decision making. Cohen and Uphoff (1977) emphasized that participation includes people's involvement in decision-making processes, in implementing programmes, their sharing in benefits of development programmes and their involvement in efforts to evaluate such programmes. Positioned between 'research-led' and 'design-led' approaches (Sanders and Stappers, 2008), participatory design is inherently aimed at addressing real-world, practical challenges in (co-)designing artefacts, human interactions, and organizational structures, starting from what already exists.

Sanoff (2009) engaged in creative collaborations with people in public spaces to re-make environments, working in new ways with local communities through a continual process of give and take, a two-way stretch between the practitioner and interested parties. The participatory design process, involving the architect, social researcher, and community, was carried out in six stages: (1) conducting observations and interviews, (2) holding group focus interviews to develop the design concept, (3) conducting group focus interviews to finalize the design, (4) collaborating in the construction of the project, (5) holding group focus interviews to plan activities, assign persons in charge (PIC), and arrange facility sharing, and (6) carrying out evaluation and follow-up.

In Jakarta, Formal participatory mechanisms such as *Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan* (Musrenbang) and public consultations during the drafting of spatial plans (RTRW and RDTR) have been introduced as tools to institutionalize citizen involvement in Jakarta. However, studies show that these mechanisms are often limited to symbolic inclusion. Miraftab (2004) characterizes such invited spaces as state-controlled arenas where participation is procedural, not transformative. While residents are invited to provide input, they are rarely empowered to meaningfully influence outcomes. Genuine civic participation in urban governance requires transparency and institutional accountability. According to Yusuf (2014), meaningful participation rests on five core principles: the right to access information, the right to reflect on that information, the right to express opinions, the right to influence decision-making processes, and the right to monitor policy implementation. Garcia-Zamor (1985) further emphasizes that as participatory approaches gain prominence, particularly bottom-up strategies, development management must shift from an input-oriented to an output-focused model. This shift repositions community members as strategic stakeholders rather than passive beneficiaries.

In Jakarta, multiple frameworks have been developed to expand participatory space, including *Musrenbang*, the Community Action Plan (CAP), the Collaborative Implementation Program (CIP), and neighbourhood forums (*Forum RW*). *Musrenbang* is a formal, regulation-based mechanism allowing residents to propose development programs through a multi-tiered process, from the neighbourhood (RW) level up to the municipal government. While structurally sound, its bureaucratic nature limits grassroots innovation and responsiveness (Colven, 2020). The Community Action Plan (CAP), on the other hand, has been implemented in various urban kampung settlements in Jakarta as a more flexible and community-driven planning model. Unlike the formalized structure of *Musrenbang*, CAP empowers local residents to identify problems, design solutions, and develop neighbourhood improvement strategies collectively. In CAP processes, citizens do not merely voice aspirations, they become co-creators of their living environment. Aligned with spatial justice theory, CAP demonstrates how equitable urban space is formed through lived experience and collective action rather than technocratic policy (Soja, 2010). CAP initiatives in Kampung Akuarium and Kampung Kunir illustrate how substantive citizen engagement can challenge historic inequalities in spatial production through co-creation and shared governance. With the strengthening of democracy (demokrasi), communities have been encouraged to further participation (partisipasi) in decision-making processes to improve their neighbourhoods. This is in a context of a more established right-based approach to public policy, which creates more inclusive cities. (Roitman and Rukmana, 2022).

DISCUSSION

From Eviction to Empowerment: The Case of Kampung Susun Kunir

Kampung Kunir is an informal settlement located on Jalan Kemukus No. 2, in Pinangsia, Taman Sari, West Jakarta. Established in the 1970s along a tributary of the Ciliwung River, it forms a critical part of Jakarta's Old Town (Kota Tua) heritage district situated just 300 meters from Fatahillah Square and adjacent to the Jakarta Kota train station. As of 2025, the settlement is home to 149 families occupying approximately 50 housing units. Kampung Kunir provides a compelling case of how participatory design can become a vehicle for justice in the context of Jakarta's contested urban development. Located within the heritage zone of Kota Tua, this settlement faced forced eviction in 2015 under the justification of river normalization and spatial violations. Yet, rather than

dissolving, residents rebuilt their community through collaboration with grassroots networks such as Jaringan Rakyat Miskin Kota (JRMK) and Architecture Sans Frontières Indonesia (ASF-ID). The community established a cooperative, *Koperasi Konsumen Kunir Pinangsia Sejahtera*, that not only functioned as an economic platform but also as a governance structure. The resulting *Kampung Susun Kunir*, a four-story vertical housing complex with communal spaces and micro-enterprise facilities, illustrates how collective agency can transform dispossession into empowerment (ASF-ID, 2025). This echoes Fainstein's (2010) notion of the *Just City*, where residents do not merely claim justice but actively produce it through participatory practice.

