

International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities
Vol. 4 No. 3, October 2026, pages: 1648-1662
e-ISSN: 2985-6469
https://ejournal.45mataram.ac.id/index.php/ijssh

The Differentiated and Negotiated Production of Urban Public Space: Contestation, Commercialization, and Everyday Life at Teras Samarinda, Indonesia

Ahmad Hidayah[1]*, Ziya Ibrizah[2], Dyah Kuntorini Dwi Angreni[3], Imelda Dwiyani[4], Hanafi Saputra[5]
Corresponding Author's e-mail : ahmad.hidayah@fisip.unmul.ac.id

Article History

Manuscript submitted:
10 Juli 2026
Manuscript revised:
03 September 2026
Accepted for publication:
19 Oktober 2026

Keywords

Urban Public Space;
Production Of Space;
Henri Lefebvre;
Publicness;
Commercialization;
Eventization;
Spatial Contestation;
Teras Samarinda;

Abstract

Urban public spaces are socially produced through interactions among institutional arrangements, everyday practices, commercial activities, and lived meanings. This study examines the production of Teras Samarinda as an urban public space, focusing on multifunctionality, temporal variation, commercialisation, eventisation, and spatial contestation. Drawing on Henri Lefebvre's theory of the production of space, this qualitative case study employed direct observation, institutional document analysis, and public discourse analysis on Threads. Four observation sessions conducted between July and September 2026 captured different temporal conditions. Data were analysed using spatial coding, temporal comparison, and cross-source triangulation. Findings reveal that Teras Samarinda functions as a multifunctional space for recreation, social interaction, tourism, microenterprise activities, and events, with spatial practices varying across time. Events reshape spatial arrangements, while Threads discourse reveals competing perspectives on accessibility, mobility, livelihoods, cleanliness, and institutional responsibility. These dynamics generate contestation and negotiation over spatial functions, meanings, and responsibilities. The study introduces the concept of *Differentiated and Negotiated Production of Urban Public Space*, contributing to Lefebvrian scholarship by demonstrating how conceived, perceived, and lived spaces interact in continuously producing and negotiating urban publicness.

Copyright © 2025, The Author(s).
This is an open access article under the BY-NC-ND license

Contents

Abstract 1648
Introduction 1649

[1] Social Development Department, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Mulawarman, Indonesia
[2] Communication Science Department, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Mulawarman, Indonesia
[3] Public Administration Department, Faculty of Social and Political Science,Universitas Mulawarman, Indonesia
[4] Social Development Department, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Mulawarman, Indonesia
[5] Department of Sociology, Social Science Faculty, Padang State University, Indonesia
[5] Social Development Department, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Mulawarman, Indonesia
[5] Department of Sociology, Social Science Faculty, Padang State University, Indonesia

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework 1650
Methods 1652
Results and Discussion 1653
Conclusion 1659
References 1660

Introduction

Urban public space is not merely a physical container for activities but a social space continuously produced through relations among institutions, users, practices, and meanings. Lefebvre (1991) conceptualizes space as socially produced through the interaction of spatial practices, representations of space, and representational spaces. Recent urban studies emphasize that publicness is multidimensional and cannot be reduced to legal ownership; accessibility, management, inclusiveness, and lived experience shape whether and how a space functions publicly (Istrate et al., 2025; J. Li et al., 2022). Stevens et al., (2024) show that urban public spaces generate multiple and unpredictable possibilities of use, while Milbourne (2021) demonstrates that publicness can emerge through everyday practices across public, private, and intermediate spaces. Contestation is therefore intrinsic to public-space production, as different users claim the same space for different purposes, rhythms, and expectations, making access, control, management, and use central to how publicness is produced and experienced (Chitrakar et al., 2022; Leclercq et al., 2020).

Contemporary public spaces increasingly accommodate recreational, commercial, cultural, tourism, and event functions. Such multifunctionality creates opportunities for economic activity and urban vitality, but it can also generate tensions over access, control, and everyday use. Research on commodification shows that commercial uses may reshape the relationship between use value and exchange value, although their effects on publicness vary across institutional and spatial arrangements (Leclercq et al., 2020; Tang, 2020). The Indonesian context is particularly relevant because public-space production has become increasingly intertwined with commercialization while retaining strong everyday and social functions (Panjaitan et al., 2022). Events add another layer of spatial reconfiguration: festivalization can mobilize public spaces for economic, cultural, and place-branding purposes while generating disputes about access and competing uses (Guillard & McGillivray, 2022; Richards, 2024; Smith et al., 2021). Such conflicts arise not simply because events occur, but because their organization, duration, spatial occupation, and governance interact with everyday practices (Richards, 2024; Stevens et al., 2024). Commercialization and eventization should therefore be examined as processes that reconfigure multifunctional public space rather than as automatic privatization or loss of publicness.

In Indonesian cities, public-space production is shaped by decentralization, changing urban governance, commercialization, and recognition of public space as a site for social interaction and economic activity (Panjaitan et al., 2022). Indonesian studies show that public spaces may become arenas for cultural tourism, creative-economy activities, placemaking, and everyday recreation (Anjarwati et al., 2024; Lahpan et al., 2024; Paramytha & Kristina, 2024). Research on Gasibu, Bandung, demonstrates that visitor activities and perceptions contribute to users' sense of place (Nadella & Kusuma, 2024), while placemaking studies show how neglected urban spaces can be transformed through community and institutional collaboration (Ihsanti & Sugiyantoro, 2024). Teras Samarinda exemplifies this multifunctional condition: it is officially represented as a public space for recreation, social interaction, tourism, events, and local economic activities, including UMKM, making

e-ISSN : 2985-6469

it an appropriate case for examining how publicness is produced when everyday uses encounter institutional, commercial, and event-based claims over the same space.

