

Interiority From the Body, Mind, and Culture

Paramita Atmodiwirjo, Yandi Andri Yatmo

*Universitas Indonesia
Indonesia*

Within the interior occupation, the human body and interior are always interacting. Body-interior relation is a key idea in understanding the human body's presence, experience, and performance in interior space. The body and the interior can define, command, and affect each other. The transactional perspective in environmental psychology emphasises the reciprocity between body and environment, as demonstrated through how "[p]ersons, processes, and contexts mutually define one another and serve aspects of the whole, not as separate elements" (Altman & Rogoff, 1987, p. 32). Awareness of these reciprocal relationships becomes a key in understanding the interior as a stage for the human body and its dynamic processes.

The human body as the main subject of the interior is inherently complex. What it means for a body to be within an interior encompasses many dimensions (Daniels & Chalmers, 2021). Body not only comprises the visible, physical body and observable acts and behaviour, but also incorporates the hidden aspects of mind, thoughts, feelings, emotions, and memories. Many hidden aspects of human nature, including hidden behavioural traits, define how humans behave in space (Sussman & Hollander, 2015). Therefore, a better understanding of human behaviours and cognitive processes will help elicit better design of interior and architectural spaces.

The practice of making the interior emerges from dynamic body-space relations. "Human body serves as a generative force for the interiors" (Marinic, 2019, p. xxvii). The making of an interior to respond appropriately to the existence of the human body should

begin with understanding the reciprocity between body and interior. Such understanding is manifested in the knowledge of how body and mind work in space and the knowledge of various potentials, opportunities, or affordances (Gibson, 1986) of interior elements that the human body perceives and utilises. These knowledge forms become the basis of interior making to enhance perceptual, experiential, and performative aspects.

One of the challenges for interior practice is how to provide an interior condition that incorporates various dimensions of the human body as the space occupant. "The interior is the condition of possibility that allows us to represent these (inter-)subjective dimensions: power relations, intimacy, (semi-)public encounters, imagination, memory, attention, desires and understanding" (Ionescu, 2018, p. 2). The human body's occupancy of the interior could be understood by looking inward, as well as considering the external forces that shape body-interior relations (Brooker & Weinthal, 2018). The human body, as the key subject in interior space, also needs to be viewed as part of its socio-cultural context. Interior can emerge from the culture translated into the built form through human actions (Rapoport, 2000). Thus, interior spaces could be perceived as the representation of the socio-cultural roles, values, and relationships that emerge in a particular society. The reading of interior spaces, along with the experience and activities that occur within the spatial arrangement, becomes a means of comprehending the inhabitant's socio-cultural practice.

In dealing with the human body's complexity and its interior occupancy, the inquiry into body-interior relations requires multidisciplinary approaches. This issue of *Interiority* presents a collection of studies that situate the human body as an inherent part of the interior environment from various perspectives: neuroscience, psychology, culture, religion, gender, and tradition. These articles present various ways in which the interior becomes a manifestation of the dynamic human body-space relations. They demonstrate attempts to examine interiority through various cases and contexts defined by individual experiences, dynamic social roles and relationships, and cultural traditions.

In the first article, Eva Storgaard, Marjan Michels, and Inge Somers connect the interior design discipline with neuroscience in an attempt to create interior spaces based on how the human mind reads and responds to interior spaces. Through examples of students' projects that examine visual complexity and affordances, they argue for the importance of an interdisciplinary approach to inform interior practice

to become more sensitive to the individual's spatial needs. Beth McGee and Nam-Kyu Park examine interior elements' role in establishing human-nature relationships through biophilic principles. Specifically, they present a systematic literature review and a survey with design practitioners to investigate the role of colour, light, and materiality towards nature experience within biophilic design practice.

The next four articles present comprehensive analyses on socio-cultural practice in various contexts to demonstrate the idea of interiority resulting from cultural values and society's everydayness. Through their analyses, the authors demonstrate the reciprocal transaction between the human body and the interior by paying attention to the "actions of the participants, the rules and norms that bind them together, their relationship to the physical settings and to the qualities...and the temporal flow of the event" (Altman & Rogoff, 1987, p. 24) as some important measures of the transactional relationship between human and environment.

Azizi Bahauddin, Rani Prihatmanti, and Sophie Asha Putri discuss how sense of place could be conveyed through the elements of sacred space. In particular, they analysed the spatial elements of St. Peter's Church as a cultural heritage site in Melaka through the layers of spatial meaning based on Lefebvre's concept of perceived, conceived and lived space. Manal Singal presents the reading of interiority in the context of *agraharam*, the traditional houses in Indian temple towns. The reading of the space and the narrative of spatial experience within *agraharam* demonstrate how sensorial experience emerges from domestic everyday space and activities performed by the occupants. In these two articles, the reading of interior experience presents a rich, unique, and contextual relationship between the elements of locality, everyday culture, and the experience of space and place.

Another discussion on the situated body within culture-specific interior space is presented by Arnis Rochma Harani, Titien Woro Murtini, and Mustika Kusumaning Wardhani. They analyse how gender roles define the dynamic of domestic space. Focusing on women's everyday activities in Kampung Kauman—a neighbourhood with strong religious and cultural values in Semarang, Indonesia—they illustrate several forms of domestic space transformation resulting from women's everyday practice. In the final article, Ami Arfianti, Murni Rachmawati, and Purwanita Setijanti examine text as the representation of traditional knowledge and its manifestation into the built environment. They analyse the verses of *primbon*, the texts of local Javanese knowledge and the manifestation of the written rules

in the spatial arrangement in the *kraton*—the Palace of Yogyakarta. *Primbon* text functions as local wisdom that society practises, guiding the space hierarchy representing the larger universe.

The articles in this issue of *Interiority* demonstrate varying interior conditions that emerged from the performance of body, mind, and culture in space. They indicate the dynamic forms of body-space relations that define the perception, experience, and performance of interior spaces. Further inquiries are necessary to understand more thoroughly how spaces operate, are occupied, and are used in different individual and cultural contexts. Such understanding will elicit new insight into the possibility of interior elements and spatial arrangements reflecting distinctive interiority in particular contexts.

References

- Altman, I., & Rogoff, B. (1987). World views in environmental psychology: Trait, interactional, organismic, and transactional perspectives. In D. Stokols & I. Altman (Eds.), *Handbook of environmental psychology* (pp. 7-40). Wiley.
- Brooker, G., & Weinthal, L. (Eds.). (2018). *The handbook of interior architecture and design*. Bloomsbury Visual Arts.
- Daniel, R., & Chalmers, L. (2021). Thinking the body-inside. *Journal of Interior Design*, 46(1), 3–9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joid.12197>
- Gibson, J. J. (1986). *The ecological approach to visual perception*. Lawrence-Erlbaum.
- Ionescu, V. (2018). The interior as interiority. *Palgrave Communications*, 4(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-018-0088-6>
- Marinic, G. (Ed.). (2018). *The interior architecture theory reader*. Routledge.
- Rapoport, A. (2000). Culture and built form—A reconsideration. In K. D. Moore (Ed.), *Culture—meaning—architecture: Critical reflections on the work of Amos Rapoport* (pp. 175–215). Routledge.
- Sussman, A., & Hollander, J. B. (2015). *Cognitive architecture: Designing for how we respond to the built environment*. Routledge.