Comparative perspectives from other Asian contexts reinforce the significance of historical continuity and the optimization of participatory processes. Ruiqi (2019), studying Singapore's public housing renewal, highlights that participatory design requires a careful balance between regulation and spontaneity, where the "kampong spirit" serves as a cultural anchor for reaching consensus across diverse stakeholders. This parallels Kunir's reliance on *gotong royong* traditions, demonstrating that localized cultural values provide the foundation for participatory legitimacy. Similarly, Hanifati and Lukito (2020) show how collective memory and shared heritage can redefine conservation practices, underscoring that participatory design is not merely about physical structures but also about preserving social and cultural meaning within urban renewal efforts.

At the same time, questions remain about the limits of state-led, top-down models of participation. As Ruiqi (2019) observes, government-driven initiatives often operate under fixed timetables that shorten design and construction cycles, leaving little room for sustained resident engagement. This aligns with the concerns raised by Prastyatama (2024), who proposes a participatory framework for humanitarian urban contexts in Indonesia that emphasizes interdisciplinary collaboration and long-term community ownership. Both argue that without deeper structural commitment, participation risks becoming symbolic, producing short-term gains without sustainable impact.

These debates resonate with recent work by Irawaty et al. (2023), who document housing justice activism in Jakarta's urban margins. They argue that participatory practices are most effective when framed as practices of *urban citizenship*, enabling marginalized residents to assert claims not just to housing but to recognition, dignity, and belonging. Linking this to Kunir, the success of the cooperative model lies precisely in transforming eviction survivors into active co-designers of their environment, thereby embodying urban citizenship in practice. Taken together, these cases suggest that participatory design is most transformative when it integrates local traditions (e.g., *gotong royong* or kampong spirit), supports long-term community governance structures, and recognizes residents as equal partners rather than passive beneficiaries. The comparative lessons from Jakarta and Singapore reveal both the potential and the limitations of participatory design, underscoring the need for frameworks that bridge spontaneity with regulation, memory with modernity, and grassroots agency with institutional support.

Reimagining Just Infrastructure for Jakarta Global Cities

The transformation of Jakarta's status from *Daerah Khusus Ibukota* (DKI) to *Daerah Khusus Jakarta* (DKJ), as mandated by Law No. 2 of 2024, signifies more than a mere administrative adjustment. It reflects both a historical and contemporary turning point in the city's trajectory amid the pressures of globalization, capitalism, and shifting geopolitical functions. At present, Jakarta ranks 74th in the Global Cities Index published by AT Kearney, and through Gubernatorial Decree No. 294 of 2025, the city has established a roadmap to position itself among the world's top 20 global cities. This vision, articulated in the *Jakarta Rise #20: Path Towards Top 20 Global City*, outlines a phased transformation toward 2045 under the RISE framework: (1) Readiness & Foundation Building (2025–2029); (2) Innovative & Inclusive Growth (2030–2034); (3) Sustainable Transformation (2035–2039); and (4) Elevated Regional & Global Leadership (2040–2045). These phases are supported by four strategic pillars—Business & Economy, Society & Workforce, Tourism & City Branding, and Environment & Sustainability—backed by three enablers: Infrastructure & Mobility, Research & Innovation, and Governance & Finance. Each pillar sets ambitious targets, from expanding the creative economy to promoting digital connectivity and green mobility. Yet, despite this ambitious agenda, the roadmap remains limited in addressing Jakarta's structural challenges, particularly the persistence of spatial and socio-economic inequality. The emphasis on global competitiveness risks framing achievements as technocratic milestones rather than as responses to systemic urban injustices. As Sassen (2005) reminds us, a global city is not simply a large metropolis with economic power, but a strategic node in transnational networks of production, finance, and services. Parnreiter (2017) further stresses that global city functions often rely on the extraction and transfer of value from peripheral to central areas. In Jakarta, this dynamic is reflected in uneven development where elite global enclaves and superblock projects expand, while kampungs and marginalized communities face displacement, precarity, and exclusion from economic centres.

