

The Practice of Architectural Design Competition in Indonesia: Whose Interests Are Served?

Joko Adiando¹, Rossa Turpuk Gabe²

¹*Department of Architecture, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia*

²*Department of Architecture, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia*
joko.adianto@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Architecture Design Competition (ADC) has been acknowledged as one of the prominent methods to serve the best of public interest. However, the spatial infringements frequently occur as the indication of the incompatibility between the best results and the needs of the users. A multi-stages qualitative research was done, in Jatinegara Vertical Rent Housing as a selected case study, and aimed to identify the incompatibility. The disproportion of the available time with the required outputs emerges as the scapegoat of the capitulation of criticality to overcome the incompatibility. Moreover, the exclusion of the designated users in the whole stages of ADC is the essential cause, as an embodied misconception of the definition client-user in the professional practice. The finding of this research addresses several recommendations to reclaim the criticality in ADC and save the practice of this profession from the mortifying failure to serve the best public interest.

© 2018 IJBESR. All rights reserved.

Keywords: architecture, design, competition, infringements, users, interest.

1. Introduction

1.1. Architectural Design Competition

A design competition has been known as an effective teaching method tools in the university and as a possibility of architectural research [1]. Since 1648, 'École Nationale Supérieure des Beaux-Arts' (1648-1968) in Paris, has introduced and has practiced the education [2] under an organized system learning-by-doing of implicit professional knowledge [3], with a continuous use of competitions [4].

Design competitions play a key participatory role in the definition of social values, in the context of a public sphere of debate, as stimulation of the production of innovative proposals for technical and aesthetic solutions

to design problems [5]. From an administrative point of view, a design competition is highly praised as the accountable process of attaining public service by avoid nepotism and to create "best value for taxpayer's money" [6].

Since architecture can have a significant impact on the living environment of people [7], submissions also have to fulfill the social and economic expectations of citizens and other stakeholders [8] Selecting the right solution requires different kinds of sense-making processes and domain-specific skills of decision-makers [9], based on the predetermined brief which represents the design question posed to those willing to compete and the equal conditions for building [10]. Therefore, competitions have been looked at with growing interests as a formula promising research, experimentation, being a

"source of critical and reflexive practices in architecture" [5].

However, research often lacks a theoretical and conceptual foundation and competitions often have been analyzed through intuition and perception, rather than a scientific approach [11]. Consequently, it is always threatened by its 'spectacular' character by giving partiality to originality and personal expression over professional experience [5]. It should stimulate discussion and debate amongst designers, industry and the public about the aesthetic quality through reflexivity about the social construction of knowledge, methods, and practice in technical and design practices [12]. Although it is acknowledged as the catalyst for research and experimentation [13], it frequently fails to provide solutions to spatial problems and does not guarantee the best design in place [14]. The failure may endanger the design profession to lose its intellectual credibility.

1.2. The Practice of Architectural Design Competition in Jatinegara Vertical Rent Housing

The collaboration between the Ministry of Public Works (MPWH) and IAI Jakarta in Architecture Design Competition (ADC) in Vertical Rent Housing (VRH) has been started in 2008. Since then, ADC has been acknowledged as a promising procurement method to generate the best design from the engagement of professional architects. This method was enforced with the enactment of Presidential Decree No. 54/2010, ADC earned legal legitimation as one of the prominent procurement methods in Goods and Service Provision and cemented its place in State's procurement activities.

MPWH initiated ADC-JVRH in 2013 to obtain the best design for the resettled inhabitants of Kampong Pulo, who received the impact from Ciliwung River Normalization Program

(CRNP) and slum resettlement programs along Ciliwung River in 2015.

Kampung Pulo, which is located in Kampong Melayu Sub-District, becomes one of the targets of the program. Historically, this sub-district has been developed as a self-helped settlement by Malay (Melayu in the Indonesian language) people in the 17th century, who earned their living as workers and petty traders. Ever since the operation of Jatinegara Station in 1925 to intensify the economic activities, Kampong Melayu became a popular catchment area for migrants to earn a living because of its propinquity to the business and public facility with established infrastructure and emerges as one of the high-density settlements in Jakarta [15]. It is located in Ciliwung Basin and experiences the most severe flood hazards and suffered approximately 600 damaged houses in the massive flood in 2007 as the water reached 6-7 meters high [16].

