

City's social space and citizens' living space

Larissa Logunova
*Kemerovo State University,
 Social and Psychological Institute
 Dr. of Sc. (Philosophy),
 Associate professor,
 professor of the Department of
 Sociological Sciences
 Kemerovo, Russia
 vinsky888@mail.ru
<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8417-913X>*

Ekaterina Mazhenina
*Kemerovo State University,
 Social and Psychological Institute,
 PhD in Sociological Sciences,
 Associate Professor,
 Associate Professor of the Department
 of Sociological Sciences
 Kemerovo, Russia,
 ekka0808@mail.ru
<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7403-5677>*

Natalia Nyatina
*Kemerovo State University,
 Social and Psychological Institute,
 PhD (Sociology),
 Associate teacher of the Department of
 Sociological Sciences
 Kemerovo, Russia
 kozeeva_n@mail.ru
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8512-3282>*

Abstract— Living space is integration of population's spiritual forces, value-based attitude to the place of residence. It is continuous, filled with the population's experience of their identity. Living space of the city is differentiated by socio-cultural dissimilarities of inhabitants, by meanings of symbolic appropriation of the territory. The government considers the city in projections of resources. Citizens view their city as a "place" for comfortable living. All meanings are symbolically formed, they define a visual image of the city's space. Authors present the results of a comparative analysis of social and living space from the standpoint of resources distribution, vital energy, management and maintenance of life support system, which is designed to meet the needs of different categories of citizens in projections of the sphere of everyday life, culture, and professional activity. Socio-cultural environment reproduces differences, which requires a system of life support to differentiate services, to adapt to the needs of residents. City's socio-cultural space is a symbolic territory where subsystems of traditional and professional types of life support combine the personnel potential and experience of self-sufficiency culture. Averaging of professional life support system technologies cannot meet the needs of unique (ethnic, age, subcultural) groups of citizens. Contradictions between environment potential, human resources and services of the system designed for an average consumer are usually solved through converging of the two types of systems on the positions of human-centricity. Smart city with a functioning life support system is a city for people's life, focused on resource-saving technologies (smart and human). The concept of resource saving means a sustainable attitude to intellectual, vital resources, as well as resources for population reproduction, which (developing from traditional practices) turn into professional care for the needs of citizens in professional demand, leisure, and consumer products. Modern social interactions of urban "non-formals", street culture, new types of home leisure, ecological, political, religious forms of leisure activity require sociological understanding. It is relevant to develop technologies for servicing such needs by life support system. Satisfaction with leisure, full and high-quality completeness of free time is an indicator of social well-being of people in living space.

Keywords - living space, life support system, social space, socio-cultural space, hybrid methodological complex.

I. INTRODUCTION

With all the attention of sociologists to the human dimension of living space, it eludes analytical constructions. Its fluidity is related to the illusion of synonymous concepts

of "social" and "living" space. If social space is measured in statuses, in corporeality of social processes, in force of the attraction of fields of power and distribution of resources, then living space is a category of assessing the space suitability for human life. This is the space of relations between people and people's attitude to space. Socio-cultural characteristics turn it into a space of mind, spiritual, symbolic, personal space in which a person does not just live but experiences it. Space is localized, it acquires features of the territory, which a person begins to "claim" to possess. It manifests a sense of belonging, solidarity with the space.

Solidarity with space is a person's understanding of its exclusivity for himself/herself; this feeling turns inhabitants into a single territorial community, it is expressed in the mental foundations of space, means a willingness to defend, protect, beautify. The importance of space of feelings and attitudes for people is ignored by sociologists due to the lack of research tools. Social space is studied in sociology from positions of substantial and structuralist approaches (P. Sorokin, P. Bourdieu [1], A. F. Filippov [2]). G. Zimmel presented this space in life categories, drawing attention to the secondary nature of social space with regard to living space, which becomes social due to the degree of being familiar with or development by people.

