

Privacy Patterns in Homes of Middle-Class Shaamy Immigrants in Montreal

Mahmoud Essam HALLAK
Ph.D. Architecture, McGill University

Abstract

After the Second World War, several waves of mostly highly educated, middle-class, traditional Muslim families from the Shaam arrived in Canada. As a result of cultural differences they found that their new living environment in Montreal did not respond to their *privacy* needs. This paper examines the privacy patterns observed in homes of the Shaamy community in Montreal by analyzing physical characteristics and modifications made to their single family detached homes and townhouses, usage patterns of domestic spaces, and inhabitants' privacy behavioral modalities.

In the context of the discussion, the paper alludes to some salient characteristics of the traditional living environment, indigenous lifestyle, and the socio-religious and cultural privacy concepts of this community. It scrutinizes briefly the correlation between these elements and the physical characteristics of Montreal housing patterns and of privacy concepts which are embodied in their designs. Both internal home layouts and functions and outdoor settings are analyzed in relation to the community and privacy. Consequently, the paper diagnoses major privacy deficiencies in the design of community homes and highlights domestic privacy mechanisms and utilization modes of the home environment. Finally, criteria are established for improving the design of detached homes and townhouses, with minimal change applied to their physical structure and patterns.

1. Introduction:

Privacy is an intrinsic requirement of every human being in various environments and cultures¹. However, people differ widely in their understanding, feelings, and practices related to privacy. These differences are manifest in social behavior and in the ways in which inhabitants develop their living environment. The home is the most liberal milieu where people can, individually or collectively, practice their freedom and mold their environment according to their cultural views and religious beliefs without interference or compromise under outside pressure². This is particularly true for members of the Shaamy community, who, as expatriates, live in a culturally foreign environment embodying different social values, perceptions of privacy, and cultural practices. In addition to these general differences, the religious and cultural background of the Shaamy community contains clear and distinct references to privacy in the form of religious principles, social laws, and traditional customs. These sources perpetuate particular privacy perceptions and practices and reinforce their influence on the Shaamy family lifestyle and living environment.

2. Objectives of the study

The study assumes that there are in the homes of the members of the Shaamy community characteristic modes of privacy which are based on the differences between the background of the community and the social content of the Canadian housing environment. Therefore, the study aims to discover how do people from Shaam fulfill their distinct cultural and religious privacy needs within the Montreal housing environment, an environment born as a direct product of Canadian lifestyles and values. It also attempts to identify the diverse privacy

patterns implemented in Shaamy homes, to adjust Canadian housing to comply with their privacy needs. At the same time, it tries to find how the designs of Canadian houses influence privacy-related practices of the Shaamy community. Moreover, the study aims to discover the level of responsiveness and satisfaction Canadian homes offer to this community, to probe the relationship between the different patterns of housing on the one hand and the living patterns and efficacy of privacy-induced patterns of change on the other, and, finally, to establish a matrix of privacy requirements in the homes of the community.

3. Methodology

The research method adopted for this study is twofold. The first step involves examining the concept of space from a privacy point of view through a review of privacy traditions which have characterized the dwellings of the Shaamy community over history. This is done in order to find the roots of the contemporary privacy phenomenon in community homes in Montreal. The second step involves analyzing privacy patterns in fourteen case studies in order to assess the impact of privacy concepts on physical environment, space usage and social behavior. The research identifies patterns of change for improving privacy conditions in the community homes, then searches for repetitive patterns of privacy and change in order to establish cause-effect relations among the set of intricate factors which define privacy mechanisms. By building a matrix of privacy modalities in relation to housing forms, the different factors which affect privacy-related practices in Shaamy homes are defined and a typology of change is uncovered.

To document the needed data of each case study, a comprehensive multiple-response information form was developed to be filled out by the researcher. This form employs multiple tools to effectively extract all the required information, observation and evaluation, interviewing and questioning, as well as photographing and drafting.³ This form is comprised of two sections, architectural and socio-cultural. The first section of the form encompasses extensive physical, behavioral, and usage-related aspects of domestic privacy. It divides homes into functional domains investigating plan arrangement, characteristics of home space, spatial usage, domestic activities, alterations, and furniture arrangement. The second section provides cultural and social information such as age groups, gender, family size, social compatibility with the host society, and many other specifics which contribute to the understanding of domestic privacy.