Existing scholarship provides important but often separated explanations of publicness, commercialization, eventization, everyday spatial practices, and digital representations. Research on publicness has clarified the importance of ownership, accessibility, management, and inclusiveness (Istrate et al., 2025; J. Li et al., 2022), while studies of privatization and commercialization examine changing relations among public, private, and community actors (Leclercq et al., 2020; Lee & Scholten, 2024; Tang, 2020). Event studies document tensions generated when festivals occupy public spaces, particularly where event policies intersect with urban economic strategies and citizen interests (Guillard & McGillivray, 2022; Richards, 2024; Smith et al., 2021). Other studies emphasize everyday practices, temporary interventions, and spatial appropriation as mechanisms through which public space is continually adapted (Doğu et al., 2024; Milbourne, 2021; Stevens et al., 2024), while digital studies show that social-media data can reveal perceptions, activities, emotions, and spatial meanings that conventional approaches struggle to capture (S. Li et al., 2024; Serin & Irak, 2022; Sohi et al., 2024; Wang, 2024). Yet these strands are rarely integrated into a single Lefebvrian account of how physical space, commercial and event activities, and social-media discourse interact within one public space.

This fragmentation is particularly evident in Indonesian urban studies for three reasons. First, Indonesian research has approached public space through separate lenses, such as user perception and sense of place, tourism and creative-economy potential, or placemaking and governance, so that commercialization and events appear either as economic opportunities or as management problems rather than as forces that reorganize everyday spatial practice. Second, these studies rely mainly on surveys, interviews, or physical observation, while the digital studies that treat social-media traces as evidence of spatial meaning have been conducted outside Indonesia. Third, Threads is a recent platform and, to our knowledge, has not yet been examined as an arena in which residents articulate claims about local public space. Consequently, little is known about how access, function, meaning, and responsibility are simultaneously negotiated in an Indonesian public space serving everyday, commercial, tourism, and event purposes. This study addresses that gap by integrating observation of physical space, analysis of commercial and event activities, and Threads discourse within one Lefebvrian framework, examining Teras Samarinda as a dynamic spatial configuration rather than a fixed public-space category.

This study examines how Teras Samarinda is produced and reproduced as an urban public space through institutional representations, everyday spatial practices, and lived meanings. It asks: (1) How is Teras Samarinda produced through institutional representations and everyday spatial practices? (2) How do commercial and event-based activities reconfigure everyday uses and lived meanings? (3) How are access, function, meaning, and responsibility contested and negotiated in the reproduction of Teras Samarinda?. The study contributes the concept of "Differentiated and Negotiated Production of Urban Public Space," which highlights how institutional multifunctionality, temporal differentiation, spatial reconfiguration, and contestation among competing claims shape public-space production. Rather than asking whether commercialization or events simply reduce publicness, it examines how publicness is continuously produced, experienced, contested, and negotiated across changing spatial and temporal conditions.

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

1. Lefebvre and the Production of Space

Henri Lefebvre's theory of the production of space provides the principal theoretical foundation of this study. Rather than treating space as a neutral container of social activities, Lefebvre (1991) argues that social space is produced through relations among three dimensions. Spatial practice, or perceived space, refers to the routinized ways in which space is used, organized, and reproduced in everyday life; here it is evidenced by observed recreation, exercise, social interaction, event attendance, and commercial activity. Representations of space, or conceived space, are produced by planners, administrators, and other institutional actors through official descriptions, regulations, and management arrangements that define Teras Samarinda as public, recreational, tourism-oriented, commercial, or event space. Representational space, or lived space, comprises the meanings, symbols, and experiences through which users interpret a place. The three dimensions are analytically distinguishable but dialectically interconnected: conceived space shapes possible uses, spatial practices reproduce or modify those arrangements, and lived meanings may reinforce, reinterpret, or contest institutional representations. Recent Lefebvrian research similarly shows that everyday and digital practices can connect conceived and lived space through networked interactions (Serin & Irak, 2022). The framework thus enables the analysis to move beyond what Teras Samarinda is designed to be toward how it is continuously produced through institutional projects, material practices, and lived meanings.

2. Urban Public Space and Publicness

Urban publicness concerns the extent to which a space is accessible, usable, inclusive, and collectively available, but it cannot be reduced to formal ownership. Li et.al., (2022) synthesize publicness through ownership, accessibility, management, and inclusiveness, while distinguishing legal publicness from lived publicness. A publicly owned space may therefore be experienced differently depending on management arrangements, spatial organization, and everyday practices. Research on public-space management likewise shows that changes in ownership or management do not automatically strengthen or weaken publicness; accountability and the distribution of stakeholder aspirations also matter (Chitrakar et al., 2022; Leclercq et al., 2020). Accessibility involves not only physical entry but also the ability to move, remain, and participate without undue obstruction; management concerns rules, maintenance, and decisions about legitimate uses; and inclusiveness concerns whether diverse groups and uses can coexist. Indonesian studies demonstrate that public spaces may simultaneously support recreation, social interaction, cultural activity, tourism, and economic practices (Anjarwati et al., 2024; Lahpan et al., 2024; Panjaitan et al., 2022; Paramytha & Kristina, 2024). Publicness is therefore better understood not as a fixed attribute of a physical site but as a relational and lived condition that varies according to time, activity, management, and competing spatial claims (Istrate et al., 2025).