Social space is filled with the people's interaction, their connections with each other. This means that:

- one person's claims to the space are limited by the legality of another one's presence in the space;
- here either social ties and relations, or the resources of power are distributed;
- social space is constituted by an ensemble of subspaces or fields (economic, intellectual, power field, etc.), which owe their structure to the unequal distribution of capital;
- space is fundamentally subject to "social control" (M. Foucault), which turns it into a space of coercion and violence, "space of social conflict" (R. Darendorf).

Social space is saturated with the clash of groups interests competing for the appropriation of resources in the fields of forces. In such a warlike space there is no room for human life with their simple desires and feelings. Sociologists do not take into account space of love and solidarity of people towards each other, towards the territory

that they have arranged for their lives. Space is intertwined with social connections of people, it becomes an ethical space that goes beyond its territorial limits. Such space becomes a "feeding" one, filled with vital energy, giving life support resources. The purpose of the study is to determine categories of dimension for citizens' living space in the context of life support and its needs. The comparative analysis defines distinctions, contradictions, points of intersection of social and living spaces.

Living space is structured around the person who is the creator of space. He/she fills it with meanings (understanding of home, homeland), feelings of belonging to the space. Physical boundaries of living space can be defined by law, but its mental perimeter is flexible: it can be reduced to survivability space or expand to the Universe volume. Human life gives a pulsation to the space, it is manifested in the rhythm, dynamics of feelings, changes in the social mood of the population, lifestyles change.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS (MODEL)

A human is unwittingly found in the center of comparing him/her with someone else. Sociology to determine dimensions considers the following to be of key importance: space turns out to be a relevant tool for such comparisons. Living in a prestigious area or in neighborhoods with social housing socially differentiates citizens. Fixing statuses in territorial positions, space acquires the feature of fixity, constancy. The science considers social space in such categories. But people's life creates space of feelings, although in the interweaving of relations, there is some order which is rather the order of meanings and its symbolic structure. The living space has "fluid" characteristics, "procedural image" (P. Shtompka [3]). Social time, at first glance, organizes the space by a succession of events: basis for the selection of reference points is conventional. People themselves choose events related to their living space, determine the degree of importance. The study of living space actualizes research methodology of integrative properties. Hard quantitative analysis can only show surface horizons of living space. The in-depth study of life is based on methods of understanding (V. Diltey, M. Weber), models of integrative research strategies (A. Barton, P. Lazarfeld), tactics of hybrid methodological complexes, combining techniques of interpretation of meanings with quantitative analysis. A multilevel approach combining micro- and macro-analysis techniques is relevant for studying the living space. The authors in the study of living space of the cities of Kuzbass ("Smart technologies of life support system of cities" [4], Kemerovo region, 2018-2019) used event analysis, the method of typing that determines the "understood event unity" of the history of city's living space, comparative analysis, method of understanding in context of historical involvement, analysis of social code.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Social space can be successfully controlled. Living space is subject to internal mechanisms of self-control with the help of socio-cultural norms controlled by agents of "soft power" (socially differentiated meanings of "decency"). Social control in living space lacks the rigidity that regulates the norms of life in social space. New formations in living space, which the institutions of power seek to take under

legislative control, can form mechanisms of disobedience (evasion, sabotage, non-violent practices of disobedience) to such control. Thus, processes of self-regulation, self-organization of space life are started.

Socio-cultural space can be considered as a boundary between social and living space. It provides more freedom for the agency in choosing lifestyle, ideas, but is regulated by value-based norms of social control. Ambiguous state laws of different countries are losing to the possibilities of wiser and more flexible social culture with its original ways and forms of living space organization. This is "space of dialogue" (M. M. Bakhtin), "space of exchange (D. Homans), "space of ideology" (L. Althusser). It constructs relationships among members of the agency, symbolic codes that define features of space experience. Such space becomes the subject of a social contract of people on rules of staying in the territory. Social culture fills living space with information, in the process of interaction it forms communication space – "space of flows" (M. Castels [5]). With the virtual characteristic feature, living space acquires depth, social and cultural space – new norms of behavior.

Living space is *the space of socio-cultural differences*. The agency creates it as a patchwork quilt, each piece of which defines a specific lifestyle of a particular group. Social differences are comparisons of "friends" and "foes." Socio-cultural differences compare lifestyles, due to peculiarities of artistic tastes and preferences. From this point of view, groups of citizens differ not only in statuses but also in technologies of goods and services consumption, in the nature of cultural and professional activities. These differences are fixed in the language – a phonetic marker of a person's belonging to a certain group of differences.