4. Privacy constituents:

Privacy principles which form the bases of many of the community's social practices are derived from Islamic religious teachings⁴. In addition, cultural roots of privacy extend deep into the history of Shaamy civilizations which continuously reflect rich and rather homogeneous privacy traditions. Acknowledged by religion, privacy traditions -or "*urf*"- represent one dimension of the cultural aspect of privacy in the current practices of the Shaamy community. Another cultural dimension is based on the textual exegesis and the practical implementation of Islamic privacy principles as colored by location, time, and the accumulation of privacy experiences throughout the history of the community. After immigration to Montreal, the community's religious and cultural understanding and practices of privacy interacted with different cultural norms, social perceptions, and design conceptions embodied in the Montreal housing environment. This interaction contributes to the production of idiosyncratic privacy modalities, and mechanisms in the community's homes aim to overcome the gap which exist

between the community's privacy ideas and practices and the cultural and physical reality of their home environment.

The study takes into consideration the cultural, religious, and environmental factors which influence the privacy practices of Shaamy people in their domestic environment before and after immigration to Canada. On these bases, the study goes on to determine privacy living patterns resulting from the interaction between the community's socio-cultural and religious background and the privacy content in the design of their Canadian homes. The paper then diagnoses the privacy-induced patterns of change or the mechanisms which the Shaamy community performs to adjust their living environment to their privacy needs.

5. Historical overview:

By exploring the history of the Shaamy home, the role of privacy as a determining factor in developing and preserving inward looking homes in the Shaam from ancient times until the beginning of 20th century, becomes evident. Traditional Shaamy homes were mostly composed of two separate domains which varied in organization, function, and size. The first domain is dedicated to the family in general and to female household and female guests in particular. The other domain is used for entertaining male guests, in particular, and serves as the living area for the family's males, in general. The courtyard of the family domain provides private outdoor space for collective social family interaction, whereas the sub-domains and individual spaces provide the other functional and personal levels of privacy. After colonization and modernization, the inward looking principle of design and internal home layouts, which are conducive to privacy, were replaced with Western-style, outward looking homes which have little consideration for the indigenous Shaamy lifestyle and privacy norms. After more than fifty years of interaction with their new environment, Shaamies developed a repertoire of privacy mechanisms to address some privacy concerns in their environment. However, due to their design limitations, the outward looking homes fail to fully respond to the traditional privacy requirements of the community. Therefore, functional and behavioral modalities evolve with time to bridge the remaining gap between the deficient physical environment in the Shaam and the cultural and religious privacy standards of Shaamy people.

Unlike their traditional introverted homes and their modern dwellings in the Shaam, Montreal home patterns represent a new challenge for the privacy norms of the Shaamy community. This novel environment calls for the development of new privacy mechanisms utilizing the previous experiences in adapting their modern (Western) homes in the Shaam to their privacy standards. As a result, there is a multi-dimensional process of interaction initiated between the socio-religious and cultural background of the community and the physical manifestation of mainstream privacy principles in Montreal homes. This process resulted in developing distinct patterns of privacy mechanisms which partially helped to reclaim the "inadequate" privacy characteristics of the community's homes.

6. Categories of privacy and their physical manifestations:

In the case studies,⁵ privacy can be divided into two major categories. The first is indoor privacy, and comprises two subdivisions: one between family and guests, and the other among family members themselves. The second category is outdoor privacy, which includes privacy between family on the one hand, and neighbors and the street on the other.

