

Housing Privacy and Community: Contradicting Cases of Cohousing and New Urbanist Developments

Zeynep Toker, PhD. ¹

Associate Professor

Department of Urban Studies and Planning

California State University, Northridge

United States of America

Abstract

As the lack of sense of community has become a prevalent trait of suburban landscape in the United States, two alternative housing types (cohousing and new urbanist developments) have emerged with claims to fix that problem through social and spatial organizations they provide. Lack of privacy, on the other hand, has been discussed as a feature of these communal living schemes, which encourage social interaction. In this study, the two aforementioned housing types are compared in regards to the sense of privacy and community they accommodate for the resident women. A total of 29 women were interviewed. Similarity of claimed intentions to enhance a sense of community is the reason for comparing cohousing and new urbanist developments, although the results of this study indicate that the resident women's experiences of privacy and community differ in these two housing types.

Keywords: Community, Privacy, Cohousing, New urbanism, Women

1. Introduction

Typical suburban neighborhoods dominating the physical landscape of the United States and lack of a sense of community in those neighborhoods (Oldenburg, 1989; Relph, 1976; Koolhaas, 1994) have initiated the conversations about possible alternatives for urban development in general and for housing in particular. Cohousing, a collaborative living scheme imported from Scandinavian countries during early 1990s, emerged as a viable option for fostering social networking and hence a sense of community with higher density layouts of private houses and communal facilities. New urbanism, on the other hand, as another endeavor to foster a sense of community, has attempted to recreate American small town life through higher density mixed-use developments ornamented with front porches carrying the hopes that sense of community will follow these physical cues.

Physical characteristics of a neighborhood that would foster a sense of community (especially higher density) trigger discussions on how to negotiate between private space and communal space. Women, having been historically and symbolically associated with the concept of home and domestic life (Domosh and Seager, 2001; Wright, 1981) have consequently been pivotal in those negotiations. Predictably, different roles defined for women in each housing type affect how women experience privacy. Cohousing has been built around the idea of collaboration within and among households for easing the burden of daily responsibilities (McCamant and Durrett, 1989). New urbanism, however, has been dwelling on the principles of neo-traditionalism (Torre, 1999; Veninga, 2004) reviving the inherently embedded homemaking wife image. The difference between women's expected roles in these housing types is revealed in the patterns of resident women's domestic routines, which influence how they establish privacy at home.

¹ For completing this research the author received an international fellowship from the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation (AAUW). For preparing the manuscript she received a grant from the Dean's Office of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences at California State University, Northridge.

The purpose of this study is to compare resident women's experiences not only for establishing privacy but also belonging to a communal life in cohousing and new urbanist developments. Challenging the conventional assumptions about collaborative living schemes, the findings of this study suggest that privacy at home is available more in the housing type where communal life is stronger.

2. Literature Review

Cohousing is notable for its concentration on collective performances of housework and childcare tasks among the residents (Scanzoni, 2000; Kranz and Palm-Linden, 1994; Fromm, 2000; Vestbro, 1997, 1998, 2000; Woodward, 1989; McCamant and Durrett, 1989). It has evolved from collective housing schemes and promotes utilizing shared spaces for housework and childcare to include women and men in the community (Kranz and Palm-Linden, 1994; Fromm, 2000; Vestbro, 1997, 1998, 2000). It is also argued that it is the concept of mutual support among households in a community, which makes cohousing developments provide appropriate living environments for non-traditional households (such as single parents, dual-earner couples, young couples, and elderly people) (Hasell and Scanzoni, 1997).

The origin of cohousing is based on two collective housing models: the service-based model and the collective-work model. The **service-based model** aimed at reducing women's burden of childcare and housework, functioned with employed staff hired to perform these duties. Service housing for the elderly, which was a combination of two categories of residents using communal premises together, was also a variation of the service-based model. The service-based model was built on the division of labor between the occupants and employed staff. In the 1930s, professional women's organizations in Europe supported collective housing, which aimed at combining professional work and family life in an efficient way by accommodating equal roles of women and men in new household types (Vestbro, 1997; Krantz and Palm-Linden, 1994). Early examples of collective housing in Europe included kindergartens and dinner halls. However, since these services were provided by underpaid female servants, collective housing in Europe was for privileged groups in the 1940s (Vestbro, 1998). Although easing the burden of increasing responsibilities related to childcare and housework was an important factor that led to the emergence of collective living, the image of the housewife with full responsibility for childcare and housework dominated the 1950s. In Europe, arguments about the adverse effects of collective facilities for childcare on the psychological and moral development of the child undermined the popularity of collective housing practices (Vestbro, 1997, 1998).

In the early 1970s, in Europe, the concept of collective living was transformed from a service-based model to a collective-work model (Fromm, 1991; Vestbro, 1998). The **collective-work model** was based on the idea that residents take care of meal services and other tasks through communal efforts (Vestbro, 1998). This model suggested a scheme with a common house and a regular childcare facility. The collective-work model, with its practical concerns, is the model of contemporary cohousing developments (Krantz and Palm-Linden, 1994; Fromm, 1991; Asplund and Bonita, 1994). In the early 1970s, groups of families who wanted a greater sense of community than was available in suburban divisions or apartment complexes began to build the first examples of cohousing in Europe. Later on, in the early 1990s, cohousing developments began to emerge in the United States (Sanoff, 2000; McCamant and Durrett, 1989; Vestbro, 2000). Today, more than 200 cohousing communities are at various stages of development in the United States (cohousing website).