To reduce flooding risk, City Government of Jakarta (CGJ) with the assistance of The Ministry of Public Works and Housing (MPWH) decided to widen the Ciliwung River by 35 meters, which consume approximately a half size of Kampong Pulo and resettle the inhabitants to the vertical housing in the vicinity. After obtaining the selected design in 2013, the construction was scheduled in 2014-2015 and projected to accomplish before the early stage of normalization project started. The thorough planning was intended to ensure the housing availability for the resettled inhabitants within the vicinity, as the effective way to minimize the reduction of their vulnerability post-resettlement.

JVRH was located in Jatinegara Baru Street by using the city government-owned land, within proximal distance with the prior neighborhood of the resettled inhabitants. This land provision strategy was effectively proven to reduce the enduring land acquisition process, in terms of time and budget. Within the 7.50 hectares land,

CGJ demanded 560 units to shelter the designated users, which was translated into two towers with 16 stories each. The first two stories were designated for social and public facilities while the rest 14 stories were destined as housing units.

MPWH initiated Architectural Design Competition of Jatinegara Vertical Rent Housing (ADC-JVRH) and became the donor of the housing provision for relocating the evicted inhabitants of Kampong Pulo. They contributed the unit standard size, the maximum construction cost, the program of social and public facilities also building safety standards, as inscribed in its enacted regulations. While IAI Jakarta as the organizing committee, organized the selection of eligible participants and juries, the feasible of ADC schedule and time to meet the deadline of final design provision and construction schedule by MPWH, disseminating all kinds of an announcement relating to ADC-JVRH, from the opening to the end result.

This task division illustrated the content of ADC-JVRH was under the control of the initiator and donor of ADC, while IAI Jakarta acted as the organizing committee and CGJ as the future owner of the building. Although the elaboration of social and economy of the designated users becomes one of the design considerations, the technical requirements were the dominant considerations, due to the indisputable authority of the donor in controlling the brief's substance. The organizing committee distributed the draft of the brief to the selected juries for harvesting refinement inputs. The brief as a testimony of the needs to be answered still fail to accommodate the substantial spatial requirements of the designated users.

The selection of the juries occurred simultaneously with the brief's formulation process. The organizing committee and donor agreed to conduct a one-stage administration

assessment and two-stages assessment as an effort to result in a comprehensive assessment. The administration assessment filtered 86 registered participants and only 41 entries were accepted and meet the administration requirements by the organizing committee.

The first stage focused on the technical requirements to assure the implementation of building safety standards in the proposed design while the second stage emphasized more on architectural considerations. The juries in the first stage consist of architects, the structure, and mechanical-electrical engineers, with well-known experiences of the building safety in high-rise buildings. The corroboration has resulted in 9 finalists, based on the utmost implementation of the prescribed building regulations.

While in the second stage, the five selected juries were represented MPWH, CGJ, a professional architect, academician, and City and Architecture Advisor Board of Jakarta (CAABJ). This composition by the profession and the client was expected to select the best design proposal, which meets the various demands of the involved stakeholders. This stage resulted in 3 winners, and the first-prize design will be developed to complete construction documents by the appointed consultant in the post-competition stage.

All of the juries in the first and second-stage have an engineering background with less sensitive and attentive to the socio-economic condition of the designated users. The review results showed the technical considerations dominated the grading results and the socio-economy of the selected users were rarely accommodated as one of the prominent design considerations. From the brief formulation to the grading stage by the juries, JVRH was appointed to be technical-based building with less attention to the socio-economy condition of designated users.