Indoors, privacy with guests calls for the separation of the guest domain from the family domain, including the shared-use circulation area. The guest domain is understood by the community to include separate male and female guest spaces, a dining room, a guest bedroom,

bathroom, and sometimes an office, all for the exclusive use of guests. Since most of these requirements are absent in the community's homes, a multi-faceted process of change takes place to compensate for the discrepancy between what the community needs and what their homes offer. Consequently, in homes where a guestroom is often lacking, the living room is converted into a guestroom⁶. However, when adhering to gender separation, the guestroom is usually occupied only by one gender, relegating the other to using various family spaces, including the basement⁷. Due to these unintended functions in the original design of the transformed spaces, in most cases, function transformation solves some problems and creates many others, leading to manifold complications in the treatment of privacy. These entanglements are also a result of the juxtaposition of these spaces within a home's scheme, its spatial configurations, and the compulsory usage of the family domain for guests.

The family domain not only implies separation between family and guests, but also contains an internal hierarchy of sub-domains or privacy zones that are based on gender, age group and / or function. The living room and kitchen are general family spaces which tend to be used more by female members of the household.⁸ The bedroom floor is also part of the private family domain and is used by parents and by female children, rather than male ones. Male youth, who tend to be more independent, often seek privacy in the basement by transforming it into a male living and sleeping domain.⁹ However, when children are young and need the care of the parents, all children use the bedroom floor for sleeping, while the basement in this case is usually used as a play and activity space for both male and female children, in addition to other functions.

7. Reasons for privacy problems and home patterns:

Privacy problems in the community's homes can be attributed to various environmental factors. The first is related to the lack of sufficient domestic spaces and the incapacity of the home to accommodate the family's diverse privacy needs. This factor is particularly aggravated as the size of a Shaamy family is often larger than that of the average Montrealer. The second main reason pertains to design deficiencies including a lack of spatial hierarchy, enclosure, and separation between various domains and spaces in the home¹⁰. As a result of these two environmental shortcomings, intersection between family and guest domains becomes unavoidable in most of the community's homes. Because of this involuntary lack of privacy, permanent and provisional physical, functional, and more often behavioral privacy mechanisms tend to be applied to restore the privacy balance within the different zones of the domestic spaces.

Based on comparing privacy conditions in various homes, it can be concluded that privacy complications usually increase in small homes mainly due to a lack of specialized and flexible spaces, while such complications decrease in larger homes. Cottages, for example, which have in their original design separate living and guestrooms, relatively offer the best possible territorial definition and privacy in home spaces among other homes patterns, provided the enclosure of the guest domain and the circulation area is assured.¹¹ Homes with a typical small surface area, such as townhouses, usually do not have distinct guestrooms in their original design with the result that the family living area tend to double as an entertainment area for guests.¹² This arrangement affects furniture type and usage pattern and grants an indefinite identity to this heterogeneous space. The mixed functional settings involuntarily decrease the household usage of this space, relegating them to using their individual bedrooms as living spaces, particularly when the basement is used as a second guestroom, an office, or a guest bedroom.

The ability of split-level cottages and bungalows as appears in the case studies to provide privacy is defined by one of the two patterns of level splitting which they might have. When level variation occurs at the entrance and within a staircase, privacy between the home's various spaces is well maintained.¹³ However, when the level split occurs at the fringes of the lobby or in another of the home's spaces, it tends to have an open plan where domestic spaces are exposed to each other.¹⁴ In contrast with typical bungalow plans, some split-level bungalows with enclosed layouts have a favorable territorial differentiation between the family bedroom domain, which is located on the upper floor, and family living and guest domains located on the ground floor.¹⁵ However, having only two floors in a bungalow not only reduces the home's surface area, but also decreases the level of separation among various domains, including guest and family ones in particular. The lack of privacy which results from this situation often leads to significant physical and functional transformations in the home's spaces and initiates various kinds of behavioral privacy mechanisms.

8. Privacy solutions and mechanisms:

As can be seen, due to the difference between the privacy practices of the community and the privacy conceptions embodied in the Montreal home environment, these homes often deny Shaamy community members many of their privacy needs. This lack of congruence between the community and its environment has led Shaamy inhabitants to develop privacy mechanisms, bringing domestic privacy up to levels that meet their religio-cultural standards. These patterns of privacy are comprised in two main categories: first, in preferences for home design and site specifications; second, in a set of a codependent patterns of change including physical, functional, and behavioral mechanisms that are applied indoors as well as outdoors.