3. Commercialization and Eventization of Public Space

Commercialization introduces economic activity into public space through selling, temporary stalls, rental arrangements, creative-economy activities, and livelihood practices. From a critical perspective, commodification may shift spatial relations toward exchange value, privileging commercially organized activities over everyday use (Leclercq et al., 2020; Tang, 2020). However, economic activities can also provide livelihoods, attract users, and become integrated into multifunctional public-space practices. Indonesian research indicates that commercial and social

e-ISSN : 2985-6469

functions may coexist, although their spatial arrangement can generate tensions among users and managers (Panjaitan et al., 2022; Paramytha & Kristina, 2024).

Eventization refers to the increasing use of public spaces for programmed cultural, recreational, commercial, or entertainment events, which temporarily introduce stages, crowds, vendors, circulation patterns, and organizational controls. Studies of urban events show that such interventions can generate negotiations over access, use, and public-space governance (Guillard & McGillivray, 2022; Richards, 2024; Smith et al., 2021), yet they may also produce new encounters and forms of cultural consumption without necessarily reducing publicness. The analytical issue is therefore not whether events or commerce are inherently beneficial or harmful, but how their organization, duration, intensity, and spatial occupation interact with everyday practices (Doğu et al., 2024; Stevens et al., 2024). Both processes are consequently examined here as forms of spatial reconfiguration rather than automatic privatization or loss of publicness.

4. Everyday Life, Contestation, and Digital Discourse

Everyday spatial practices such as walking, exercising, relaxing, gathering, and photographing reproduce public space, but they may also generate competing claims about appropriate use. Contestation emerges when users attach different expectations to access, function, cleanliness, comfort, livelihood, or responsibility. Rather than treating conflict as external to spatial production, a Lefebvrian perspective understands contestation as part of the process through which meanings and uses of space are negotiated (Istrate et al., 2025; Milbourne, 2021). Digital platforms make these lived interpretations visible: Serin and Irak (2022) show that social-media practices can connect lived and conceived space, while recent digital-urban research demonstrates the value of social-media traces for examining perceptions, activities, emotions, and spatial meanings (S. Li et al., 2024; Sohi et al., 2024; Wang, 2024).

5. Research Gap and Analytical Proposition

Building on this review, a Lefebvrian synthesis allows publicness, commercialization, eventization, everyday practices, and digital discourse to be examined relationally through the interaction of conceived, practiced, and lived space. This study therefore proposes the concept of Differentiated and Negotiated Production of Urban Public Space. "Differentiated" refers to the variation of spatial practices and publicness across ordinary, recreational, commercial, and event conditions, while "negotiated" refers to the continuing contestation and adjustment of access, function, meaning, and responsibility among competing claims. The proposition is that publicness is neither permanently secured by institutional designation nor automatically undermined by commercialization or events; instead, it is continuously produced through the interaction of institutional representations, everyday practices, lived meanings, and spatial claims.

Methods

This study employs a qualitative case-study approach, with Henri Lefebvre's theory of the production of space as the principal analytical framework. Teras Samarinda was selected because it accommodates recreation, everyday social interaction, pedestrian activity, tourism, commercial activities, and public events. Rather than treating publicness as a fixed attribute of the site, the study examines how spatial practices, institutional representations, and lived meanings interact across different temporal and functional conditions. Data were drawn from three complementary sources. First, direct observation was conducted during four sessions between July and September 2026: 12 July

at 17:20 WITA, 5 August at 20:00 WITA, 30 August at 06:20 WITA, and 26 September at 19:30 WITA, capturing late-afternoon recreation, nighttime leisure, morning exercise, and an event setting. Field notes documented activities, spatial concentration, movement patterns, use of facilities, commercial presence, event arrangements, and changes in spatial configuration. Second, institutional and documentary materials concerning the planning, management, functions, facilities, events, and commercial uses of Teras Samarinda were examined to identify representations of the space and its intended functions. Third, publicly accessible posts and discussions on Threads were analyzed as discursive traces of users' lived meanings and spatial claims, as specified below.

Threads data were operationalized as a proxy for representational space (lived space). The unit of analysis was the individual public post or reply describing experiences of, evaluations of, or claims about Teras Samarinda. Posts were identified through keyword searches for "teras samarinda" and limited to publicly accessible content published in October 2026; 17 posts and replies met these criteria. Three boundaries guided interpretation. First, Threads users form a self-selected, digitally active, platform-specific group, so their posts record subjective discourse rather than the opinion of Samarinda residents as a whole. Second, the material was analyzed for the range and content of meanings and claims, not for their frequency, and no inference about public opinion was drawn. Third, statements about access constraints or responsibility were treated as articulated perceptions and compared with observational and documentary data rather than accepted as verified facts. Quotations are anonymized and identified only by codes (T1, T2, etc.), with usernames and identifying details removed.

