

Interiority Across the Scales

Paramita Atmodiwirjo, Yandi Andri Yatmo

*Universitas Indonesia
Indonesia*

The understanding of interior gradually has shifted from the enclosed spatiality defined by physical boundaries to the extended notion of interiority as a dynamic condition. Interiority as a dynamic condition acknowledges various dimensions that contribute to such a condition, from time and temporality (Leveratto, 2020), and the dynamic contexts of global conditions through social, economic and cultural exchanges (Hadjiyanni, 2018), to advances in technology that unavoidably shift spatial relations (Taylor, 2018). These emerging dimensions pose some implications for interior discipline and design practice, necessitating that they consider changing boundaries, contexts and typologies, and acknowledging them as inherent conditions for interior.

Understanding interior becomes more complex as dynamic conditions make it possible for interior to extend across boundaries, time, scales and typologies. The built environment usually is divided into several levels and scales with various typologies, each of which has its own set of considerations and conditions (Adams, 2024). It comprises hierarchical levels that define the built environment's structure (Habraken, 1998). Within such division and hierarchy, interior usually is treated as the smaller scale or micro-part of the building in the wider urban context. However, with the interior's dynamic condition, such scales and levels become dynamic and interchangeable, usually overlapping with and influencing one another (Adams, 2024). Interior can be experienced, inhabited and produced as multi-layer entities, in which layers represent the different scales of environment that continuously relate to one another.

It is then necessary to examine interior from a multi-scalar perspective that considers interior as not always being associated with a certain scale or typology. It clearly has been demonstrated within the dissolving dichotomy of urban and interior, or urban and domestic. As the urban approach began to view interior as part of urban infrastructure, the idea of multi-scalar offers the potential "to bridge traditional scales, typologies and territories" (Leveratto, 2020, p. 9). It reconsiders the notion of territory, in which the inhabited interior is not necessarily associated with a particularly defined territory, as demonstrated in some contemporary interior phenomena of placelessness, nomadism, and transience (Campos, 2018). Interior conditions may emerge at any scales or levels of the built environment in which the relational and temporal character becomes more significant than the physical materiality that traditionally defines such scales and levels.

Thinking across scales when discussing interior conditions requires a closer examination of the possible relationships between the large and the miniature, the macro and the micro, the landscape and the details, the infrastructure and the domestic (Ashby & Crinson, 2022). The approach to move across these scales—from macro to micro, then back again—may reveal potential strategies to produce a more relational and contextual built environment. For example, in-depth knowledge of spatial interior mechanisms and strategies found at micro-scale can offer alternative perspectives in defining the appropriate programming in an urban-scale context (Harani et al., 2023). Meanwhile, acknowledging interior as global constructs with emerging issues and societal challenges helps define more appropriate interior spatial construction practices (Hadjiyanni, 2018).

This issue of *Interiority* presents various inquiries on the emergence of interiority and interior conditions across different scales. The articles demonstrate a wide range of perspectives on interior beyond the conventional notion of interior scale and typology, mainly addressing the domestic environment and its dynamic variants and elements. They cover a wide range of inquiries and practices that attempt to celebrate the transient, temporal and relational character of domestic interior, from urban-domestic relations, shifting roles of women beyond the domestic sphere, collective domesticity, to domestic objects.

In this issue, Julia Capomaggi presents a narrative examining a campsite as a setting for ephemeral domesticity, in which the practice of camping functions as an extended practice of domesticity, with the campsite becoming a temporal urban landscape. The inquiry into a series of campsites in Catalonia, Spain, demonstrates

the interior's transient character, in which the condition of 'endless interior' is generated by the ground condition and intimacy gradient, rather than by the landscape's physical boundaries. Ayman Kassem discusses the reciprocal relationship between urban and domestic scale through a review of the *SupaVenezia* exhibition, highlighting a local gallery's attempts to co-exist with the city's large, annual Biennale art exhibition in the Venice urban context. The exhibition's dynamic display strategy, comprising micro-spatial exhibits that contain domestic objects displayed in commercial-like settings and arranged within fluid irregular grids, elicits reflection on the nexus of art, commerce, and spatial experience.

The next two articles in this issue address women's presence within design discourse and community spatial practice. Both articles demonstrate the transformation of women's roles as they move beyond the domestic sphere and into more influential roles in society. Francesca Romana Forlini discusses women's role as designers in resisting the construction of women's identity during Italy's fascist regime. The article highlights women's contribution to design practice through the concept of cultural domesticity, with an emphasis on the values of interior in accommodating everyday life and cultural values. These women's influential roles as decision-makers within the cultural context are discussed in another article by Fakhur Razi Maamor, Sabzali Musa Kahn, and Basitah Taif in the case of *buah buton*, the interior element that represents these women's status in Negeri Sembilan's traditional domestic dwellings. The authors demonstrate the relationship between *buah buton* design, its placement within the dwelling interior, and women's contributions to society, particularly in the customary culture in maintaining generational continuity.

The other two articles propose quantitative and algorithmic approaches for interior inquiry and practice in attempting to shift territory and scale from private to public and from architecture to object. Virginia De Jorge-Huertas and Justo De Jorge-Moreno conduct an inquiry into sharing as a transitional practice between private and collective domains by examining cases of cohousing projects in Europe during the past three decades. The inquiry employs cluster analysis to identify the typology of cohousing, followed by more detailed space syntax analysis to uncover the interiority of the shared space. The final article—by Klawkanlayaphon Sawatmongkhonkul, Eakachat Joneurairatana, and Veerawat Sirivesmas—demonstrates another shift from interior to furniture on a smaller spatial scale. They demonstrate how the parametric design approach, often applied in architecture, has potential applications with furniture objects, in which flexibility and versatility become important considerations for

designing at object scale. They argue that the parametric approach plays an important role in enabling establishment of intricate systems in furniture making to ensure its performance in ergonomic accuracy and material efficiency.

The case studies presented in this issue of *Interiority* illustrate a range of possibilities on how interiority emerges across various scales, demonstrating the interior's resilience across history and towards future challenges. These cases acknowledge the dynamic aspects of interior architecture, which opens possibilities for various interpretations of interior, locating it within a broader understanding of social, political and cultural contexts. The emergence of interior conditions across scales calls for multidimensional thinking and multidisciplinary approaches in interior research and practice.

References

- Adams, R. (2024). *Designing spatial culture*. Routledge.
- Ashby, C., & Crinson, M. (Eds.). (2022). *Building/object: Shared and contested territories of design and architecture*. Bloomsbury Visual Arts.
- Campos, A. (2018). Territory and inhabitation. In G. Marinic (Ed.), *The interior architecture theory reader* (pp. 74–81). Routledge.
- Habraken, N. J. (1998). *The structure of the ordinary: Form and control in the built environment*. MIT Press.
- Hadjiyanni, T. (2018). Interiors as global constructs: Framing culture and design discourses in a world of movement. In G. Marinic (Ed.), *The interior architecture theory reader* (pp. 397–406). Routledge.
- Harani, A. R., Atmodiwirjo, P., & Yatmo, Y. A. (2023). Makeshift as spatio-temporal mechanism tactics of urban interior in Kampung Bustaman Semarang, Indonesia. *Urban Design International*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41289-023-00232-1>
- Leveratto, J. (2020). Learning from interiors toward a multiscalar approach to adaptivity. *International Journal of Interior + Spatial Design*, 6, 8–15.
- Taylor, M. (2018). Shape shifting: Interior architecture and dynamic design. In G. Marinic (Ed.), *The interior architecture theory reader* (pp. 53–58). Routledge.