8.1. Design preferences:

Usually, when buying a home, the community applies its privacy criteria to identifying a set of preferences in their new homes. These preferences aim to ensure specific privacy features imbedded in the site and home design, or exist as a potential possibility for easy and practical change of the home's layouts in the future. Regarding a home's internal layout, the community tends to choose homes with enclosed plans, large areas, and three-level settings.¹⁶ As to preferred design details, it is desirable to have the guest domain on the first floor secluded from the family domain and circulation area, comprised of separate male and female guests spaces and including a dining room, washroom, and ideally a guest bedroom.¹⁷ As for the family domain, it is preferred that it include a living room, a family dining room, an area for male children including bedrooms in the basement, a sleeping domain for the rest of the family, and a female activity space.¹⁸ Preferences for external features include avoiding direct face to face position of home elevations and openings with neighboring homes. Therefore, many homes among the case studies tend to face public gardens or undeveloped lots.¹⁹ Additionally, it is desirable for a home to be located at the end of a cul-de-sac, a situation which allows for a minimum number of neighboring homes and street pedestrians, as well as for deep backyards.²⁰

8.2. Privacy patterns of change:

A change representing the second category of privacy mechanisms includes three interrelated privacy mechanisms varying in their frequency, effectiveness, and sequence of application according to the home's pattern as well as space layouts, and the level to which the inhabitants feel settled in their homes to name just a few. These mechanisms include change of the home's physical configurations, space usage patterns, and patterns of domestic behavior

among family and with guests. These mechanisms vary in the rate at which they are applied in each case study and function codependently and integrally in order to balance economically and easily the negative aspects of home design and to achieve satisfactory levels of privacy both indoors and outdoors.

8.2.1. Physical privacy mechanisms:

Physical privacy mechanisms vary in nature and scale, ranging from adding temporary light screens to adding an entire floor. Examples of small-scale physical changes include adding permanent doors to separate a guestroom from the lobby, the basement from the rest of the home, or the kitchen from the circulation area, living room, and dining room.²¹ Large scale physical mechanisms include demolishing walls to enlarge rooms, adding walls to divide spaces, extending spaces outside the home's peripheries, and altering space configurations.²² Physical privacy mechanisms of the home's exterior are usually minor due to the inability of the community to achieve an acceptable level of privacy in outdoor spaces. The incapacity to apply significant changes is due to the outward-looking principle of design, suburban bylaws, and mainstream social norms which are incongruent with and restrictive of privacy applications. Therefore, physical changes are minor, concentrating on setting up visual barriers such as erecting bowers adjacent to a home's rear facades, planting trees and lush plants close to the fence, or raising the fence to the legal height.²³

8.2.2. Change of usage:

Change of usage is a frequently applied mechanism, being a flexible, economic, and practical solution to many domestic privacy problems. Functional mechanisms take various static (permanent) and dynamic (temporary) forms, including the change of the function of a space,²⁴ appropriating an abandoned space,²⁵ combining several functions in one space,²⁶ and changing the usage pattern of a space.²⁷ One of the most common changes of use in the community's homes is transforming the living room into a guestroom.²⁸ Another example represents transforming the original function of the basement (bar, storage, etc.) to serve as a second guestroom, an office for non-family guests, a guest bedroom, a living and sleeping area for male children, a living room, or more than one of these functions simultaneously.²⁹ Sometimes, one of the family bedrooms is transformed into a guest bedroom, a study, or a living room. In some case studies, appropriating spaces involves successfully converting unused spaces -such as basements and storage- into reception rooms, offices, or spaces having many other functions.³⁰ Another functional mechanism includes combining several disharmonious functions in one space. The need for this mechanism is mostly due to the small size of typical Montreal homes compared to the large size of Shaamy families, the diverse and specialized spatial functions inherent to community tradition and the need sometimes for gender separation. Common examples of combining functions include joining family living and guest entertaining functions in one area,³¹ and sharing the family and guest sleeping functions of the same space.³² Finally, the change of usage patterns includes increasing, decreasing, temporary, and situational restriction on the use of some spaces.³³ This phenomenon tends to be a by-product of the combining function mechanism.