Such contradictions highlight the profound implications of Jakarta's transformation for spatial structure and social justice. Jakarta embodies layered urban realities that, as Kusno (2023) observes, often resist relational order and manifest as chaotic and fragmented landscapes. This condition is rooted partly in the legacy of Fordism, which emphasized mass production, centralized control, and spatial efficiency. In the post-Fordist era, as Sassen (1991)

argues, cities simultaneously integrate into global capital networks while fragmenting local labour and community structures. Jakarta demonstrates this tension through state–market alliances in superblock and infrastructure projects that frequently marginalize existing socio-spatial fabrics. At the same time, neoliberal governance has deepened deregulation, privatization, and market dominance (Storper, 2016), transforming the state into a facilitator of growth rather than a guarantor of rights. As Harvey (2004) describes, these dynamics amount to "accumulation by dispossession," producing a dual city: globalized enclaves linked to transnational capital coexist uneasily with urban kampungs deprived of secure tenure, basic infrastructure, and recognition. This transformation brings with it major consequences for spatial equity and urban justice. Yet, community resistance demonstrates alternative pathways. Irawaty et al. (2023) highlight how kampung residents practice *urban citizenship* through housing justice activism, asserting their right to remain and participate in shaping the city. This resonates with Cabannes et al.'s (2018) argument for *social urbanism*, where community empowerment and grassroots planning offer a counterweight to elite-driven urbanism. Within the framework of DKJ, these practices underscore the need to expand justice beyond redistribution to include recognition and participation (Fraser and Honneth, 2003). Kusno (2015) notes that urban development in Jakarta frequently proceeds through "creative destruction," where modernization efforts displace long-established community spaces, particularly in urban *kampung*. Without accommodating these complex realities, Jakarta's transition into DKJ risks intensifying spatial fragmentation and inequality. Post-DKI Jakarta must strive to balance economic growth with spatial and social sustainability, not merely to become an efficient global city, but a just and inclusive one (Hudalah, 2025; Kusno, 2015).

In such a context, justice must extend beyond *redistributive justice* to include *recognitional justice*, the acknowledgment of marginalized groups and the creation of authentic deliberative spaces (Fraser and Honneth, 2003). Jakarta exemplifying a contested arena where state rationality, market hegemony, and community-based resistance intersect (Castells, 1983), making community a crucial fourth value in the Just City framework alongside its original three principles, and, as Seto and Najicha (2023) contend, with "Sila kelima" providing a moral and normative foundation to reconcile global justice principles with local values.

CONCLUSION

Infrastructure in Jakarta has functioned both as a tool of exclusion and a potential medium of empowerment. While top-down development often aligns with market interests and leads to displacement, community-led initiatives have shown that bottom-up empowerment is possible, especially when grounded in local wisdom, historical traditions of mutual aid (gotong royong), and participatory governance. Jakarta's transition from DKI to DKJ presents a critical juncture. If approached through a justice-oriented lens, it opens a path for an inclusive, sustainable, and humane global city. Rather than relying solely on technocratic planning or global metrics, the city must re-centre its policies on the rights, voices, and lived experiences of its communities. Ultimately, justice is not an abstract ideal, but a strategic and moral imperative. A just Jakarta is one that elevates its people—not only by building roads and skyscrapers, but by ensuring dignity, recognition, and agency for all who live within it. In doing so, Jakarta can become a global city not only in competitiveness, but in compassion and community resilience.

To strengthen meaningful public participation in Jakarta's urban development, this study proposes the *Lembaga Bantuan Pendamping Masyarakat (LBPM)* as a collaborative platform linking government, market, and communities. Building on the earlier *Lembaga Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Jakarta (2004–2015)*, LBPM would identify neighborhood needs at the RT/RW level while integrating top-down and bottom-up planning, mediating between state policies and community priorities, and upholding principles of urban justice. Its functions would include enabling citizen feedback on local plans, monitoring development projects, and conducting spatial-social assessments to design equitable interventions. To ensure independence, facilitators should come from universities, professional associations, and civil society groups. However, LBPM's effectiveness requires a stronger legal foundation: existing gubernatorial regulations (No. 90/2018 and No. 33/2024) are insufficient, as they are vulnerable to shifts in political leadership. Elevating inclusive planning policies to the status of *Peraturan Daerah* would secure continuity, embed justice in urban governance, and establish a durable institutional framework for a just and sustainable global Jakarta.

Ultimately, Jakarta's path as DKJ must be measured not only by its global competitiveness but by its capacity to secure dignity, recognition, and agency for its residents. A just Jakarta is one where infrastructure serves empowerment as much as development, and where the city's future is shaped collectively by the people who inhabit it.