Living space is historical, filled with images of social memory. As a result of mnemogenesis (the emergence and functioning of social memory), it is formed into a space for life, which is different from the territory. Its cultural and historical image is fixed in autostereotypes of the population. Historical depth can be measured by analyzing cultural symbols, places of memory. This is the territory of socio-cultural experience. After physical destruction of living space, the social memory of it will retain the information necessary for survival in crisis situations.

Culture is the system-forming element of living space. As a means of collective programming, it enshrines forms of social practice, relatively stable norms and values in symbolic codes of communication. City becomes a cultural text, elements of the analysis of which involve design of dwellings, local area, the dress code of citizens, their education and internal culture, types of consumption (purchases of products and goods), essential features of leisure activities.

Living space of the individual is in contact with the living space provided by the city. Field spaces (stylistic, social, cultural) intersect, overlap each other, forming a life-supporting environment. It is a micro-level that shows the specifics of social relations, emotionally colored with interpersonal relationships, unique meanings, values shared by an individual and his/her environment. Interpersonal control dominates here, there are strong personalized social ties, possibilities of institutional intervention are weakened.

Living space of a person is structured by a system of values, choice of lifestyles, peculiarities of social relations.

In the study of city life support system, we relied on concepts: "space" (city-resource), "territory" (city-territory), "place" (city-meaning), which correspond to hypostases of space: social, geographical, vital. Life support system covers all hypostases of the city space, being structured into subsystems of the human-centered (traditional) type and the org-centric (professional) type, it serves the real and built-over space of culture, virtual space. A traditional type of system is based on formats of population experience, the culture of community. Professional system is the result of institutions' work, it was created by the efforts of professional staff. Both types of the system provide needs of the population in comfort and information.

Traditional type of life support is focused on self-organization experience of citizens, mutual support in solving vital issues with the use of current social relations and establishment of new ones. The human-centered core of traditional subsystem organizes the actions of people for life transformation. The org-centric core of professional subsystem is focused on maintaining its constituent organizations' work– search for organizational solutions, not human resources that fill living space.

The idea of "smart cities" (Google cities) is a product of this system that promotes technological solutions in servicing the population. It is a search for resources in technology, not in the potential of vital energy of space. The concept of "smart city" is conceived as a solution for the org-centric system of life support. Qualitatively developed *smart* format technologies make a city with an automatic service system more attractive, but do not solve problematic contradictions of its socio-cultural environment. Citizens are becoming more dependent on these technologies than free to solve problems with them.

The city space from a technological point of view seems one-sided. This is a city that lives the life of an administration, the needs of the Mayor's office. The city becomes the subject of competition "for human and cash flows, for administrative and intellectual resources, for investment and attractiveness for business, for social and cultural capital" (A. Sogomonov) [6]. But the city has a complex-organized design that weaves together human meanings, rules of life for organizations. It is a machine of production and maintenance of socio-cultural differences, burdened with the problems of urbanism – the balance of city as space and city as a place.

TABLE I. SOCIAL AND LIVING SPACE OF THE CITY

Social space of the city	Living space of the city
statuses space	space of social connections, meanings, interpretations; individual space of life
status positions, their functions	communities of residents, interests
Space of above-individual force; force of fields	individual and group involvement or belonging, solidarity with environment; force of senses
predominantly public spaces	predominantly private spaces
predictable, no situational flexibility	situationally
uneven distribution of resources; social positions are characterized	distribution of life energy in the form of sufficiency or necessity

by different volume and set of resources	
predominantly impersonal, formality and flexibility of requirements to interactions	predominantly personified; interactions (professional, family, friendly) are filled with unique content
management, technical organization	self-organization, mutual support
boundaries are defined by the structure of social statuses and distances, territorial restrictions in the allocation of resources	borders and content are mobile: place of residence at the same time becomes a territory of rest, implementation of professional duties
territorial meaning: resource city, structured by districts	territorial meaning: location city, structured by "places"- meanings
it is served mainly by org-centric (civilizational) subsystem of life support and its structures, <i>smart</i> format technology	based on the experience of culture, practice of traditional life supporting subsystem; self-support, mutual support of <i>human</i> format technology
technical fundamentals of organization, normativity of life	social and cultural foundations of organization, normality of life