In cohousing developments, formation of tenure types and management principles are shaped around the ideas of collective living and supported by common facilities. In most of the cohousing developments, it is preferable to accommodate a larger mix of residents by attracting not only couples, but also singles with or without children (Fromm, 1991). The variety of tenure types is supported with collective utilization of common facilities. Daily responsibilities, such as cooking and dining, and childcare, in addition to recreational activities, are carried out collectively on a regular basis. Common facilities are designed to be integral parts of a community's daily life and are always supplemental to the private residences. The common house typically includes a common kitchen, dining area, sitting area, children's playroom and laundry and may also have a workshop, library, exercise room, crafts room and/or one or two guest rooms. Except in very tight urban sites, cohousing communities often have playground equipment, lawns, and gardens as well (McCamant and Durrett, 1989; Fromm, 1991; Vestbro, 2000). Future residents' participation in the design during the development process is essential so that the product meets their needs (Endoh, 1998, 1999).

Consequently, community building starts in the initial stages assuring the effectiveness of residents' management, which is an invariably common characteristic in cohousing developments (Fromm, 1991). Residents do most of the work to maintain the property, yet there is no shared community economy. They participate in the preparation of common meals and meet regularly to develop policies for management collectively (McCamant and Durrett, 1989).

In a study of cohousing communities in the United States, Fromm (2000) reports that residents stated the advantages of living in a cohousing development as community support, a good social life, a better life for children, having dinners together, working as a group, and sharing resources (among others). Supporting these statements, 70% of the surveyed cohousing residents had cared for a neighbor's child without being paid. Similarly, 100% of the residents reported that they would feel comfortable asking neighbors to help with tasks or errands (Fromm, 2000). However, another study with a focus on older women in cooperative living arrangements reveals the importance of separation between private facilities and shared facilities in cohousing developments (Brenton, 1999). This balance between shared and private spaces in cohousing developments has been instrumental in fostering a sense of community. It has been suggested that density and layout in addition to functionality of communal (shared) spaces are the key design factors influencing social interaction in cohousing developments (Williams, 2005). The routine social interaction generates the network friendly housing environment that many new household types find useful (Hassell and Scanzoni, 1997).

New urbanist developments initiated by commercial developers are defined as residential communities typically on the outskirts of metropolitan areas (Torre, 1999). New urbanist planning principles revolve around the decentralization of urban patterns, where daily needs, housing, jobs, and schools, among other activities are placed within walking distance of each other. According to this proposal the communities should have a center that combines commercial, recreational and cultural uses. With an emphasis on pedestrian movement in these decentralized small units, the streets and sidewalks should be organized to slow down vehicular traffic, encourage bicycle and pedestrian circulation, and make public transportation accessible. For these communities' social composition, diversity of household types, and income and age groups should be supported in the variety of house types (Torre, 1999; Calthorpe, 1993, 1994; Bressi, 1994; Duany and Plater-Zyberk, 1994; Moule and Ployzoides, 1994; Talen, 1999). Since the early 1980s, based on these criteria, many developments were built in the United States. In 1996, the number of people living in new urbanist developments reached two thousand (Torre, 1999), and it has been rapidly increasing since then with the adoption of these principles by national and local planning organizations and by developers, who are eager to benefit from this new trend (Torre, 1999; Bressi, 1994). Based on a survey conducted by New Urban News, in 2002 there were 472 neighborhood scale new urbanist developments in some stage of development in the United States (Southworth, 2003).

The new urbanist developments are for-profit, private developments mostly on private residential lots, and are based on single-family house structures (Torre, 1999; Harvey, 1997).

In addition to a lack of collectively managed facilities, control of the management in the new urbanist developments on house design eliminates the possibility for residents to accommodate their needs and values in their houses (Torre, 1999). Therefore, new urbanist planning principles have been criticized for privileging spatial forms over social processes (Fulton, 1996; Sorkin, 1998; Harvey, 1997; Talen, 1999; Veninga, 2004). Harvey (1997) questions the very concept of community as it is advertised in new urbanist developments. For him, it is the image of a community rather than a real one that has been produced in this type of developments for the affluent residents. Due to the spatial determinism embedded in the new urbanist planning concept, which assumes that proper design will "save" American cities and provide a new moral order, the neighborhood becomes equivalent to the community in new urbanist planning (Harvey, 1997).

New urbanist developments represent a consumer-based model for domestic life, where cleaning services, domestic servants, and ready-to-eat well-balanced foods are available for purchase, different from the model based on collective management and performance of services that are accessible to all residents (Torre, 1999).

Since both private and shared domestic routines are established primarily by women who still perform the majority of housework tasks (Bianchi et al., 2000; Bittman and Wajcman, 2000; Lennon and Rosenfield, 1994; South and Spitze, 1994; Gershuny and Robinson, 1988; Press and Townsley, 1998; Ahrentzen et al., 1989; Michelson, 1994; Wajcman, 1991), how they negotiate space at home and whether they become part of the communal life are pivotal in describing private and communal lives in these communities.