REFERENCES

Abeyasekere, S. (1989). *Jakarta: A history*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216–224. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225

Bell, D. (1973) The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting. Basic Books, New York.

Blussé, L. (1986). *Strange Company: Chinese settlers, mestizo women and the Dutch in VOC Batavia*. Foris Publications.

Budiharjo, E. (2009). *Arsitektur dan Perilaku*. Gadjah Mada University Press.

Campbell, H., & Marshall, R. (2006). Towards justice in planning: A reappraisal. European planning studies, 14(2), 239-252.

Castells, M. (1983). *The City and the Grassroots*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers.

Cohen, J. M. and Uphoff, N. T. (1980). Participation's place in rural development: Seeking clarity through specificity. *World Development*, 8(3), 213–235. https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750x(80)90011-x

Colven, E. (2020). Subterranean infrastructures in a sinking city: The politics of visibility in Jakarta. *Critical Asian Studies*, 52(3), 311–331. https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.2020.1793210

Conyers, D. (1986). "Decentralization and Development: A Framework for Analysis." Community Development Journal 21(2).

Dewi, E. P., Sujatini, S., Suryani, F. and Wijaya, A. (2022). Canals to streets: Postcolonial studies on the urban transformation of colonial Batavia. *Engineering Heritage Journal*, 6(1), 25–30. https://doi.org/10.26480/gwk.01.2022.25.30

Dewi, I. (2013). Pengaruh program nasional pemberdayaan masyarakat mandiri perkotaan (PNPM-MP) terhadap peningkatan pendapatan masyarakat miskin di Kota Banda Aceh. *Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi Pascasarjana Universitas Syiah Kuala, Banda Aceh*, 1, 1–10.

Dikeç, M. (2001). Justice and the spatial imagination. Environment and planning A, 33(10), 1785-1805.

Dorleans, B. (2000). Jakarta: From city to metropolis. In P. Nas (Ed.), The Indonesian Town Revisited. Leiden: Leiden University Press. ISBN: 3825860388, 9783825860387

Douglass, M. (2010). Globalization, mega-projects and the environment: Urban form and water in Jakarta. *Environment and Urbanization Asia*, 1(1), 45–65. https://doi.org/10.1177/097542530900100105

Dyson, A. H., & Genishi, C. (Eds.). (1994). The need for story: Cultural diversity in classroom and community. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Forester, J. (1989). Planning in the Face of Power. University of California Press. ISBN: 9780520064133

Fainstein, S. (2010). The Just City. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. ISBN 978-0-8014-4655-9.

Finger, M. (1994). NGOs and transformation: Beyond social movement theory, in T. Princen and M. Finger (eds), *Environmental NGOs in World Politics: Linking the local and the global* (pp. 48–66). London: Routledge.

Fraser, N. and Honneth, A. (2003). *Redistribution or Recognition?: A political-philosophical exchange*. Translated by J. Golb, J. Ingram and C. Wilke. London: Verso Books.

Garcia-Zamor, J.-C. (1985). *Public Participation in Development Planning and Management. Cases from Africa and Asia*. London: Routledge.

Gerbeaud, F. (2018). Gerbeaud, F. (2018). 3 Inhabitants of Spontaneous Settlements in Bangkok: Networks and Actions Changing the Contemporary Metropolis. *Cities in Asia by and for the People*, 69.

Cabannes, M. Douglass and R Padawangi (eds), *Cities in Asia by and for the People* (pp. 69–98). Amsterdam University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9789048536252-006

Hanifati, K. and Lukito, Y. N. (2020). Redefining conservation through collective memory. *International Journal of Built Environment and Scientific Research*, 4(1), 23–32. https://doi.org/10.24853/ijbesr.4.1.23-32

Harvey, D. (1989). *The Condition of Post Modernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, Nature, and the Geography of Difference*. Blackwell.

Harvey, D. (2004). The 'New' Imperialism: Accumulation by Dispossession. Socialist Register, 40, 63-87. https://socialistregister.com/index.php/srv/article/view/5811

Harvey, D. (2006). *Neo-Liberalism and the Restoration of Class Power. Spaces of Global Capitalism: A theory of uneven geographical development*. London: Verso.