The city's space is structured by the fields of culture attraction. The cultural landscape of a city depends on specifics of distribution of benefits provided by the city. Comfortable climate, building development, availability of social infrastructure determine attractiveness of life in the city. City territory comprises administrative areas, sleeping quarters, and suburbs (suburbia). Big cities socially differentiate population by places of residence. The criterion of such differentiation is the cost of housing. Where natural and climatic features are transformed into particularity of social and administrative resources, the social space of the city is born. It realizes the possibilities of org-centric life support system, based on rates of resources allocation using *smart* format technology, which become the tool of social differentiation: those who have the means to buy such technologies, appropriate the profit from city resources. Such city solves mainly problems of communications (information, engineering, housing and communal). The administration of the city hall considers resources of the architectural appearance of the city, their locations as a lever of managing urban units and business structures. Lack of social support to justify the placement of informal places for daily meetings of citizens, recreation areas and public spaces with their political potential give way to shopping centers, as well as private clubs. According to Z. Bauman [7], in the conflict of interests all ethical levers are taken away from inhabitants, means capable to limit the harm done to them are expropriated [8].

"City-place" construct is more consistent with the conceptual structure of living space. It resists the transformation into a smart-space, actualizes mechanisms of self-organization, based on the sense of place – mental understanding of the city by its inhabitants. Living space forms "places of force", spreading its charm and influence (clubs, cinemas, church, historical and geographical attractions), the territory for the "third places" (intermediate places between work and home – cafes, pubs [9]). These places bind citizens territorially, attract temporally and energetically, fill the unstructured time between work and household duties with cultural meanings.

S. Flasti, P. Oldenburg, Z. Bauman explore the diversity of places that make up meanings of urban spaces. Specific

spaces are defined: "slippery space" (space that cannot be achieved due to the lack of access roads), "prickly space" (strictly protected by technical devices), "creepy" (jittery) space (guarded and shot by patrols) [10]. People try to avoid such places, choosing their own homes, yards, local areas as places to meet. They are usually not guarded, but people are responsible for them, showing a sense of belonging to space. In fact, the city exists because of life of such places-meanings, places-spaces. Their maintenance is carried out in the context of *human* format technologies built into the human-centered life support system.

The contradiction between cities development arises between the orientation of officials to create cities for the functioning of enterprises and industries and the desire of citizens to live in a city that has the meaning of a comfortable place. Improvement will not solve the problem of *city-place to work*: in such city its territory rejects interests of residents. In *city-place to live* urban communities are responsible for improvement issues, they symbolically appropriate the territory.

If space loses its sense for a human of being in it, it becomes "empty space". Sometimes space itself requires inviolability, claiming emptiness for those who do not have rights to this territory. Such places are fenced, equipped with security systems, limiting citizens' freedom of movement, turning into "forbidden places". As a reaction to the construction by the elite of "fortresses", advancing on living space of cities, there is "self-defense through aggression" of those who remained behind the fences.

The city is divided into public and private spaces. If private spaces are protected by their owners from the claims of neighbors, public spaces need protection of urban communities from the elite's encroachment, claiming the capture of "unattended" areas. Intermediate spaces (areas with fountains, lawns) soften annoying noise of big cities, fasten "places" to each other. Power in the city has its own symbolically decorated place. But citizens do not perceive the place of power as a territory convenient for a pleasant pastime.