8.2.3. Behavioral mechanisms:

Privacy-based change of behavior represents a complementary mechanism that supplements the shortcomings of physical and functional privacy techniques. It functions as the last resort in acquiring privacy when other measures fail, become ineffective, or are inapplicable. Behavioral mechanisms involve various modalities including refrainment, restriction, and regulating the time of space usage. It also includes the regulation of social communication through the various types of verbal, paraverbal, and physical behaviors³⁴.

8.3. The interplay of various privacy mechanisms:

Usually, there is a certain sequence for implementing various privacy mechanisms mainly determined by the extent to which a home responds to the community's privacy norms. Initially, after buying a home, the inhabitants primarily apply behavioral, then functional, privacy mechanisms to fulfill their urgent privacy needs. With the progression of time, increased settlement, and growth of the family, environmental mechanisms become more viable and tend to be increasingly implemented. Therefore, one of the main deterrents for applying fundamental privacy solutions is lack of stability. Accordingly, factors such as family size, religious observance, and settlement are not always binding for implementing environmental changes, even though such factors are extremely influential.

9. Results:

Based on the survey conducted and analysis of the case studies conclusions were reached regarding home characteristics that are most responsive to privacy traditions of Shamma community and their lifestyle. Other findings were reached in respect to the interplay between the various privacy mechanisms in relation to the pattern of housing in which they are implemented.

9.1. Criteria for home responsiveness to privacy needs:

A general examination of the characteristics of the case studies, privacy problems, and types of privacy mechanisms in application reveals that a home's responsiveness depends upon definite criteria which are comprised of three elements; enclosure, size, and hierarchy of the home's spaces. Based on these criteria, homes of different patterns and designs embody varying capacities to address the community's privacy needs. Accordingly, an analysis of home patterns reveals that, relatively, the cottage is the most responsive home pattern among the case studies. Split-level bungalows, townhouses, simple-plan bungalows, and finally open plan split-level cottages -in that sequence- reflect decreasing tendencies to provide adequate privacy for the Shamma community.

9.2. The relationships between home and privacy patterns:

Analysis of the case studies also indicates that some privacy mechanisms have a tendency to be associated with certain home patterns. For example, high rates of physical changes are more likely to happen in cottages and enclosed-plan split-levels homes,³⁵ whereas high rates of usage and behavioral privacy mechanisms occur increasingly in townhouses and open-plan, split-level homes. These trends are based on several factors, including the previously identified design criteria, inhabitants' adherence to privacy rules, inhabitants' preferences for home patterns, and the feasibility of applying a particular privacy mechanism in each home pattern. Further factors accounting for the kind of privacy mechanisms at work are family size, financial ability of the household, and degree of settlement a family has in its environment.

These factors suggest trends and hierarchies for implementing different privacy mechanisms in various home patterns. These hierarchies can be explained in light of the fact that the relationships among various privacy mechanisms are inversely proportionate. Accordingly, with the increase in the rate of applying physical changes, functional and behavioral mechanisms tend to decrease and vice versa. Conditioned to accept certain kinds of mechanisms, the pattern of each home then follows a certain hierarchy for applying different kinds of privacy mechanisms. As a result, homes with greater potential for physical change - such as cottages- contain high rates of physical mechanisms and fewer functional and behavioral ones, while homes with a slim potential for accommodating physical changes -such as open-plan split-level homes and townhouses- have relatively high rates of functional and behavioral mechanisms.

10. Conclusion:

This paper has offered matrices of Shaamy community members' preferences for home patterns and designs, as well as for various privacy mechanisms which they implement in their homes. These matrices help establish an understanding of privacy as a major cultural factor that distinguishes the Shaamy community lifestyle and domestic environment. Finally, the paper reports criteria for homes that are responsive to the culturally-specific needs of the Muslim Shaamy community in Montreal.