Negotiating space at home is a dynamic process in which the initial status differences between women and men create certain types of gendered spaces, which institutionalized spatial segregation and allocation in houses then reinforces the existing gender roles (Spain, 1992; Roberts, 1990; Domosh, 1998). Since the onset of industrialization in Western Europe and North America, it has been women's identities and interests that are bound up with the idea of home and the literal form of the house (Domosh and Seager, 2001; Ellin, 1996; Wright, 1981). Although marginal, there have also been alternative approaches, which were initiated by groups of women in industrialized societies to accommodate unconventional roles for women, such as cooperative housekeeping projects in the second half of the nineteenth century (Domosh and Seager, 2001; Rock et al., 1980; Hayden, 1981, 1984). However, reform movements like cooperative housekeeping remained marginal and the examples of their practical implementation were very limited in number, compared to the dominant view of femininity and its expression in typical house plans (Hayden, 1984).

Since salient values of household members surface in performing household tasks, and in daily household living, intra-house use patterns are important. In cases of conflict for space use among household members, the use patterns are modified by defining territories, time rescheduling for comparative uses, functional differentiation between activities, and exercise of controls (Sanoff, 1971). It has been argued that the amount of time women spend for housework tasks influences their use and perception of houses (Ahrentzen et al., 1989; Peatross and Hassell, 1992; Roberts, 1990; Domosh, 1998; Boys, 1990; Franck, 1985; Bowlby et al., 1997; Munro and Madigan, 1999; Booth, 1999).

Discussions on gender division of space focus on macro-scale space and originate from the argument on ideology of separation of spheres, which is an ideology that confines women to private (domestic) space, and men to public space (Massey, 1994; Spain, 1992; Domosh, 1998). However, domestic space is not homogeneous and is experienced differently by women and men (Bowlby et al., 1997; Weisman, 1992; Ahrentzen et al., 1989).

The gender division of household space is shaped through women's and men's use and perception of certain spaces. The differentiation in use patterns of women and men in houses originates from the distinction between types of household activities that are performed by either women or men. Eventually, the way they use these spaces influence their perception of them.

Research about use patterns in domestic space claims that women's time spent for housework defines housework spaces (especially, the kitchen) as women's spaces (Ahrentzen et al., 1989; Sebba and Churchman, 1983; Tognoli, 1980). It is also argued that women associate negative feelings with these spaces due to their dislike of housework activities (Tognoli, 1980; Pennartz, 1999; Munro and Madigan, 1999).

Ahrentzen et al. (1989) have examined the relationship between the share in housework and use of domestic space in Toronto through time-budget surveys with 538 family households. They concluded that married and employed women and men spend the same amount of time in core rooms of the house except for the kitchen. Moreover, they stated that although the time spent in the core rooms are the same for employed mothers and fathers, their experiences of those spaces differ. Also, married women spend a greater proportion of their time in the kitchen compared to men (Ahrentzen et al., 1989). The findings of this study suggest that the use patterns, which are identified according to time spent by the members of households, demonstrate the role distribution in households.

Sebba and Churchman (1983) describe domestic space as a territorial model, where each area has a clear classification and is characterized by a particular pattern of behaviors and attitudes. The findings of this study in a middle-class neighborhood of Haifa, Israel suggest that the kitchen emerges as an exceptional space in houses, which is identified as belonging to women by the other members of households as well as by women themselves. Although all members of the household use the kitchen, because of a larger amount of time spent for housework tasks in the kitchen by women compared to other members of the household, the kitchen is defined as women's territory. Women also report they use kitchens to entertain their guests and that they feel like some part of their homes belong to them, particularly kitchens and/or bedrooms, whereas when men mention that they feel like some part of their homes belong to them, they are workrooms and/or bedrooms. However, despite the fact that women are associated with the kitchens, they do not feel undisturbed in their kitchens. Sebba and Churchman (1983) conclude that domestic spaces are divided among household members with territorial claims, which are based on what each member does in those spaces.

Oseland and Donald (1993) have also reported that the kitchen emerged as an unusual element of the home environment which was a transition space between private areas (more personal bedrooms) and social areas (more social living rooms). Relying on Sebba and Churchman's (1983) conclusions, Oseland and Donald (1993: 259) speculate that this transitional characteristic of the kitchen is because it is "still considered to be the domain of the mother." However, this inference is not supported by their data set. Nevertheless, their substantiated findings indicate that people evaluate space in their homes in terms of who they are with, what they are doing and where they are doing it.

Tognoli (1980) argues that role distribution between women and men influences how they perceive their houses. In his study, Tognoli (1980) asked women and men to list the activities taking place in their kitchens, living rooms, bathrooms, and bedrooms, and to associate their feelings about those spaces in their houses. The findings of the study show that women consistently listed more activities for all four rooms. Exemplifying the differences between women and men, it is stated that for the kitchen, women mentioned cooking, washing, and tidiness more than men, while men mentioned eating more than women (Tognoli, 1980).

In his study in a large provincial town in the eastern part of the Netherlands, Pennartz (1999) found that the perception of the atmosphere at home by women is different than it is by men. When women described pleasantness, they all referred to times and spaces, in which they can disassociate themselves from housework tasks and be alone, while men never referred to housework. Consequently, the least pleasant space for women was reported as the kitchen, where they feel haunted by the housework tasks to be completed. Although the study focused on the influence of spatial organization in houses on the formation of an atmosphere, either pleasant or unpleasant, the findings point out a major differentiation between women and men in their descriptions of pleasant times and spaces (Pennartz, 1999).