1.3 In-congruency between the Limited Time and Desire to Practice Critical Design

As prescribed in brief, the participants must submit the work, which consists of the background analysis and conceptual idea description, master plan, site plan, building plans, sections, and elevations, interior and exterior perspective, structural axonometry, and mechanical-electrical-plumbing system and the proposed construction cost and building materials. All the products must comply with the valid building safety standards as an object of assessment in the grading process by the selected members of the juries. The incomplete works will fail to pass the one-stage administration assessment, before the substantial two-stage evaluations.

The opening of ADC-JVRH was announced on May 15th, 2013. Two weeks later, the organizing committee held a discussion session with the participants to clarify the substantial and administration issues. The date of submission was set on June 19th, 2013, which only gives a month for participants to produce a critical design proposal for solving the essential living space problems of the designated users. The limited time has reduced the desire of participants significantly to engage critically with the encountered design issues. The available time and energy of the participants were focused on meeting the administration and design brief to avoid preliminary elimination.

The research discovered the significant implication of state budgetary system with the limited time of ADC. According to respondents from MPWH, the annual fiscal year starts in April and terminates in December. Since early April to May 2013, the brief formulation stage occurred between MPH as a donor, CGJ as beneficiary and IAI Jakarta as Organizing committee. Within a month, the three parties collaboration was enforced to produce a comprehensive brief for ADC-JVRH. Because

of the immense amount of work, the intensive discussions rarely occurred and the division of tasks became the most plausible efforts to accomplish the resulted brief within the available time. According to members of the organizing committee, the donor tends to reuse the contextual brief from the previous similar competitions for saving time.

The result of ADC-JVRH must be acquired in early July 2013, because it will be developed into complete construction documents by the appointed architecture consultant, for procurement of construction service at the end of October 2013. As the procurement of construction service requires 2 months, according to Presidential Decree No. 54/2010, the appointed contractor will be decided in early December 2013. This compact time arrangement has enabled MPWH to propose the JVRH construction budget to Ministry of Finance in the next fiscal year and the built JVRH will be accomplished in early 2015, as the resettlement program started along with the beginning of the Ciliwung River Normalization project by CGJ. It depicts the ADC-JVRH becomes one of the long-enduring processes in a single fiscal year, which deserves a small portion of the allocated time.

The standard cost of government building also holds a pivotal role in the possibility the critical practice to exist. It is regulated in Ministerial Regulation of Public Work and House No. 45/2007 to control the state budget spending on government-own building, which demands mandatory compliance. According to participants, it is almost impossible to propose critical design within a predetermined budget, and consequently, ADC-JVRH produced almost similar design with minimal kinds of variety.

1.4 Research Aims

This research aims to investigate the rationale of the incompatibility of the implemented the best design from ADC with the practiced spatial

infringements by designated users to accommodate their everyday life.

The findings of this research suggest the importance of the involvement of the designated users throughout the whole processes in ADC to accommodate their interests. Generally, this research addresses several recommendations to reclaim the criticality in ADC and save the practice of this profession from the mortifying failure to serve the best public interest.

2. Methods

The employment of the case-study method allows this research to attain the expected result. It consisted of three stages, which are the investigation of the spatial infringements by the designated users and the inquiry of the ADC process. The first was intended to establish evidence of the incompatibility, and the rationale of the occurred spatial infringements, while the second was designated to discover the reasons of the selected design through the entire process of ADC-JVRH. The third stage was proposed to identify the critical points within ADC-JVRH, as the sources of the occurred incompatibility.

The first stage was delivered in January-April 2016 and began with the quantifying the numbers of infringed-households to establish the magnitude of the issue towards the general population. The unsatisfactory towards the design was also obtained by using semi-structured interviews and analyze with the Likert test to understand the incompatible design with the everyday life of the designated users. There were identified 490 households performed the spatial infringements, and as many 200 respondents were consented to participate in an interview session with the semi-structured interview.