City-place forms meanings-requirements to living space. Meaning of convenience is a dream of citizens of walking distance as elements of infrastructure. The meaning of intelligence is the need for universities. To get education right near where you live is comfort for young people. University determines creation of a pre-intellectual environment, the youth in the city is an indicator of its social prospects. The meaning of ecological compatibility of space is not just a natural desire for quality of life, but also the position of culture of ecology, the idea of which is "green cities". These meanings are embodied in cities built in the tradition of *human* format technologies – technologies that understand a person, a citizen as a central figure of the city. A citizen creates around the space of the city, fills it with meanings of life, symbolically "appropriating" and controlling it, forming public spaces for urban communities. Subcultural and stylistic associations of citizens are focused on cultural, ethnic, religious groups, symbolically visually fixing their otherness in the space of the city. These groups claim "their" place, spontaneously making out platforms and areas for different styles of street culture. These areas can be "zeroed" by city authorities in order to "ensure order". But

humans need to geographically fix the uniqueness of their status and cultural identity is stronger than deterrent measures to "manage the culture" of the city.

The city is formed in the space of leisure, self-realization. Opportunities offered by the commercialization of culture have changed the format and time *horizons* of leisure [11]. Leisure habits of citizens entrenched forms of leisure time activities associated with nature, beauty industry, SPA vacations, pastime, a stimulating active lifestyle became popular. A fashionable form of leisure has become synonymous of bourgeois, prestige. High technology availability to representatives of the middle and lower classes has expanded the range of amateur artists, photographers, composers. With the strengthening of leisure domestication trend, the spectrum of amateur collecting is expanding. The living environment becomes a field of creative activity [12]. The modern style of urban life is changing. Shopping, quests, parkour, cafes have established themselves as new types of urban leisure. Political and protest activities are becoming a form of free time. Street culture changes living space, requiring territory for new forms of leisure.

Internetization of space helps to increase the number of freelancers: teachers, creative community, writers work at home or at any convenient area (for example, resting on the beach). Leisure acquires the meaning of work, and work – becomes leisure. Without breaking daily habits (jogging in the morning, daytime sleep, etc.), overcoming restrictions on availability of the place of work due to physiological characteristics or territorial remoteness, the person changes the structure of social time, implementing professional skills and hobbies. Differentiating features involve the possession of expensive paraphernalia of leisure activities, the structure of time budget, the amount of free time to spend on oneself.

Leisure activities organization is an element of life support system, which is designed to offer a wide range of cultural activities, providing an opportunity for different stylistic communities of residents to relax and have fun at any time of the day. The traditional system preserves the experience of national and religious holidays, family and "club" forms of free time. Modern times adjust traditional forms of leisure. Self-organization of the population generates a variety of cultural platforms on an initiative basis (communities of representatives of street culture). Main characteristics of such "platforms" have properties of the human-centered system: situational, voluntary participation, compliance with interests of the individual. The main requirement is maximum coverage of preferences of all categories of the population living in the city's space. It means that *fair-minded* socio-cultural environment *understanding* the needs of its inhabitants is being formed.

A professional life support system is set up to serve vital needs of the average user. But spiritual needs are beyond boundaries of survival, they contradict org-centric approach when planning the leisure organization public officials of the departments give preference to cultural and consumer forms, hedonic models of citizens' pastime. The classical plan of cultural events contains a set of mass celebrations during calendar public holidays, guest performers' concerts. The org-centric system is conservative in responding to changes in the socio-cultural sphere. High-level public

officials conclude that the population reads little, rarely goes to the theater according to reports on attending libraries by the readers, as well as box office sales. But people may not go to libraries because they use alternative technologies to get information. They do not go to the theater, because it is far from their home, and the infrastructure does not take into account the possibility of late return from the entertainment institution. At the same time, amateur shadow theaters are successfully operating in the city, and tickets are sold out for several months in advance. People do not visit the palaces of culture, because they create enthusiastically sculptures made of felted cloth in their spare time, perform design works with light painting, compose music at home studios, develop genres of street culture. They have learned to equip living space, drawing resources from the traditional life support system, realizing their own leisure interests, which professionals are not aware of, they just serve the org-centric system.