Harvey, D. (2008). The right to the city. *New Left Review*, 53, 23–40. https://doi.org/10.64590/fmh

Hellman, J. and van Voorst, R. (2018). *Claiming Space in Jakarta: Megaprojects, city planning and incrementalism*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315111919

Herlambang, S., Leitner, H., Tjung, L. J., Sheppard, E. and Anguelov, D. (2018). Jakarta's great land transformation: Hybrid neoliberalisation and informality. *Urban Studies*, 56(4), 627–648. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098018756556

Huck, A., Monstadt, J. and Driessen, P. (2020). Mainstreaming resilience in urban policy making? Insights from Christchurch and Rotterdam. *Geoforum*, 117, 194–205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2020.10.001

Hudalah, D. (2025). *Planning Indonesia's New Capital City: Behind Nusantara*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003529668:10.4324/9781003529668

Huff, G. and Huff, G. (2015). Urban growth and change in 1940s Southeast Asia. *The Economic History Review*, 68(2), 522–547. https://doi.org/10.1111/ehr.12073

Irawaty, D. T., Leitner, H. and Sheppard, E. (2023). Practicing urban citizenship: Housing justice activism from Jakarta's margins. *City*, 27(5–6), 985–1006. https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2023.2271716

Kearney. (2022). 2022 global cities index, *Kearney*. Available at: https://www.kearney.com/global-cities.

Kurasawa, A. (2015). *Kuasa Jepang di Jawa: Perubahan sosial di pedesaan 1942–1945*. Komunitas Bambu.

Kusno, A. (2013). *After the New Order: Space, Politics and Jakarta. Honolulu. Hl: University of Hawaii Press.* ISBN: 0824837452, 9780824837457

Kusno, A. (2023). Jakarta: City of a Thousand Dimensions. NUS Press. ISBN: 978-981-325-226-4

Kusumawijaya, M. (2004). *Jakarta: Metropolis tunggang langgang*. GagasMedia.

Lam, D. P., Hinz, E., Lang, D. J., Tengö, M., von Wehrden, H. and Martín-López, B. (2020). Indigenous and local knowledge in sustainability transformations research: A literature review. *Ecology & Society*, 25(1). https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-11305-250103

llen, A., Wesely, J., Blanes, P., Brandolini, F., Enet, M., Iacovini, R. F. G., Fassina, R., Flores Pacheco, B., Medina, G., Muniz, A., Pérez, S., Pineda, S., Reina, M., Amparo Sánchez Medina, L. and Xavier, J. (2022). Crafting urban equality through grassroots critical pedagogies: Weave, sentipensar, mobilize, reverberate, emancipate. *Environment & Urbanization*, 34(2), 446–464. https://doi.org/10.1177/09562478221115334

Lefebvre H. (1968). Le Droit à la ville (The right to the city) (2nd ed.). Paris, France: Anthropos.

Lombard, D. (1990). *Nusa Jawa: Silang budaya jilid II: Jaringan Asia*. Gramedia.

Matin, N., Forrester, J. and Ensor, J. (2018). What is equitable resilience? *World Development*, 109, 197–205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.04.020

Merrifield, A. and Swyngedouw, E. (eds) (1996). *The Urbanization of Injustice*. New York: New York University Press.

Miraftab, F. (2004). Public-private partnerships. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 24(1), 89–101. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456x04267173

Mi Shih (2019) Cities for profit: The real estate turn in Asia's urban politics, by Gavin Shatkin, Journal of Urban Affairs, 41:2, 270-271, DOI: 10.1080/07352166.2018.1483143

Muhammad, Gugun. (2025, August 25). Personal Interview.

Nas, P. J. M. and Malo, S. M. (2000). Urban symbolism and city politics in Jakarta, in P. Nas (ed), *Directing the Flow of Urban Change: Indonesian urban studies* (pp. 171–194). Leiden: Leiden University Press.

Grijns, K., & Nas, P. J. M. (Eds.). (2000). Jakarta–Batavia: Socio-cultural essays. Leiden, Netherlands: KITLV Press.

Pacione, M. (1990). Urban liveability: A review. *Urban Geography*, 11(1), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.2747/0272-3638.11.1.1

Padawangi, R. (2012). The river and the city: The politics of water in post-Suharto Jakarta. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 36(2), 295–312.

Parnreiter, C. (2017). *Global Cities and the Geographical Transfer of Value*. SAGE. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098017722739

Pires, T. (1944). *The Suma Oriental of Tomé Pires* (vol. I–II, A. Cortesão, ed & trans). Hakluyt Society.