Similarly, Munro and Madigan (1999) state that women find the home environment less relaxing than men, since women are occupied with housework most of the time. They have examined people's use of space in their homes and its relation to their views of family unity and individual privacy in post-war flats and houses in Glasgow. In this study, issues of privacy among family members and the resolution of conflicts over the use of space within their home were analyzed through data collected by questionnaires and interviews. The aim was to understand how families negotiated their relationships within the physical limitations of conventional suburban houses. They concluded that the use of domestic space was shaped through family unity and individual privacy. Findings of the study point out that women's traditional responsibility for housework shape and differentiate their use of time and space at home. Madigan and Munro (1999: 71) conclude that space is negotiated among the members of the household for privacy and that women establish privacy "by time management rather than 'a room of one's own.'" They explain that the willingness of women to fit into the routines and schedules of other household members enables them to establish privacy (Madigan and Munro, 1999). Thus, it is the absence of other household members that provide the physical conditions for establishing privacy.

Although research about negotiating spaces for privacy between women and men in houses has been limited, **privacy at home** has been studied through the concepts of territoriality and crowding (Altman, 1975).

Privacy within the household includes both the spatial dimension (architectural privacy) and the behavioral dimension (privacy as behavior) (Madigan and Munro, 1999; Laufer et al., 1976; Phroshansky et al., 1976). The need for privacy is the need to maximize freedom of choice and to remove constraints and limitations on behavior (Phroshansky et al., 1976). Although privacy is often described as a person's choice of aloneness, it also refers to interaction since presence of others and the possibility of interaction with them is assumed (Laufer et al., 1976; Altman, 1975). The freedom of choice is the ability to control what goes on in defined areas of space that are important for the behavior of the individual (Phroshansky et al., 1976).

The need and ability to exert control is an essential part of privacy. Three aspects of control related to privacy have been identified. First, *control over choice* is an individual's freedom to choose to be private both in physical and in psychological terms (Laufer et al., 1976; Phroshansky et al., 1976). Second, *control over access* is an individual's ability to create physical boundaries between self and others for achieving privacy (Laufer et al., 1976;). Third, *control over stimulation* is an individual's ability to determine the level of distraction created by the others for privacy (Laufer et al., 1976). Exerting control over specific spaces creates exclusive or near-exclusive use of those spaces. The acquisition of exclusive spaces serves to define and to evaluate the identity of the individual for herself/himself and for others (Phroshansky et al., 1976).

Consequently, the control of interaction with others is essential for an individual to function effectively (Laufer et al., 1976; Phroshansky et al., 1976; Altman, 1975).

As physical settings evoke and sustain behaviors and experiences that are *private* in character (Laufer et al., 1976), the organization of space at home fosters or hinders privacy, which is essential in developing a sense of self-esteem. Therefore, lack of spaces for privacy limits the control over interaction, and absence of others becomes the primary mechanism to establish privacy.

According to Seamon (1979: 81), as long as there is lack of space for privacy, “the person is not fully at home.” The argument that privacy is one of the fundamental functions of home is prevalent in the literature (e.g. Hayward, 1977; Seamon, 1979). Smith’s (1994a) findings also support the argument that privacy is deeply associated with the concept of home. Moreover, her comparison of female and male respondents’ comments reveals that difficulties imposed by lack of privacy were mentioned more by women (Smith, 1994a). However, presence of research (e.g. Pedersen, 1999), which reports no difference between women and men in terms of privacy functions in general, should be a caution against claiming that women need more privacy. Privacy at home for women is different than privacy in general due to structurally imbalanced power distribution between women and men in domestic partnerships. Therefore, reports of women’s higher dissatisfaction with the lack of their own space (Pedersen, 1999), or women’s stronger emphasis on personal control to discriminate between situations at home (Smith, 1994b) are reactions of women against lack of privacy at home, which is the spatial and behavioral consequence of structurally imposed subordination. The fact that women and men need privacy equally remains an ally for the argument that home should provide privacy equally.

However, women’s experience of home, which includes doing most of the housework, is shaped accordingly. Privacy, being one of the fundamental functions of home, therefore, is unlikely to be established similarly by women and men. For example, Smith (1994b) reports that housework items such as cooking and washing up were related to lower levels of perceived control, compared to other activities such as reading, relaxing, and eating when alone. The findings also show that the housework activities are generally associated with low degree of social connectedness and the perception of little control (Smith, 1994b).

This study aims to compare cohousing and new urbanist developments for (1) resident women’s experiences of privacy at home, and (2) their experiences of social networking in the community.

3. Methodology

In application of multiple case study strategy in this study, theoretical replication was sought with pattern matching and replication seeking strategies (Yin, 2003).

To identify the spatial characteristics of new urbanist and cohousing developments, **observations** were made while selecting cases. Activity patterns of respondents were collected in **time diary** interviews, in which respondents were asked to recall the happenings of a 24-hour period on their last typical weekday. Time diaries provided data about women’s domestic schedules, the settings of their activities, and the involvement of others in those activities. Each respondents’ space nomenclature, composed of the names they use for specific spaces, was also identified in the interviews. Data for women’s spaces for privacy (exclusive spaces and spaces they retreat to for privacy) were also gathered in **interviews** with women, all of which were recorded and transcribed.

In this study, a list of cohousing developments and a list of new urbanist developments in a single state in the southeastern part of the United States were used as potential **sites for cases**. Three sites from each list with more than 50% of the planned site constructed were selected.