Footnotes:

¹ Rapoport, Amos. House Form and Culture. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice, 1969, .14.

² Westin, Alan. F. Privacy and Freedom. New York: Atheneum, 1967, 29.

³ Observation and evaluation were important tools for documenting visible aspects of privacy patterns. This process included touring all internal and external parts of the home. Moreover, numerous photographs were taken to help document home features, and for analyzing and interpreting the visual data at later stages. Plans were drawn to record house layouts, in addition to the position of furniture pieces and patterns of spatial usage. Furthermore, interviewing inhabitants provided an understanding of the non-material aspects of privacy, such as behavior and usage. The researcher's visits used to last mostly four continuous hours, during which the researcher was able to witness different faces of interaction among the occupants and with the researcher himself. These diverse methods helped in the collection of extensive data and assisted in encompassing a wide range of privacy patterns and unveiling the real motives for change.

⁴ According to Islamic teachings, privacy is a part of the Islamic socio-moral system regulated by Islamic law, defining the material, environmental, and behavioral practices among Muslim community. A code of privacy is built in support of the main objectives of the Islamic socio-moral system, which aims to protect the personal creed, honor, life, and property of the members of society. Consequently, physical, visual, acoustic, and behavioral privacy boundaries are drawn in order to safeguard these four comprehensive aspects. Privacy principles, as part of the basic Islamic individual and social laws and moral system, are not subject to modification through the evolution of society or change of environment, since they relate to the unchangeable and innate part of humans. However, applications and manifestations of privacy vary based on the input of the environment and cultures. The explicit articulation of the notion of privacy through law results in a unity of social practices, architecture, and civic life. At the same time, flexibility in accommodating cultural and environmental variables allows for creativity and diversity in privacy practices.

⁵ Symbols used for plans and figures of the various types of case studies:

A = Single family detached home

B = Bungalow

C = Split level detached home

D = Townhouse

P =Plan

I = Image

e.g.: A1-P1 (First floor plan of case study A1)

C2-I3 (Image number 3 of case study C2)

⁶ See B1-P1, C2-P1, and D1-P1 as examples where living rooms on the first floor were transformed into guestrooms.

⁷ This can be noticed in case study B1, where the living room in the basement is used occasionally for guests. See B1-P1, B1-P2. In case study D1, the living room on the first floor was transformed into a guestroom to accommodate, along with the guest suite in the basement, guests of both genders. See D1-P1, D1-P3.

⁸ This situation was observed in several case studies such as A1, A2, C1.

⁹ Examples of this situation can be found in case studies A1 and B1. See A1-P2 and B1-P2.

¹⁰ The open layouts of the home as in case studies C2 and D1 embody all these characteristics. See C2-P1, D1-P1.

¹¹ The provision of a living room, though used temporarily as an informal guestroom, in case studies A1 and A2, for instance, secures a high level of privacy for both the household and the guests. See A1-P1, A2-P1.

¹² The lack of a guestroom in case study D1 necessitates that the living room assume this function as well. See D1-P1, D1-I2.

¹³ This layout secures the separation of the circulation area from home's more private spaces. See C1-P1.

¹⁴ This is evident in case study C2, where the guest room, dining area and bedroom floor are exposed to each other. See C2-P1.

¹⁵ As plan C1-P1 shows, there is a clear separation between the guest domain on the first floor and the family domain on the second floor, attained through the location of the circulation area on one side of the house.

¹⁶ See A1-P1, which represents a well enclosed plan for a cottage. C3-P1 shows a split level bungalow which the owner was encouraged to buy because it has the potential of being easily transformed into a three level cottage with clear privacy zones. Accordingly, after a short period of occupancy, an additional floor was built to enhance the privacy conditions of the house.