The second stage was delivered in April-May 2016, which comprised a thorough

investigation of ADC-JVRH processes, from the brief formulation, selection and establishment of the juries, the announcement of design competition, management of submission, grading the submitted works and the announcement of the selected winner was investigated through documents collected from the organizing committee and in-depth interview with its members. The documents of the first-prize winner were attained from the organizing committee while the construction drawing was obtained from the contractor. The data and information from CGJ, MPWH and juries were extremely difficult to obtain because of various reasons. Nonetheless, the obtained information from the members of the organizing committee who participated thoroughly in the whole processes is considered sufficient to establish the comprehension of the entire processes.

The third stage was conducted in May-June 2016, with a qualitative approach to identify and investigate the design incoherency, from initial idea to the occupancy stage. The critical description analysis was selected to reach the essential problem of the incompatibility and result in the possible recommendations in the future.

3. Results and Discussions

3.1. Evaluation of User Satisfaction and Transformation During Occupation

Likert test acquired the illustration in Table 1 from 200 respondents, who the designated users in JRVH. Some aspects were used to evaluate the average, satisfactory level of the selected users towards the design of JRVH.

Table 1. The Satisfaction level of the designated users in JVRH

The Aspect of Users Satisfaction	Score*	
The building form and the public facility	The compatibility the unit with everyday activities	2.78
	The quality of pedestrian circulation	4.88
	The vehicle parking lot	4.60
	The trading space in ground floor	1.97
The communal space in the building	The size of the corridor	4.94
	The interaction space in each floor	1.48
The interior arrangement	Interaction among members of household	4.69
	Laundry	1.96
	Performing hobbies	1.88
	Trading/ economy activity	1.83
	Store belongings	1.73

*scale 1-5

Due to the limited size and restriction chance for self-help incremental unit growth, spatial infringements become the solution to overcome the spatial deprivation. These findings accentuate more on the quality of building system such as circulation and form rather than the compatibility with the spatial needs of everyday activities of the designated users.

There are 386 of 560 households (78.77%) performed spatial infringements to accommodate drying clothes and storing the belongings in the corridor, while 104 respondents (22.23%) for expansion of domestic and economic activities. These infringements have infringed the building regulations because of compromising the mitigation attempts against unexpected hazards. However, they were delivered as a form of resistance towards the incompatibility of the unit design with their immediate needs.



Figure 1: Various Spatial Infringement because of Lack Attention towards the everyday activities and spatial needs of the designated users

The second most popular spatial infringement is the proliferation of Home-Based Enterprise (HBE) in the units. There are 70 registered HBEs in the record of building management, but the number is not accurate because there are flexible operated HBEs. The primary occupation problem relates to the rent and monthly living cost in the building. As confirmed by Shalih [16], the average monthly income of the family is less than US\$ 200, from practicing informal economy, which is below the regional minimum income of Jakarta. In their prior neighborhood, the number of monthly income is still sufficient to meet their basic needs and children's school tuition. The additional monthly fees such as electricity (US\$ 20) and water (US\$ 20) burden them, as water is neighbors share free acquired from the communal well and electricity fee during their lives in the prior neighborhood. According to building management, the regulated rent fee is around US\$ 30, and the building service fee will reach around US\$ 50 for maintaining building utility such as elevators and others. Although CGJ still subsidizes the rent and building service fees, all respondents claimed they would not afford to pay the fees to live in vertical rent house if someday the subsidy is dismissed.



Figure 2: Various Spatial Infringements for Home-Based Enterprises in Units

The transformation does not occur inside the unit but expands to the corridor. This interior transformation is unexpected to occur while the expansion to the corridor is an unacceptable infringement of building regulation, as stated in Apartment Act No 20/2011 and The Ministerial Regulation of Public Work No. 5/2007. However, HBE is essential to ensure the sustainability of the low-income occupants to live in JVRH. The unit is their only asset to generate additional income for paying the fees, meet their basic needs and children's school tuition.

Despite knowing the infringement, the building management allows the flourishing HBEs in the unit, for two reasons. First, it will minimize the elevator usage, which reduces the subsidized operational and maintenance cost. The occupants are able to shop for their needs within walking distance that reduce the frequency of elevator usage. Second, HBEs support the livelihood of low-income inhabitants as an alternative to meet their needs and generate additional income.