A main group of residents in all three **cohousing developments** had met prior to the preparation of the site plan. These collective efforts in the preliminary phases of the planning and design process contributed to constructing the community. Regular meetings in addition to common meals were held by residents in the common house for collective management and maintenance. Common houses included communal kitchens, meeting areas, dining areas, and playrooms for kids. Each cohousing development had a pedestrian path connecting comparatively high density houses with the common house. Alongside these pedestrian pathswere community gardens and playgrounds.

Several neighborhood units built by different developers were planned to be incorporated into each **new urbanist development**. These units were private, for-profit developments modeled after single-family houses standing on private lots. Nevertheless, neither the developments nor the accommodated facilities were collectively managed, despite the existence of homeowners’ associations and regular newsletters. Each of these developments included a planned or built center with commercial and recreational facilities, such as grocery stores, movie theatres and child care, all in compliance with new urbanist planning principles,. Relatively high density houses with their private garages were positioned along streets and sidewalks which were planned to allow bicycle and pedestrian circulation alongside vehicular traffic.

Fifteen women who were living with a partner in a cohousing development and 14 women who were living with a partner in a new urbanist development were interviewed.

4. Findings

The differences between cohousing and new urbanist developments were notable for both resident women’s experiences of privacy at home, and their experiences of social networking in the community.

A higher percentage of cohousing respondents reported to have exclusive spaces at home compared to new urbanist respondents. Due to the absence of exclusive spaces in their houses, most of the new urbanist respondents identified bedrooms and family spaces as their spaces for privacy. However, since most of the cohousing respondents had their exclusive spaces, they identified mostly those exclusive spaces and bedrooms as their spaces for privacy. Consequently, as a way of establishing privacy, a higher percentage of cohousing respondents referred to already having their exclusive spaces to retreat to, whereas a higher percentage of the new urbanist respondents used behavioral measures by going to spaces left over from other members of the household. Moreover, cohousing respondents spent twice as much of their time at home in their spaces for privacy compared to new urbanist respondents. Cohousing respondents reported social networking in their communities; new urbanist respondents did not.

4.1. Availability of exclusive spaces in cohousing and new urbanist developments

Exclusive spaces were available to 73% of the cohousing respondents, compared to 21% of the new urbanist respondents. The nature of these exclusive spaces was also different between the two housing types. In new urbanist developments the exclusive spaces were only women’s separate offices, whereas in cohousing developments these exclusive spaces were women’s separate studios, offices, and hobby rooms.

A higher percentage of cohousing respondents (47%) lived in houses in which both the respondent and her partner had their exclusive spaces separately. However, a higher percentage of new urbanist respondents (36%) lived in houses in which neither the respondent nor the respondent’s partner had an exclusive space (Table 1).

Table 1. Presence of exclusive spaces for respondents and their partners

Presence of:	Percentage of cohousing respondents living with their partners (n=15)	Percentage of new urbanist respondents living with their partners (n=14)
No exclusive space for either	0%	36%
Only partner’s exclusive space	13%	29%
Shared exclusive space	27%	14%
Separate exclusive spaces for each	47%	14%
Only respondent’s exclusive space	13%	7%
Total	100%	100%

Another difference between cohousing and new urbanist houses was that the new urbanist houses were larger than the cohousing houses. The average size of a new urbanist house was 3,370 square feet, whereas the average size of a cohousing house was 2,640 square feet. The difference in size was partly due to the presence of formal rooms (formal dining rooms and/or formal living rooms) in new urbanist houses, which were 360 square feet on average. Another reason for the size difference was that in the new urbanist houses the kitchens were larger.

The average size of a kitchen in a new urbanist house was 180 square feet whereas the average size of a kitchen in a cohousing house was 130 square feet. However, the smaller houses of cohousing developments were compensated by the presence of the common houses, which were separate buildings with shared ownership.

Yet, despite relatively smaller size of the cohousing houses, they accommodated exclusive spaces more than the larger houses of new urbanist developments.

4.2. Spaces for privacy in cohousing and new urbanist developments

Four categories of spaces for privacy (the bathroom, family spaces, the bedroom, and the exclusive space) were identified. A higher percentage of cohousing respondents (42.1%) identified their exclusive spaces as spaces for privacy compared to new urbanist respondents (6.7%). The majority of the cohousing respondents identified their exclusive spaces (42.1%) and bedrooms (42.1%) as their spaces for privacy, whereas the majority of new urbanist respondents identified bedrooms (46.7%) and family spaces (33.3%) as their spaces for privacy (Table 2).

Table 2. Spaces for privacy in cohousing and new urbanist developments

	Cohousing respondents	New urbanist respondents
	Percentage of respondents who identified that space as the space for privacy	Percentage of respondents who identified that space as the space for privacy
Exclusive spaces	42.1%	6.7%
Bedroom	42.1%	46.7%
Family spaces	10.5%	33.3%
Bathroom or none	5.3%	13.3%
Total	100%	100%

The average percentage of overall time spent in the spaces for privacy in cohousing developments (30% of total time at home) was twice as much of the average percentage of overall time spent in the spaces for privacy in new urbanist developments (15% of total time at home). However, only 11% of the cohousing respondents compared to 25% of the new urbanist respondents did housework in their spaces for privacy.