Pitidis, V. and Coaffee, J. (2020). Catalysing governance transformations through urban resilience implementation: The case of Thessaloniki, Greece. *Cities*, 107, 102934. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2020.102934

Prastyatama, B. (2024). *Participatory framework for architectural practice in Indonesian humanitarian urban context* (PhD dissertation). Taubman College.

Purcell, M. (2003). Citizenship and the Right to the Global City: Reimagining the Capitalist World Order. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 564-90. DOI: 10.1111/1468-2427.0046.

Roberts, M., Gil Sander, F., Tiwari, S. (2019). *Time to ACT: Realizing Indonesia's urban potential*. Washington, DC: World Bank. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/entities/publication/3d3402fd-6763-5532-b2fc-dfd980c45f58.

Robinson, W. I. (2009). Saskia Sassen and the sociology of globalization: A critical appraisal. Sociological Analysis, 5-27. DOI: 10.1080/08111146.2018.1437874

Roitman, S. and Rukmana, D. (eds) (2022). *Routledge Handbook of Urban Indonesia*. Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003318170

Roy, A. (2005). Urban informality: Toward an epistemology of planning. Journal of the American Planning Association 71(2). DOI:10.1080/01944360508976689

Ruiqi, D. (2019). Understanding participatory design of public housing renewal in Singapore: From the perspectives of history, strategy and reflection. *Athens Journal of Architecture*, 6, 79–96. https://doi.org/10.30958/aja.6-1-4

Sadikin, A. (1977). *Gita Jaya: Catatan H. Ali Sadikin, Gubernur Kepala Daerah Khusus Kbukota Jakarta, 1966–1977*. Pemerintah Daerah Khusus Ibukota Jakarta.

Salama, A. M. and Grierson, D. (2016). Transformations in architecture and urbanism of cities in the Global South. *Open House International*, 41(2), 1–101. https://doi.org/10.1108/OHI-02-2016-B0001

Sanders, E. B. N. and Stappers, P. J. (2008). Co-creation and the new landscapes of design. *Co-Design*, 4(1), 5–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/15710880701875068

Sanoff, H. (1999). *Community Participation Methods in Design and Planning*. John Wiley & Sons.

Sassen, S. (1991). *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton University Press.

Sassen, S. (2005). *The Global City: Introducing a concept*. Princeton University Press.

Sassen, S. (2016). The global city: Enabling economic intermediation and bearing its costs. *City & Community*, 97–108. https://doi.org/10.1111/cico.12175

Scott, A. J. (2007). Capitalism and urbanization in a new key? The cognitive-cultural dimension. *Social forces*, *85*(4), 1465-1482.

Seto, G. N. and Najicha, F. U. (2023). Keadilan sosial dan spasial sebagai manifestasi sila kelima Pancasila. *Jurnal Civic Education*.

Sheppard, E. (2014). Globalizing capitalism and southern urbanization, in S. Parnell and S. Oldfield (eds), *Routledge Handbook on Cities of the Global South* (pp. 143–154). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203387832.ch15

Silver, C. (2007). *Planning the Megacity: Jakarta in the twentieth century*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203700013

Soja, Edward William. (2010). Seeking Spatial Justice. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-9663.2011.00655

Storper, M. (2016). The neo-liberal city as idea and reality. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 4(2), 241–263. https://doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2016.1158662

Suwarno, P. J. (1995). *Dari Azazyookai dan Tonarigumi ke Rukun Kampung dan Rukun Tetangga di Yogyakarta (1942–1989)*. Penerbit Universitas Sanata Dharma Yogyakarta.

Téllez Contreras, L. F. (2025). Infrastructural politics: A conceptual mapping and critical review. *Urban Studies*, 62(1), 31–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980241246620

Tönnies, F. (1940). *Fundamental Concepts of Sociology* (C. F. Loomis, trans & Supplement). American Book. (Original work published 1887)

Van der Brug, PH (1994) Malaria en malaise, de VOC in Batavia in de achttiende eeuw. De Bataafsche Leeuw, Amsterdam. ISBN: 9067073490, 9789067073493

Wates, N. (2014). *The Community Planning Handbook: How people can shape their cities, towns and villages in any part of the world*. Routledge.

Winarso, H. and Firman, T. (2002). Residential land development in Jabotabek, Indonesia: Triggering economic crisis? *Habitat International*, 26(4), 487–506. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0197-3975(02)00023-1

Yusuf, A. W. (2014). Partisipasi masyarakat dalam pembangunan kota yang berkelanjutan dan berkeadilan. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 11(2).