Data analysis proceeded through four stages: (1) descriptive coding of observed practices, institutional statements, and digital discourse; (2) application of the Lefebvrian categories of spatial practice, representations of space, and representational spaces; (3) temporal and relational comparison to identify differences in spatial use and relationships among commercialization, eventization, access, function, meaning, contestation, and negotiation; and (4) cross-source triangulation across observation, documentary materials, and Threads discourse. Particular attention was given to whether claims were directly observable, institutionally represented, or discursively articulated. This enabled the analysis to distinguish observed spatial reconfiguration from perceived access constraints and calls for negotiation, without assuming that contestation resulted in exclusion or that proposed negotiations constituted successful agreements.

Results and Discussion

1. Results

a. Institutional Conception of Teras Samarinda as a Multifunctional Public Space

Institutional documents present Teras Samarinda as a multifunctional urban space combining recreation, social interaction, tourism, cultural activities, public events, and local economic activities. Government descriptions emphasize it as a place where residents can gather, interact, relax, and participate in community activities, while the amphitheater is associated with cultural performances and event programming, and designated areas for curated UMKM are incorporated into the spatial arrangement. The institutional conception therefore does not define Teras Samarinda through a single function. Its public-space identity is constructed through the coexistence of recreational, social, cultural, tourism, and economic functions, which management arrangements further institutionalize through reservation procedures for the amphitheater and booth and facility arrangements for commercial uses. This representation provides the spatial context within which different practices and claims subsequently emerge.

e-ISSN : 2985-6469

b. Temporal Differentiation in Everyday Spatial Practices

Direct observations demonstrate substantial differences in how Teras Samarinda was used across temporal conditions. On 12 July 2026 at 17:20 WITA, the site was filled with visitors enjoying the Mahakam River sunset, chatting with family members, partners, and friends, while some engaged in physical activity; the dominant configuration was recreational and social. On 5 August 2026 at 20:00 WITA, visitors were relaxing, taking photographs, producing personal video content, and using the public facilities, whereas on 30 August 2026 at 06:20 WITA the site was relatively quiet, with visitors primarily engaged in morning exercise. The same physical space thus accommodated different practices according to time of day. The fourth observation, conducted on 26 September 2026 at 19:30 WITA, presented a markedly different configuration. The site was very crowded because an event was taking place: visitors concentrated around dance and music performances, while numerous temporary UMKM stands were positioned around the main stage, producing a more concentrated, performance-oriented spatial arrangement than in the ordinary recreational and exercise conditions.

c. Event and Commercial Activities as Spatial Reconfiguration

The September observation provides the clearest empirical evidence of the interaction between event activity and commercial use. The simultaneous presence of a performance stage, audience, and temporary UMKM stands altered the concentration of people and activities within the observed area. Space that was used primarily for recreation, social interaction, or exercise under other temporal conditions became organized around the event. This finding is consistent with institutional arrangements that identify the amphitheater as a venue for public events, while the presence of curated and temporary commercial activities shows that economic practices form part of the broader multifunctional configuration of Teras Samarinda. The evidence does not indicate that commercialization replaced recreational use; rather, commercial and event activities appeared as additional spatial practices that became particularly visible under the event condition.

d. Plural Lived Meanings in Public Social-Media Discourse

Threads discourse revealed multiple meanings attached to Teras Samarinda. Some posts described the space primarily as a place for recreation, walking, jogging, cycling, family activities, relaxation, and enjoying the river environment. Other discussions emphasized its role as a livelihood space for UMKM and as a venue for entertainment and events. Cleanliness and spatial comfort were recurring concerns. Some users associated temporary tents and event activities with crowding, obstruction, traffic, food-related smells, or changes in the visual character of the space, whereas others defended vendors' economic interests, arguing that UMKM activities could coexist with public use if appropriately arranged and managed. The tension between recreational users and vendors is visible in the following posts:

> *"...coba balik lagi ke teras skrg deh kak? lantainya bhkan lengket bgt, bau limbah makanan di spanjang bekas tenda umkm."* ["...try going back to the teras now. The floor is really sticky, and it smells of food waste all along where the UMKM tents stood."] (T1)
>
> *"Ini loh kami di liat juga umkm dan pelaku kreativitas lainnya, yg mencari rezeki dan membuat daya tarik supaya masyarakat datang ke teras dengan menampilkan beragam macam hiburan"* ["Look at us too, the UMKM and other creative actors, who are earning a living and creating an attraction so that people come to the teras by presenting all kinds of entertainment"] (T2)

The same arrangement of stalls is thus read as a source of dirt and disorder by some users and as a legitimate livelihood space by others, depending on how each user positions themselves within the space.

e. Contestation over Access, Function, Meaning, and Responsibility

The digital discourse also revealed competing claims concerning how the space should be used. One cluster of comments emphasized access for walking, jogging, cycling, and family recreation, particularly where temporary commercial structures were perceived to occupy circulation or activity areas; these represent perceived access constraints rather than independently verified exclusion.