The ways to establish privacy in those spaces also differed between cohousing and new urbanist respondents. Establishing privacy by cutting contact with other members of the household was an almost equally often used strategy in cohousing developments (32%) and new urbanist developments (29%). However, the space they retreat to was different in two housing types. More than one third (36%) of the women in cohousing developments went to their exclusive private spaces, whereas more than one third (35%) went to spaces left over from others in order to establish privacy. (Table 3).

Table 3. Ways to establish privacy in spaces for privacy in cohousing and new urbanist developments

Codes	Cohousing	New urbanist
Space is exclusively hers	36%	6%
Space is separate/away/quiet	9%	24%
Space is pleasant/comfortable	10%	0%
Space is for leisure activities	5%	6%
By cutting contact	32%	29%
Left over from others	9%	35%
Total	100%	100%

4.3. Community: Social Networking

Among cohousing respondents 30% reported a housework activity that was shared or traded off among households in the community. Yet, none of the new urbanist respondents reported sharing or trading off a housework activity with neighbors.

The presence of communal facilities, communal management of these facilities, and tight-knit community through communal activities (such as communal dinners) in cohousing developments provided possibilities of sharing and trading off housework activities. For example, two cohousing respondents reported time spent in the common house for cooking with other neighbors. Another cohousing respondent, who was married and had two children, described a tradeoff agreement with a neighbor, who was a single man. Her hobby was gardening for which she spent 26.5% of her total time at home; however, she did not like cooking. She worked on the garden of her neighbor twice a week in return of his cooking dinner for her family twice a week in her kitchen. Another cohousing respondent, who was married and had two children, described an agreement with another neighbor, who was also a single man. Every time she had a computer problem, he fixed the computer in return for having dinner with her family. Other shared activities included bookkeeping and repairing and up keeping of communal facilities. Sharing housework among neighbors was nonexistent in new urbanist developments.

5. Discussion

Cohousing and new urbanist developments are attempts to address the problem of lack of a sense of community despite their fundamentally different social agendas and spatial schemes. Cohousing has been built around the idea of collaborative living accommodating private and communal (shared) spaces with an egalitarian approach, whereas new urbanism has been shaped with neo-traditional understanding of women's roles as homemakers and the convenience of locating commercialized services in close proximity of houses. This study reflects the everyday consequences of these different social agendas and spatial schemes. In cohousing developments, not only women but also their partners had better access to privacy. Given the discussions on negotiating space at home, the availability of exclusive spaces in cohousing houses is a sign of egalitarianism embedded in cohousing. Research shows that women have mostly kitchens associated with them in which they are haunted by housework (Ahrentzen et al, 1989; Sebba and Chuchman, 1983; Tognoli, 1980). Research also suggests that houses should accommodate private spaces for women, which stimulate feelings of privacy and belonging, outside the housework spaces (Weisman, 1981/2000; Rock et al, 1980). Especially, when the smaller size of cohousing houses is taken into consideration, the allocation of space for exclusive use of women outside of housework spaces in cohousing houses is even more remarkable. Presence of these exclusive spaces enables them to establish privacy mostly through spatial measures.

Analysis of 29 in-depth interviews conducted with women in these two housing types shows how women establish privacy at home is defined by the availability of exclusive spaces. Despite a relatively small size of cohousing houses compared to new urbanist houses, exclusive spaces were available more to the women in cohousing developments which enabled them to establish privacy without the need to utilize behavioral measures. Resident women of new urbanist developments, however, established privacy in spaces, which were left over from the other members of the household, and in their absence, since they did not have their exclusive spaces. Also, in cohousing developments sharing daily responsibilities among residents was a sign of presence of communal life; a sign which was nonexistent in new urbanist developments.

All three aspects of control needed to establish privacy (control over choice, access and stimulation) were exercised by cohousing respondents leading to having exclusive spaces (Laufer et al., 1976; Phroshansky et al., 1976). Since the acquisition of exclusive spaces serves to define and to evaluate the identity of the individual for herself and for others (Phroshansky et al., 1976), one main function of home was accomplished in cohousing developments. However, women living in new urbanist developments had to utilize behavioral measures more to establish privacy. For the new urbanist respondents due to lack of spaces that are private in character (Laufer et al., 1976), absence of others became the primary mechanism to establish privacy. The findings of this study about spaces for privacy in new urbanist developments are consistent with the findings of a previous study, in which the authors show that women establish privacy "by time management rather than 'a room of one's own.'" They state that the willingness of women to fit into the routines and schedules of other household members force them to establish a sense of privacy accordingly (Madigan and Munro, 1999), which was the case for new urbanist respondents.

Given that historically, privacy has been perceived as a privilege (Newell, 1995), allocation of space for exclusive use of women in cohousing developments, and almost a lack of such spaces for women in new urbanist developments reinforces the underlying values of these two housing types.

However, a more interesting outcome of these values is the presence of social networking in cohousing developments in addition to better availability of individual privacy. In accordance with the intended social agenda (McCament and Durrett, 1989), in this study cohousing developments revealed signs of social networking. New urbanist developments, which also intend to increase interaction among neighborhoods, however, did not.

Acknowledging the small sample size of respondents in this study, the intention is not to claim that new urbanist developments do not foster a sense of community, but rather to point out that the similarity of women's experiences in the same housing type and the differences between the two housing types are suggestive of these patterns' commonality.