Opposing two types of life support system intersects at the point of "human- centricity". Both systems serve vital needs of citizens. The org-centric system serves these needs in social space to a greater extent, the traditional one – in life space. Org-centric system sees vital human problems from a position of paternalism (customer approach), the traditional system is set up to self-reliance practice, initiatives of urban communities. To combine both types of subsystems in positions of human-centricity it is relevant to embody the following principles for the city's vital space functioning:

- support of citizens' self-organization, civil initiatives;
- trust in the talent and proficiency of unknown artists, musicians;
- right to symbolic appropriation of the territory (any subcultural group with unique leisure preferences can have their place in the city, its inhabitants are responsible for appearance and order at this "place");
- mutual assistance, solidarity, involvement and belonging;
- tolerance (willingness to promote new artistic forms);
- creation (living space is the territory of culture and urban communities' development).

IV. CONCLUSION

A city is a territory, a place, some space. It is managed by administration with smart technologies, but it lives the life of citizens practicing traditional technologies of self-sufficiency (human). Power and business structures are fighting for the city territory, which is considered as a resource, but places in the city are symbolically appropriated by citizens of different social strata. The texture of urban space is associated with the experience of inhabitants of the social and cultural landscape. Love for the city is manifested in specifics of the social mood of residents, in the desire of young people to stay in the city.

The city grinds the space of differences into a single cultural space, colorful and multidimensional. It is

demarcated by symbolic boundaries into public, communal and private spaces, which are recognized by residents in the following meanings: legal (private and public property zones) and symbolic ("places of power", "places of memory", private (isolated and quiet) zones).

The results of the comparative analysis of social and living space showed differences and interrelation. Social space is a space of force in which resources and statuses are distributed in the fields of attraction. Living space is a space of possibilities filled with meanings and feelings. Social space characterizes physical and geographical cross-section of living space, diversity and concentration of citizens' statuses. Living space is focused on implementation of significant (and vital, and spiritual) human needs. It is structured by the territories of subcultural, stylistic communities, symbolically decorated. By constructing a living space, a person seeks to make it worthy, comfortable and "understandable" for himself/herself. This correspondence is important for personal development and maintenance of social order foundations.

Categories of living space dimension: man as the creator of living space, boundaries of living space, socio-cultural differences, the specific character of social memory. The analysis research complex of such a specific object is hybrid.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

«The reported study was funded by RFBR and EISR according to the research project No 18-411-420001, RFBR-region, agreement number 12 dated 07/20/2018».

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Bourdieu, "Sociology of social space", St. Petersburg: Institute of experimental sociology, Aleteiya, 2007, p. 288.
- [2] A.F. Filippov, "Sociology of space", St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dahl, 2008, p. 186.
- [3] P. Shtompka, "Sociology of social changes", Moscow: Aspect Press, 1996, 416 p.
- [4] L.Yu. Logunova, E.V. Golovatsky, E.A. Mazhenina, and N.V. Nyatina. "Smart technologies in the life support system of the cities of Kuzbass: socio-political and sociocultural contexts", Kemerovo, 2018, p. 284.
- [5] M. Castells, "Information Ege: economy, society and the culture. Culture of real virtuality", GU HSE, 2000, pp. 386-390.
- [6] A. Sogomonov, "New quality of the cities – the new quality of policy", in Municipal authority, no. 3, p. 26, 2016.
- [7] S. Bauman, "Power without place, the place without the power", in Sociological magazine, no. ¾, pp. 86-100, 1998.
- [8] S. Bauman, "Fluid present; the lane with English under the editorship", St. Petersburg, 2008, p. 11.
- [9] R. Oldenburg, "Third place: cafe, coffee shops, bookstores, bars, beauty shops and other places of "parties" as the base of the community", in New literary review, p. 456, 2014.
- [10] S. Flusty Building, "Paranoia", in Architecture of Fear, Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press, Ed. Nan Ellin, pp. 47-59, 1997.
- [11] E.V. Golovatsky, L.Y. Logunova, and E.A. Mazhenina, "Social Resources As Conditions Of Well-Being In Urban Space: Legal, Sociocultural, Communicational", in The European Proceedings of Social & Behavioural Sciences, TOM L-RPTSS, pp. 441-448, 2018.
- [12] A. Schmitz, M. Flemmen, and L. Rosenlund, "Social class, symbolic domination, and Angst: The example of the Norwegian social space", in The Sociological Review, vol. 66, pp. 623-644, 2017.