> *"...jadi ga leluasa dinikmati jika diisi full sepanjang jalan sama tenda berjualan. Selain menghilangkan estetika teras nya, jadi terbatas akses untuk kita menikmati ruang publik itu sendiri."* ["...it cannot be enjoyed freely when the whole path is filled with vending tents. Besides spoiling the aesthetics of the teras, it limits our access to enjoy the public space itself."] (T3)

A second form of contestation concerned function: some users argued that Teras Samarinda should retain its recreational character, while others emphasized the legitimacy of UMKM, events, and entertainment. A third concerned meaning, as the space was alternatively described as a clean recreational environment, a city attraction, an economic opportunity, or an entertainment venue. Responsibility was also contested. Threads discussions attributed responsibility variously to government, managers, event organizers, vendors, or combinations of these actors, and some users called for clearer rules, better spatial arrangements, waste-management facilities, and coordination among organizers, managers, vendors, and visitors. The discourse thus reveals disagreement not only about use but also about who should manage the consequences of multifunctional use.

> *"...yang patut disalahkan adalah pemerintah dan EO sebab gagal mengantisipasi dampak kegiatan."* ["...those to blame are the government and the event organizer for failing to anticipate the impacts of the activity."] (T4)

f. Calls for Negotiation and Spatial Adjustment

Despite disagreement, the Threads discourse contained several proposals aimed at accommodating competing uses. These included relocating temporary commercial stands, separating circulation areas from selling areas, providing appropriate spaces for UMKM, improving waste facilities, establishing clearer rules, and strengthening coordination between event organizers and managers.

> *"Tempat kalian berjualan, harusnya disudut² taman, bukan di tengah² tempat orang jalan, lari, sepedaan, dan aktifitas lainnya. Rundingkan dengan pengelola teras, dimana penempatan yang lebih baik, dan minta tambahan persediaan tempat sampah" ["Your selling spots should be in the corners of the park, not in the middle of where people walk, run, cycle, and do other activities. Negotiate with the teras management about better placement, and ask for more rubbish bins"] (T5)*

e-ISSN : 2985-6469

These statements are treated as calls for negotiation or spatial adjustment rather than evidence that successful negotiation has already occurred. They indicate that users recognize the coexistence of different interests and seek arrangements that could accommodate recreation, commerce, mobility, and entertainment simultaneously.

g. Synthesis of Empirical Findings

Taken together, the findings show that Teras Samarinda operates through differentiated spatial conditions rather than a single, stable pattern of public use. Institutional representations establish the site as multifunctional; everyday practices vary across temporal conditions; and performances and temporary commercial activities can reorganize spatial concentration and activity. Threads discourse adds plural lived meanings and competing claims concerning access, function, cleanliness, livelihood, entertainment, and responsibility, together with calls for adjustment and coordination. Rather than a simple transition from public to commercial space, the findings therefore reveal multiple functions that coexist but do not always align.

2. Discussion

a. From Multifunctional Space to the Production of Urban Public Space

The findings demonstrate that Teras Samarinda should not be understood simply as a physical location designated for public use. Its character as an urban public space is continuously produced through the interaction of institutional representations, everyday spatial practices, and lived meanings, following Lefebvre's proposition that space is socially produced through spatial practices, representations of space, and representational spaces (Lefebvre, 1991). Institutional documents construct the site as multifunctional, while direct observations show that these functions are enacted differently across temporal conditions. In Lefebvrian terms, the institutional conception represents conceived space, observed activities represent perceived space, and Threads discourse reveals the lived meanings and claims that users attach to the same setting. Public space therefore emerges not from physical design or formal designation alone but from the relationship among institutional planning, spatial practices, and lived interpretations (Lefebvre, 1991). This finding is consistent with research emphasizing that public-space production involves multiple actors, phases, and instruments rather than being determined by a single institutional actor (Lee & Scholten, 2024). In their study of privately owned public spaces in Hamburg, Lee and Scholten show that actors may intervene across planning, design, delivery, and management. At Teras Samarinda, multifunctionality is likewise not merely a characteristic assigned by planners but an ongoing spatial condition in which different activities and meanings intersect.

b. Temporality and the Differentiation of Publicness

One of the clearest findings is the temporal differentiation of spatial practices. The four observations reveal late-afternoon recreation and social interaction, nighttime leisure and digital content production, morning exercise, and event-centered nighttime activity; the physical space remained the same, but its dominant practices, density, movement patterns, and meanings varied. The September event made this particularly visible: audiences and temporary UMKM stands produced a distinct configuration that did not eliminate publicness but temporarily altered the organization through which public use was experienced. This extends the understanding of publicness beyond a static assessment of whether a site is formally open to the public. Publicness is also experienced through the temporal conditions under which access and use occur, consistent with Lefebvre's view that spatial practice is embedded in everyday rhythms and routines (Lefebvre, 1991). The same physical setting can therefore

accommodate different practices without becoming a different physical space. Do□u et al. (2024) similarly show that temporary urban interventions change how people interact with urban environments, with outcomes shaped by participation processes, the actors involved, and the scale of change. The Teras Samarinda case extends this insight by showing that, even without a formal design intervention, temporally bounded activities can reorganize everyday spatial practices. Publicness is therefore differentiated across time, shaped by when the space is used and which activities dominate.