References

- Ahrentzen, S., Levine, D. W. and Michelson, W. (1989). Space and Time and Activity in the Home: A Gender Analysis. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 9, 89-101.
- Altman, I. (1975). *The Environment and Social Behavior: Privacy, Personal Space, Territory, Crowding*. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Asplund, B. and Bonita, R. (1994). Sweden's Servicehouse Concept. *World Health*, 28-29.
- Bianchi S. M., Milkie, M. A., Sayer, L. C. and Robinson, J. P. (2000). Is Anyone Doing the Housework? Trends in the Gender Division of Household Labor. *Social Forces*, 79(1), 191-228.
- Bittman, M. and Wajcman, J. (2000). The Rush Hour: The Character of Leisure Time and Gender Equity. *Social Forces*, 79(1), 165-189.
- Booth, S. S. (1999). Reconstructing Sexual Geography: Gender and Space in Changing Sicilian Settlements. In D. Birdwell-Phasant and D. Lawrence-Zuniga (Eds.), *Houselife: Space, Place and Family in Europe* (pp.133-156). New York: Berg.
- Boys, J. (1990). Women and the Designed Environment: Dealing with Difference. *Built Environment*, 16(4), 249-256.
- Bowlby S., Gregory, S. and McKie, L. (1997). "Doing Home:" Patriarchy, Caring and Space. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 20(3), 343-350.
- Brenton, M. (1999) Cooperative Living Arrangements Among Older Women, *Local Environment*, 4(1), 79-87.
- Bressi T. W. (1994). Planning the American Dream. In P. Katz (Ed.), *The New Urbanism: Toward an Architecture of Community* (pp. xxv-xlii). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Calthorpe, P. (1994). The Region. In P. Katz (Ed.), *The New Urbanism: Toward an Architecture of Community* (pp. xi-xvi.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Calthorpe, P. (1993). *The Next American Metropolis: Ecology, Community, and the American Dream*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Cohousing Website. (2014). Retrieved from <http://www.cohousing.org/node/2449>
- Domosh, M. (1998). Geography and gender: Home, Again? *Progress in Human Geography*, 22(2), 276-282.
- Domosh, M. and Seager, J. (2001). *Putting Women in Place: Feminist Geographers Make Sense of the World*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Duany, A. and Plater-Zyberk, E. (1994). The Neighborhood, the District and the Corridor. In P. Katz (Ed.), *The New Urbanism: Toward an Architecture of Community* (pp. xvii-xx). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Ellin, N. (1996). *Postmodern Urbanism*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Endoh, Y. (1999). Participatory Design that Materializes the Quality of the Exchange between Human Beings and the Environment—Case Study: C-Court, a Cooperative Housing. Paper at *Working Conference on Democratic Design in the Pacific Rim*.
- Endoh, Y. (1998). The Contemporary Meaning of Cooperative Housing —Case Study: M-Port (Kumamoto). Paper at *Working Conference on Democratic Design in the Pacific Rim*.
- Franck, K. A. (1985). Social Construction of the Physical Environment: The Case of Gender. *Sociological Focus*, 18(2), 143-160
- Fromm, D. (2000). American Cohousing: The First Five Years. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 17(2), 94-109.
- Fromm, D. (1991). Collaborating On Community. *In Context: Living Together*, 29, 59.

- Fulton, W. (1996). *The New Urbanism: Hope or Hype for American Communities?* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- Gershuny, J. and Robinson, J. P. (1988). Historical Changes in the Household Division of Labor. *Demography*, 25(4), 537-552.
- Hasell, M. J. and Scanzoni, J. H. (1997). Social Networks and Network-Friendly Housing in the U.S. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 38(3-4), 289-297.
- Harvey, D. (1997). The New Urbanism and the Communitarian Trap. *Harvard Design Magazine*, Winter/Spring 1997, 68-71.
- Hayden, D. (1984). *Redesigning the American Dream: The Future of Housing, Work, and Family Life*. New York, London: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Hayden, D. (1981). *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England: The MIT Press.
- Koolhaas, R., (1994) S, M, L, XL. New York: Monacelli Press.
- Krantz, B. and Palm-Lindén, K. (1994). Forms Of Collective Housing, Forms Of Living Alternatives. Paper presented at XIIIth World Congress of Sociology, Bielefeld, Germany, Session Quality of Live and Housing.
- Laufer, R. S., Proshansky, H. M. and Wolfe, M. (1976). Some Analytic Dimensions of Privacy. In H. M. Proshansky, W. H. Ittelson and Leanne G. Rivlin (Eds.), *Environmental Psychology: People and Their Physical Settings* (pp. 206-217). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Lennon, M. C. and Rosenfield, S. (1994). Relative Fairness and the Division of Housework: The Importance of Options. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100(2), 506-531.
- Madigan, R. and Munro, M. (1999). "The more we are together": Domestic Space, Gender and Privacy." In T. Chapman and J. Hockey (Eds.), *Ideal Homes? Social Change and Domestic Life* (pp. 61-72). London and New York: Routledge.
- McCamant, K. M. and Durrett, C. R. (1989). *Cohousing – A Contemporary Approach To Housing Ourselves*, Berkley, CA, USA: Ten Speed Press.
- Michelson, W. (1994). Everyday Life in Contextual Perspective. In I. Altman and A. Chuchman (Eds.), *Women and the Environment* (pp. 17-42). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Moule, E. and Ployzoides, S. (1994). The Street, the Block and the Building. In P. Katz (Ed.), *The New Urbanism: Toward an Architecture of Community* (pp. xxi-xxiv). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Munro, M. and Madigan, R. (1999). Negotiating Space in the Family Home. In I. Cieraad (Ed.), *At Home: An Anthropology of Domestic Space* (pp. 107-117). New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Newell, P. B. (1995) Perspectives on Privacy. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 15, 87-104.
- Oldenburg, R. (1989) *The Great Good Place: cafés, coffee shops, community centers, beauty parlors, general stores, bars, hangouts, and how they get you through the day*. New York: Paragon House.
- Oseland, N. and Donald, I. (1993) The Evaluation of Space in Homes: A Facet Study. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 13, 251-261.
- Proshansky, H. M., Ittelson, W. H. and Rivlin, L. G. (1976). Freedom of Choice and Behavior in a Physical Setting. In H. M. Proshansky, W. H. Ittelson and L. G. Rivlin (Eds.), *Environmental Psychology: People and Their Physical Settings* (pp.170-181). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Peatross, F. D. and Hasell, M. J. (1992). Changing Lives/Changing Spaces: An Investigation of the Relationships Between Gender Orientation and Behaviors, and Spatial Preferences in Residential Kitchens. *The Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 9(3), 239-257.
- Pedersen, D. M. (1999) Model Types of Privacy by Privacy Functions. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 19, 397-405.
- Pennartz, P. J. J. (1999). Home: The Experience of Atmosphere. In I. Cieraad (Ed.), *At Home: An Anthropology of Domestic Space* (pp. 95-106). New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Press, J. E. and Townsley, E. (1998). Wives' and Husbands' Housework Reporting: Gender, Class, and Social Desirability. *Gender and Society*, 12(2), 188-218.
- Ralph, E. (1976) *Place and Placelessness*. London : Pion, Ltd.
- Roberts, M. (1990). Gender and Housing: The Impact of Design. *Built Environment*, 16(4), 257-268.