Figure 3: The Spatial Infringements of Trading/Economy Activities from the Predetermined Space to the Front yard of JVRH

The trading space was designated in the 2nd floor, as planned in the first-prize winner's drawing and construction drawing. Nonetheless, most of the respondents (80.00%) claimed to decline using the available space. First, space is relatively far from the possible consumers. Their commodities are hardly noticed from the street and elevators become the only access for possible consumers from the units. As stated before, the elevators usage should be reduced to minimize the building operation and maintenance cost, which indicates the low numbers of possible consumers from the units. Second, the size of predetermined commercial space is insufficient to accommodate the number of inhabitants who intend to perform trading/economy activities. The spatial scarcity ignites competition among them that can lead to conflict among inhabitants. Based on observation and in-depth interview with respondents, less than 20 inhabitants perform trading activities in the designated space.

3.2. The Systematic Exclusion of the Designated User Interests

MPWH initiated ADC-JVRH and took full control of the brief from the beginning. The division task has favored complete authority to determine the content of the brief without any intervention from other stakeholders. The content consists of building a program, site condition and the mandatory building regulations that must be accommodated in the work entries. As the donor of this project, the

content was dictated by the prior experience of brief making and disregard the interest of the designated users. Therefore, the interest of designated user has been excluded systematically since the beginning of the brief making stage.

Despite the brief has pointed the social and economy of designated users as one of the highlighted design considerations, this effort received insufficient attention from the participants because of the equal priority with other engineering considerations. It allows the social and economy of the designated users to receive the lowest priority even diminished from the considerations.

Although the selected juries came from various institutions to represent diverse interests, none of the representation of the designated users was invited to participate. Nevertheless, the designated users as a society have an important role as well as the profession and the client in the composition of juries [1]. The dominant educational background of all the members of the jury was building engineering, which solidifies the domination of engineering considerations in determining the best design. The creativity in form making, response towards tropical climate, the excellence of mitigation system and fire protection system were the decisive design considerations. While the emergent spatial needs of designated users such as feasible trading space for generating income or sufficient storage for every family were ignored.

The limited time of ADC-JVRH also plays significant impact to the lack of consideration towards the interest of designated users. The available time is essential for doing research while in practice of the competition [1]. The participants did not have sufficient time for conducting short-time research on the social and economy expectation of the intended users to formulate the precise spatial solution. The participants focused on composing the program

with mandatory building regulations and translate them into the required products, to pass the one-stage administration assessment and compete in the next two-stage technical assessment. The amount of demanded products has confiscated their potential creativity within the grating of building regulations and other technical requirements, rather than opening the design possibility in search for the best creative spatial solution according to the actual needs of users. The attempts to serve the interests of designated users in this competition were based on mirage assumptions, and the unforeseen spatial infringements in the post-occupancy stage proved the execrable omissions.

The small amount of allocated time accommodates the interest of MPWH to produce the construction design and appointed contractor at the end of the fiscal year. It allowed MPWH to start the construction process in the following fiscal year and accomplished at the same time with the beginning of Ciliwung River Normalization Project by CGJ. It demonstrated the deadline of JVRH construction was the highest priority and the compatibility of the design with the needs of designated users was nothing more than expendable consideration.

The narrow timeframe to accomplish abundant products also has impoverished the opportunity ADC-JVRH as a catalyst for research and experimentation, as asserted by Malmberg [13] and subverted the proliferation of critical thinking, as Rendell [17] expected, to attain the best possible solution for the designated users and other stakeholders. This impotence to achieve the expected outcome has endangered design profession to lose its intellectual credibility because of its failure to provide solutions to spatial problems.

Therefore, the forsaken of designated user's interest is predictable and predetermined with the absence of representation of the selected users in the process of brief making and the

board of jury, the equal treatment of the social and economic condition with other engineering considerations and limited time for a design competition. The elimination of the involvement of the designated users and their expendable interests from the overall processes is the embodiment of pseudo-participation in a design competition.