c. Commercialization Is Not Simply the Loss of Publicness

The presence of UMKM and other commercial activities introduces an important tension. Some users are concerned that commercial structures occupy areas used for walking, jogging, cycling, or family recreation, while others emphasize the legitimacy of UMKM as an economic and livelihood activity. The evidence therefore reveals competing claims rather than a straightforward opposition between "public users" and "commercial actors." This challenges interpretations that automatically equate commercialization with the decline or privatization of public space. Lee and Scholten (2024), for example, argue that ownership alone is not decisive in defining publicness and point instead to accessibility, management, inclusiveness, design, and the type of public space. At Teras Samarinda, the evidence does not show that commercial activity removed recreational use; rather, it appears as one component of a multifunctional configuration, especially visible during the observed event. From a Lefebvrian perspective, commercialization is one process through which spatial relations are reconfigured: it introduces practices, actors, material arrangements, and meanings that may coexist with recreation but generate competing claims where users perceive constraints on circulation, comfort, or cleanliness. A space can thus remain publicly accessible while being reorganized by commercial practices, moving the analysis beyond a binary public/private framework toward how different uses are accommodated, spatially distributed, and governed.

d. Eventization as Spatial Reconfiguration Rather Than Automatic Privatization

The event observed on 26 September 2026 is particularly important for understanding eventization. Performances, audiences, and temporary UMKM stands concentrated activity around the main stage and altered the spatial rhythm of the site, yet the observation does not support the claim that the event privatized the space or caused a loss of publicness. Instead, eventization can be understood as a temporary reorganization of an existing spatial configuration. This resonates with Roberts (2023), who applies Lefebvre's concept of *détournement* to show how the Park Lane Road Improvement Scheme made urban space more uncertain and open to appropriation, generating competing publics and competing claims concerning how it should be configured. Although the transformation at Teras Samarinda is temporal and activity-based rather than a major permanent infrastructural intervention, the analytical connection holds: in both cases, changes in spatial configuration create conditions in which different actors articulate different claims about the appropriate use and meaning of space. Do□u et al. (2024) further show that the outcomes of temporary interventions depend on the actors involved and the scale of spatial change. Eventization at Teras Samarinda should therefore be understood as a temporary spatial reconfiguration rather than automatic privatization, whose implications depend on how space is organized, which activities remain possible, how movement is managed, and how competing interests are accommodated.

e. Contestation as Part of the Production of Public Space

The Threads material shows that disagreement concerning access, function, cleanliness, economic activity, and responsibility is not external to the production of Teras Samarinda but part of the process through which its meaning and use are articulated. This resonates with Roberts' (2023) analysis of Hyde Park, which demonstrates that a major spatial intervention can generate multiple

e-ISSN : 2985-6469

publics with competing agendas and that *détournement* can make urban spaces more open to appropriation and strategic contestation, producing competing claims to publicness (Roberts, 2023). The findings do not establish that any group possesses a universally valid understanding of public space, and institutional designation does not eliminate disagreement over how public use should be organized. This supports a Lefebvrian interpretation in which contestation is itself part of spatial production, since social relations actively produce and reproduce the meaning and organization of space (Lefebvre, 1991). Contestation is therefore analytically significant because it makes visible the different spatial claims embedded within an apparently shared public space.

f. Digital Discourse as Lived-Space Politics

Within the boundaries set out in the Methods, Threads provides a window into the lived dimension of Teras Samarinda by revealing how particular users articulate spatial experiences, concerns, judgments, and proposals. Through these digital traces, cleanliness, comfort, access, livelihood, aesthetics, and responsibility appear not simply as technical management issues but as matters of meaning and entitlement. Statements about where vendors should be located, whether events should occupy particular areas, how cleanliness should be maintained, and who should assume responsibility show how lived experience develops into claims about spatial governance. This is consistent with Lefebvre's distinction between conceived space, formally represented in institutional documents, and lived space, which concerns how space is experienced, appropriated, and imbued with meaning (Lefebvre, 1991); Threads provides discursive traces through which such meanings become observable.

g. From Contestation to Negotiated Publicness

The Threads discourse also contains proposals for accommodation: alternative locations for commercial stands, clearer separation between selling and circulation areas, additional waste facilities, better coordination, clearer rules, and greater attention to UMKM interests. Contestation is thus accompanied by attempts to imagine alternative spatial arrangements. The Teras Samarinda findings should nevertheless not be interpreted as evidence of formal co-production, because the data demonstrate calls for coordination and negotiation but not an institutionalized process or successful agreement. Negotiated publicness in this study therefore refers to an ongoing condition in which competing claims are articulated and spatial adjustments are proposed, capturing the processual character of public-space production rather than an assumed consensus. The findings also extend Roberts' (2023) discussion of competing publics: whereas Roberts identifies strategic agendas around the future configuration of uncertain urban space, Teras Samarinda reveals a more everyday form of contestation in which users articulate practical proposals for accommodating different uses.

h. Toward a Differentiated and Negotiated Production of Urban Public Space

The central theoretical implication of the findings is the proposition of Differentiated and Negotiated Production of Urban Public Space, which captures four interacting processes. First, institutional multifunctionality establishes the range of uses through which the space is conceived. Second, temporal differentiation means that these functions do not operate with equal intensity at all times. Third, commercial and event activities can temporarily reorganize spatial concentration and movement. Fourth, these changes generate plural lived meanings and competing claims concerning access, function, meaning, and responsibility. This proposition builds on Lefebvre's understanding of space as socially produced, while drawing together Roberts' (2023) insight that spatial uncertainty produces competing publics, Lee and Scholten's (2024) emphasis on multiple actors and phases, and Do□u et al.'s (2024) attention to temporality, participation, and scale in temporary urban interventions.