- Rock, C., Torre, S. and Wright, G. (1980). The Appropriation of the House: Changes in House Design and Concepts of Domesticity. In G. R. Wekerle, R. Peterson and D. Morley (Eds.), *New Space for Women* (pp. 83-100). Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Sanoff, H. (2000). *Community Participation Methods in Design and Planning*. New York, Chichester, Weinheim, Brisbane, Singapore, Toronto: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Sanoff, H. (1971). The Social Implications of Residential Environments. *International Journal of Environmental Studies*, 2, 13-19.
- Scanzoni, J. (2000). *Designing Families: The Search for Self and Community in the Information Age*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Pine Forge Press.
- Seamon, D. (1979) *A Geography of the Lifeworld: Movement, Rest and Encounter*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Sebba, R. & Chuchman, A. (1983). Territories and Territoriality in the Home. *Environment and Behavior*, 15(2), 191-210.
- Smith, S. G. (1994a) The Essential Qualities of a Home. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 14, 31-46.
- Smith, S. G. (1994b) The Psychological Construction of Home Life. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 14, 125-136.
- Spain, D. (1992). *Gendered Spaces*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Sorkin, M. (1998). Can New Urbanism Learn from Modernism's Mistakes? *Metropolis*, August/September 1998.
- South, S. J. & Spitze, G. (1994). Housework in Marital and Non-marital Households. *American Sociological Review*, 59(June), 327-347.
- Southworth, M. (2003). New Urbanism and the American Metropolis. *Built Environment*, 29(3), 210-226.
- Spain, D. (1995). Sustainability, Feminist Visions, and the Utopian Tradition. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 9(4), 362-370.
- Talen, E. (1999). Sense of Community and Neighborhood Form: An Assessment of the Social Doctrine of New Urbanism. *Urban Studies*, 36(8), 1361-1379.
- Tognoli, J. (1980). Differences in Women's and Men's Responses to Domestic Space. *Sex Roles*, 6(6), 833-842.
- Torre, S. (1999). Expanding the Urban Design Agenda: A Critique of the New Urbanism. In J. Rothschild (Ed.), *Design and Feminism: Re-Visioning Spaces, Places, and Everyday Things* (pp. 35-43). New Brunswick, New Jersey, and London: Rutgers University Press.
- Veninga, C. (2004) Spatial Prescriptions and Social Realities: New Urbanism and the Production of Northwest Landing. *Urban Geography*, 25(5), 458-482.
- Vestbro, D. U. (2000). From Collective Housing to Cohousing – A Summary of Research. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 17(2), 164-178.
- Vestbro, D. U. (1998). Is collective Housing the Key to Sustainable Development? Scandinavian Experiences in a Postmodernist Perspective. Paper for the *ICSA Conference Utopian communities and sustainability*, Amsterdam.
- Vestbro, D. U. (1997). Collective Housing In Scandinavia – How Feminism Revised A Modernist Experiment. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 14(4), 329-342.
- Wajcman, J. (1991). *Feminism Confronts Technology*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Weisman, L. K. (1992). *Discrimination by Design: A Feminist Critique of the Man-Made Environment*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Williams, J. (2005) Designing Neighbourhoods for Social Interaction: The Case of Cohousing. *Journal of Urban Design*, 10(2), 195-227.
- Woodward, A. (1989). Communal Housing in Sweden: A Remedy for the Stress of Everyday Life. In K. Franck and S. Ahrentzen (Eds.), *New Households, New Housing* (pp. 71-99). New York, NY: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Wright, G. (1981). *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Yin, R. K (2003) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.