3.3. Questioning the Served Interest in Architecture Design Competition

The exclusion of the needs of the designated user from the ADC-JVRH has asserted the ADC as a festivity of spectacular architectural design, as Adamczyk [5]. As the implementation of the program, construction cost and building regulations are mandatory, the form-making creativity and spectacular becomes the distinguished added value to claim victory in the enduring assessment stage. It has entrapped ADC into the aesthetic quality contention and fails to stimulate discussion and debate amongst designers, industry and the public through reflexivity about the social construction of knowledge, methods, and practice in technical and design practices, as Sengers, et al. [12] concerned.

Therefore, it is essential to pose the ethical question on whose interests the ADC-JVRH serves. Is it the interests of MPWH as initiator and donor to accomplishing its task to support housing provision in Ciliwung River Normalization project? Is it the interest of CGJ as a beneficiary to provide housing for the resettled occupants? Is it solely the architect's to elevate the professional reputation? Or is it all of the above by fictionalizing the designated users as an abstraction without phenomenal identity [18] and merely generic constructs [19]?

The spatial infringements have exemplified the un-accommodated the interest of the designated users, which eludes the ideological, social contract of the profession with the public, as

explained by Cuff [2]. Unfortunately, she affirmed the recognition within the architect profession is based on peers, rather than the feedback from clients and society. The recognition from the board of jury, which consists of architects and engineers with the irrefutable reputation, is considered more honorable than the unknown users.

This case also provides a precedent to redefine the role of the client critically. Pressman explained the client as the person(s) in charge of the project's budget, but not necessarily the user(s) [20]. Nonetheless, he highlighted the role of the client as the representation of the future end-users, who also understand and endeavor in the design process for the interest of the designated users. However, the case of ADC-JVRH has illustrated the different role of the client. MPWH, as the client who is in charge of the project's budget, has its own interest to pursue and fail to represent the importance of the designated users. The well-complied design with the mandatory building regulations, predetermined cost, and the preordained time were its only interests, while the benefit of the selected users has been systematically excluded throughout the process.

4. Conclusion

This research puts forward that ADC as fundamental research opportunities is a way for architects to achieve excellence in design. In Indonesia, The Enactment of Presidential Decree No. 54/2010 is the milestone for the legitimation of ADC as one of the prominent methods in State Goods and Service Procurement. The enduring and transparent process assures ADC to provide the best design for public facilities. Furthermore, ADC encourages the participation of architects in the provision or improvement of the public facilities. However, the incompatibility between the considered best results of ADC with the interest of the designated users

indicates the urge for improvement. ADC-JVRH case demonstrated the various spatial infringements as the result of this incompatibility.

This research confirms the incompatibility is the result of the exclusion of the designated users throughout the processes. The brief was formulated without any consideration of the interest of the designated users. The criteria assessment emphasized the mandatory compliance with the building regulations over the actual spatial needs of the designated users. While the selected juries consist of academician and practitioner with the well-known reputation in engineering fields with less attention and knowledge on the actual everyday life of the designated users. While the available time has crippled the participants to deliver search profound comprehension of the designated users and practice critical design to attain the best solution.

The redefinition of the client is decisive to reclaim ADC as a catalyst for research and experimentation in search of the best solution. ADC must involve the representation of the designated users throughout the whole process to accommodate their interests. This attempt should reduce the incompatibility during the post-occupancy stage and minimize the abdicable spatial infringement in the future. This redefinition contributes to the shifting of the design considerations. The existing criteria assessment has positioned the social and economy expectation of the designated users as one of the design considerations, which earns equal priority with other engineering considerations. This condition allows the descent of the expectation to the bottom of design priority or even obliteration. The redefinition may secure the position of the social and economy expectation of the designated users among other design considerations.