i. Theoretical Contribution to Lefebvre and Publicness

The study contributes to Lefebvrian scholarship by demonstrating how conceived, perceived, and lived space interact under temporally differentiated conditions: institutional representations define Teras Samarinda as multifunctional, everyday practices enact different uses over time, and digital discourse reveals the lived meanings and claims surrounding those uses. This reinforces Lefebvre's proposition that space is simultaneously material, practiced, represented, and lived (Lefebvre, 1991). The study also contributes to publicness research by shifting attention from whether a space is public toward how publicness is produced and reconfigured, consistent with Lee and Scholten's (2024) argument that publicness cannot be determined by ownership alone. Extending Roberts' (2023) view of publicness as a contested social and political condition, it shows how competing claims emerge through temporally differentiated recreational, commercial, and event practices. The resulting proposition can therefore be stated as follows: Urban public space is differentiated and negotiated when institutional multifunctionality encounters temporally differentiated spatial practices and plural lived meanings, producing competing claims over access, function, and meaning that continuously reconfigure the organization and publicness of space.

j. Integrated Discussion: A Relational Model of Public-Space Production

Taken together, the findings suggest that Teras Samarinda should be understood through a relational rather than linear model. Institutional representations do not mechanically determine everyday practices, nor do practices simply reproduce institutional intentions; commercial and event activities introduce additional configurations, while lived meanings and digital discourse can challenge, reinterpret, or propose adjustments to existing arrangements. The production of space can therefore be represented as:



Figure 1. Conceptual Framework of the Differentiated and Negotiated Production of Urban Public Space

The arrows do not denote a deterministic causal sequence. Institutional arrangements shape possibilities for use; users enact and reinterpret those possibilities; events and commercial activities temporarily reorganize spatial practices; and lived meanings generate claims that can lead to proposals for spatial adjustment. The principal theoretical contribution is therefore the conceptualization of publicness as a differentiated and negotiated condition of spatial production that is simultaneously spatial, temporal, social, and discursive. Publicness at Teras Samarinda is neither guaranteed by formal designation nor necessarily undermined by commercial or event activities; it emerges as an ongoing relational achievement that remains open to contestation, adjustment, and reinterpretation.

Conclusion

This study concludes that Teras Samarinda is continuously produced and reproduced as an urban public space through the interaction of institutional representations, everyday spatial practices, commercial activities, events, and lived meanings. Its publicness is not determined solely by physical design or institutional designation but emerges through dynamic relationships among conceived, perceived, and lived space. The findings reveal that Teras Samarinda is institutionally conceived as a multifunctional space accommodating recreation, social interaction, tourism, cultural activities, events,

e-ISSN : 2985-6469

and micro, small, and medium enterprise (MSME) activities. However, its spatial practices vary across temporal conditions, as morning exercise, afternoon recreation, evening leisure, and organised events generate different patterns of movement, interaction, and spatial concentration. Commercial and event-related activities temporarily reshape spatial arrangements without entirely replacing everyday recreational functions. Furthermore, public discourse on Threads reveals diverse and competing interpretations concerning accessibility, mobility, livelihoods, entertainment, cleanliness, and institutional responsibility, indicating that publicness is continuously contested and negotiated through everyday interactions. These findings contribute to the understanding of urban spatial production through the proposed concept of *Differentiated and Negotiated Production of Urban Public Space*, which emphasises temporality, multifunctionality, and negotiation as interconnected dimensions shaping the relationship between institutional planning, spatial practices, and lived experiences.

Based on these findings, several recommendations are proposed for future research, practitioners, and policymakers. Future studies should employ longitudinal observations, broader stakeholder participation, and comparative approaches across different urban public spaces to examine how spatial practices, institutional arrangements, and competing claims evolve over time, particularly considering the limited observation sessions and context-specific social media data used in this study. For practitioners, the management of Teras Samarinda should establish unobstructed pedestrian and jogging corridors, designate specific vending zones for MSMEs, implement flexible scheduling for commercial and event activities, and strengthen waste management through clear responsibilities and regular inspections. Event organisers should also be required to provide spatial layouts that maintain accessibility and minimise conflicts among users. For policymakers, adaptive spatial management regulations should be developed to balance public accessibility, local economic activities, and environmental quality. These policies should incorporate participatory governance mechanisms involving management authorities, MSME representatives, event organisers, and community groups, supported by accessible public feedback channels. Such measures are expected to strengthen inclusive, sustainable, and responsive public space governance while accommodating the diverse interests and changing spatial practices of urban communities.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to all individuals and institutions who supported this research. Special appreciation is extended to the management of Teras Samarinda and all parties who contributed valuable information and insights into the dynamics of urban public space. The authors also acknowledge the support of academic colleagues and relevant institutions whose contributions were essential to the successful completion of this study.