The length of time or reduction of the required output is essential to provide a chance for the participants to conduct research and experimentation in search of the best solution. The integration of ADC-JVRH to the whole enduring housing provision served insufficient time for conduction research and experimentation. If widening the time of ADC is impossible, the most plausible recommendation is the reduction of required outputs. The schematic design is considered sufficient while its development including the estimation of construction cost and the production of construction documents will be delivered in the post-ADC stage.

The occurred incompatibility demonstrated the practice of pseudo-participation in ADC. The alignment of the donor's interests and the exclusion of the designated users throughout the process has impoverished the chance for the architects to contribute to the living improvement of the society, as one of the professional obligations, which is inscribed in the professional ethics guideline. It demands a balance of power between the client as a donor, the designated users as beneficiaries, architects as service providers and association of profession as an organizer in an active engagement to restore the lost dignity of ADC as an instrument for an architect to serve the best interest of the public at large.

Acknowledgement

Sincere gratitude was sent to Muhammad Amry, Fauzan Habibie, Ardiansyah Ah, Bambang Wicaksono, Her Pramtama, Steve. J. Manahampi, Achmad Ismail and Adisty for their sincere willingness to share the information of the ADC-JVRH process and documents. The great acknowledgment was also shared to Muhammad Naufal Fadhil and Sutanrai Abdillah, for their tenacious efforts on the enduring data collection stage in JVRH.

References

- [1] Guilherme, Pedro Miguel Hernandez Salvador. 2014. Competitions serve a larger purpose in architectural knowledge, *Architecture & Education Journal*, 11: 425-451.
- [2] Cuff, D. 1991. *Architecture: the story of practice*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- [3] Stevens, G. 1998. *The Favored Circle: The Social Foundations of Architectural Distinction*. London: MIT Press.
- [4] Kostof, S. 2000. *The architect*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- [5] Adamczyk, Georges. 2004. *Architectural competitions and new reflexive practices*, Dublin: ARCC – AEEA.
- [6] Arrowsmith, S. 2005. *The law of public and utilities procurement*. London: Sweet & Maxwell.
- [7] Gifford, R. 2002. *Environmental psychology: principles and practice*. Coleville, WA: Optimal Books.
- [8] Volker, L., Lauche, K., Heintz, J. L., de Jonge, H. 2008. Deciding about design quality: design perception during a European tendering procedure. *Design Studies*, 29(4): 387-409.
- [9] Volker, L. 2012. Procuring architectural services: sensemaking in a legal context. *Construction Management and Economics*, 30(9): 749-759.
- [10] Collyer, G. S. 2004. *Competing globally in architecture competitions*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Academy.
- [11] Van Wezemaal, J.E. 2008. *The complexity of competitions: the quest for an adequate research design*. Stockholm: Conference Architectural Competitions.
- [12] Sengers, McCarthy, Dourish. 2006. *Reflective HCI: Articulating an Agenda for Critical Practice. Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI)*. New York: ACM Press.
- [13] Malmberg, C (eds). 2006. *The politics of design: competitions for public projects*. Anaheim, CA: PrintMedia Communications.
- [14] Knack, R. E. 1990. Design-development competitions: the case of Bunker Hill. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 7(2): 160-171.
- [15] Pratiwi, Nyi M. 2008. *Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Masyarakat Tetap Tinggal di Daerah Rentan Bencana (Studi Deskriptif Pada Masyarakat Kampung Pulo, Kelurahan Kampung Melayu)*. Depok: Skripsi Universitas Indonesia.
- [16] Shalih, Osmar. 2012. *Adaptasi Penduduk Kampung Melayu Jakarta Terhadap Banjir Tahunan*, Depok: Skripsi Universitas Indonesia.
- [17] Rendell, J. 2000. Architectural Research and Disciplinarity. *Architectural Research Quarterly* 8(2): 141-148.
- [18] Forty, A. 2000. *Words and buildings a vocabulary of modern architecture*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- [19] Ellis, W. R., Cuff, D. 1989. *Architects' people*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [20] Pressman, A. 1995. *The Fountain Headache: The Politics of Architect-Client Relations*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.

(This page is intentionally left blank)