References

Anjarwati, A., Purnomo, D., & Hadiwijoyo, S. S. (2024). Produksi Ruang Publik Pedesaan sebagai Destinasi Wisata: Studi Destinasi Wisata Muncar. *Jurnal Sosial Humaniora*, *15.0*(1.0), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.30997/jsh.v15i1.12123

Chitrakar, R. M., Baker, D. C., & Guaralda, M. (2022). How accessible are neighbourhood open spaces? Control of public space and its management in contemporary cities. *Cities*, *131.0*, 103948. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2022.103948

Do□u, T., Mengi, O., & Köse, □. (2024). Where do temporary urban design interventions fall on the spectrum of public participation? An analysis of global trends. *Cities*, *152*, 105164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2024.105164

Guillard, S., & McGillivray, D. (2022). Eventful policies, public spaces and neoliberal citizenship: Lessons from Glasgow. *Cities*, *130.0*, 103921. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2022.103921

Ihsanti, D. A., & Sugiyantoro, S. (2024). Placemaking di Kolong Jalan Layang: Fenomena Penggunaan "Lost Space" untuk Taman Kota. *Jurnal Pembangunan Wilayah Dan Kota*, *20.0*(4.0), 474–488. https://doi.org/10.14710/pwk.v20i4.65149

Istrate, A.-L., Mitchell, A., Russell, P., & Murphy, S. (2025). Comparative analyses of publicness in urban squares within a diversifying metropolis. *URBAN DESIGN International*, *30*(3), 150–168. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41289-024-00256-1

Lahpan, N. Y. K., Putra, B. D., Hidayana, I. S., & Shafanissa, W. (2024). Pemanfaatan Ruang Publik Bagi Pengembangan Wisata Berbasis Seni Budaya Lokal. *Panggung*, *34*(2). https://doi.org/10.26742/panggung.v34i2.3368

Leclercq, E., Pojani, D., & Van Bueren, E. (2020). Is public space privatization always bad for the public? Mixed evidence from the United Kingdom. *Cities*, *100.0*, 102649. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2020.102649

Lee, D., & Scholten, N. (2024). Co-production of privately owned public space: Who, why, when, and how? *URBAN DESIGN International*, *29*(2), 123–133. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41289-024-00239-2

Lefebvre, Henri. (1991). *The production of space* (Donald. Nicholson-Smith, Ed.). Blackwell Publishing.

Li, J., Dang, A., & Song, Y. (2022). Defining the ideal public space: A perspective from the publicness. *Journal of Urban Management*, *11.0*(4.0), 479–487. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jum.2022.08.005

Li, S., Wang, C., Rong, L., Zhou, S., & Wu, Z. (2024). Understanding How People Perceive and Interact with Public Space through Social Media Big Data: A Case Study of Xiamen, China. *Land*, *13.0*(9.0), 1500. https://doi.org/10.3390/land13091500

Milbourne, P. (2021). Growing public spaces in the city: Community gardening and the making of new urban environments of publicness. *Urban Studies*, *58*(14), 2901–2919. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098020972281

Nadella, A., & Kusuma, H. E. (2024). Pengaruh Aktivitas dan Persepsi Pengunjung terhadap Sense of Place Ruang Publik (Kasus: Lapangan Gasibu). *Review of Urbanism and Architectural Studies*, *22*(1), 21–30. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.ruas.2024.022.01.3

Panjaitan, T. W. S., Pojani, D., & Darchen, S. (2022). The transformation of public space production and consumption in post-Reformation Indonesian cities. *City, Culture and Society*, *29.0*, 100444. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2022.100444

Paramytha, P., & Kristina, B. A. (2024). Identifikasi Potensi Ekonomi Kreatif pada Ruang Publik di Kota Yogyakarta. *Jurnal LINEARS*, *7.0*(1.0), 13–20. https://doi.org/10.26618/j-linears.v7i1.14249

Richards, G. (2024). Events and urban space: A challenging relationship? *International Journal of Tourism Cities*, *10.0*(3.0), 1067–1081. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJTC-12-2023-0270

Roberts, J. M. (2023). A road scheme, the state, and the détournement of urban space: Henri Lefebvre and competing publics in postwar Hyde Park, London. *Political Geography*, *107*, 102968. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2023.102968

e-ISSN : 2985-6469

Serin, B., & Irak, D. (2022). Production of space from the digital front: From everyday life to the everyday politics of networked practices. *Cities*, *130.0*, 103889. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2022.103889

Smith, A., Vodi□ka, G., Colombo, A., Lindström, K. N., McGillivray, D., & Quinn, B. (2021). Staging city events in public spaces: An urban design perspective. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, *12.0*(2.0), 224–239. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEFM-10-2020-0063

Sohi, S. Z., Banihashemi, S., Sheikhkhoshkar, M., & Abdollahi Roshan, P. (2024). From data to design: Social network insights for urban design and regeneration. *Frontiers of Architectural Research*, *13.0*(6.0), 1377–1399. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foar.2024.04.006

Stevens, Q., Leorke, D., Dovey, K., Awepuga, F., & Morley, M. (2024). From 'pop-up' to permanent: Temporary urbanism as an emerging mode of strategic open-space planning. *Cities*, *154.0*, 105376. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2024.105376

Tang, S. (2020). Public space as commodity: social production of the Hong Kong waterfront. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers - Urban Design and Planning*, *173.0*(4.0), 146–155. https://doi.org/10.1680/jurdp.19.00024

Wang, Y. (2024). Fusing multi-source social media data and street view imagery to inform urban space quality: A study of user perceptions at Kampong Glam and Haji Lane. *Urban Informatics*, *3.0*, 21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44212-024-00052-w