¹⁷ As shown in A1-P1 and A2-P1, both houses include a guestroom and a living room that can be used temporarily by guests. In case study D1, a guest sleeping room, a guest living area, and a separate washroom were supplied in the basement, as shown in plan D1-P3. In case study C3, a guest sleeping room was provided on the first floor after expanding the house.

¹⁸ The requirements of this domain are provided in case study A1. See A1-P1 and A1-P2.

¹⁹ As A1-I2 shows, the house faces an open space, while C1-I1 shows how the home is located at the corner of the street, so that there is no building facing the home's front.

²⁰ Plan D1-P1 shows an example of good privacy conditions of the home with the street, due to the location of the home at the end of a cul-de-sac. Figure C1-I2 shows the home's deep backyard that is a result of the home's location at the corner of a block. Such location ensures maximum distance between the case study's facades and neighbors' homes, granting more privacy on the interiors of the home.

²¹ An example of this change is adding a door between the guestroom and the lobby area, as can be seen in images A1-I3 and D1-II, 2. Image A2-I3 points out a door that was added between the living room and the lobby.

²² Plan A2-P1 and image A2-I4 show a solarium that was added to the living room which required demolishing part of the living room wall. One of the major purposes of this extension was to provide semi-separated spaces to accommodate informal guests of both genders. Plan C3-P1 shows an entire floor that was added to cater to the need for reception, dining, and sleeping spaces for guests.

²³ In accordance with this, images A1-I1 and A2-I1 show small trees that were planted in front of the living room and guestroom windows of two of the case studies as a visual barrier that can secure some privacy for home interiors vis-a-vis the street. Image C1-I2 shows bowers that were planted in front of the openings of the living room in the backyard to provide visual privacy from neighboring homes. Plan C2-P1 and image C2-I2 show a wall of hedges and trees that used as a visual barrier around the backyard.

²⁴ An example of this is using the living room as a guestroom, as in case studies A2 and D1. See A2-P1 and D1-P1.

²⁵ For example, in case study C1, an abandoned storage space was transformed into a guestroom. See C1-P1.

²⁶ As in the case studies A2, B1, and C2, where the same space is used as a living room and a guestroom. This mixed use disturbs the household's feeling of privacy, particularly when guests are being entertained.

²⁷ An example of this kind of change of usage exists in case study D1, where the need for preserving the household's privacy with a guest present has permanently changed the household's patterns of using the living/guestroom.

²⁸ As in case study D1, in which the living room is used mostly as a guestroom.

²⁹ As in case studies B1, C3, D1, A1, B1 in sequence

³⁰ This kind of transformation occurred in case study D1, where the basement was transformed into a guest living and sleeping area.

³¹ An example of this privacy mechanism is the use of the guestroom as a living room as well in case study B1.

³² Case studies A1 and C1 are examples of this type of usage where family bedrooms are used temporarily as guest bedrooms when needed.

³³ This applies to most shared-use spaces such as living/guestrooms. These spaces are used by both guests and family members as in case studies B1, C2, and D1.

³⁴ This is a very prevalent mechanism due to the inadaptability of some of the home layouts to the needs of the inhabitants. Case study C2 gives a good example of this mechanism where the household restrict their use of many of the home's spaces upon entertaining guests because of the home's open plan and the consequent lack of privacy between them and the guests.

³⁵ An example of this is case study A2, where the living/guestroom was expanded, while in case study C3 an entire floor was added to provide separate family and guest domains.

Works Consulted:

- Abraham, Sameer Y. and Nabeel Abraham. Arabs in the New World: studies on Arab-American Communities. Detroit, Mich.: Wayne State University, Center for Urban Studies, 1983.
- Abu-Laban, Baha. An Olive Branch on the Family Tree: The Arabs in Canada. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1980.
- Ait Sabbah, Fatna. Woman in the Muslim Unconscious. NY: Pergamon Press, 1984.
- Al-Hathloul, Saleh A. "Tradition, Continuity and Change in the Physical Environment: the Arab-Muslim City." Diss. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1981.
- Al-Qaradawy, Yusuf. The Status of Women In Islam. Cairo: Islamic Home, 1997.
- Al-Zuhayly, Wahbh. Al-Fiqh Al-Eslami Wa'Adillatuh. Vol.1. Dimashq: Dar Al-Fikr, 1989.
- Alexander, Christopher. Houses Generated by Patterns. Berkeley, CA.: Center for Environmental Structure, 1969.
- Altman, Irwin and Carol M. Werner, eds. Home Environments. New York: Plenum Press, 1985.
- Altman, Irwin and Martin M. Chemers. Culture and Environment. Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth, 1980.
- Altman, Irwin, and W. W. Haythorn. "The Ecology of Isolated Groups." Behavioral Science 12 (1967): 169-182.
- Altman, Irwin. "Privacy Regulation: Culturally Universal or Culturally Specific?" Journal of Social Issues, 33 (1977): 66-84.
- Altman, Irwin. "Some Perspectives on the Study of Man-Environment Phenomena." Representative Research in Social Psychology 4.1 (1973): 109-126.
- Altman, Irwin. The Environment and Social Behavior. Monterey, CA.: Brooks/Coles, 1975.
- Alwaz, Helal. "Decoding the building code in Damascus: a search for culturally reflected built environment." M.A. Thesis. McGill University, 1995
- Archea, J. "The Place of Architectural Factors in Behavioural Theories of Privacy." Journal of Social Issues 33.3 (1977): 116-137.
- Ardener, Shirley, ed. Women and Space: Ground Rules and Social Maps. London: Croom Helm, 1981.
- Ardery, R. The Territorial Imperative. New York: Atheneum, 1966.
- Argyle, M. and R. Ingham. "Gaze, Mutual Gaze and Proximity." Semiotica 6.1 (1972): 32-50.
- Aswad, Barbara C. and Barbara Bilge., eds. Family and Gender Among American Muslims: Issues Facing Middle Eastern Immigrants and their Descendants. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996.
- Barazi, Muhammad Fuad. Hijab al-Muslimah: bayna intihal al-mubtilin wa-tawil al-jahilin. al-Tabah 1. al-Riyad : Maktabat Adwa al-Salaf, 1995.
- Barbara Daly Metcalf, ed. Making Muslim Space in North America and Europe. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1996.
- Bates, A. P. "Privacy - A Useful Concept?" Social Forces 42 (1964): 429-434.
- Baum, Andrew and Stuart Valins. Architecture and Social Behavior: Psychological studies of Social Density. Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates, 1977.
- Beardsley, E. L. "Privacy: Autonomy and Selective Disclosure." Privacy. Eds. J. R. Pennock and J. W. Chapman. New York: Atherton Press, 1971, 56-70.
- Becker, F. D. and C. Mayo. "Delineating Personal Distance and Territoriality." Environment & Behavior. No. 3. (1971): 375-381.
- Becker, F. D. "Study of Spatial Markers." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 26.3 (1973): 439-445.
- Berscheid, E. "Privacy: A Hidden Variable in Experimental Social Psychology." Journal of Social Issues 33.3 (1977): 85-101.

-
- Bindal, M. "Privacy Requirement and its Effects on Housing Design." International Journal for Housing Science and its Applications. 6 (1982): 301-312.
- Bloustein, E. J. "Privacy as an Aspect of Human Dignity: An Answer to Dean Prosser." Philosophical Dimensions of Privacy. Ed. Ferdinand David Schoeman. New York: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Bossard, J. H. S., and E. S. Boll. Ritual in Family Living. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1950.
- Brener, John, Environmental Psychology in Building Design. London: Applied, 1982.
- Brower, S., Dockett, K. and R. B. Taylor. "Residents' Perception of Territorial Features and Perceived Local Threat." Environment and Behavior 15.4 (July 1983): 419-437.
- Buttimer, Anne, "Social Space in Interdisciplinary Perspective." Geographical Review 59 (July 1969): 417-426
- Byrom, Connie. "Privacy and Courtyard Housing." The Architects' Journal 151.2 (14 Jan. 1970): 101-106.
- Canter, David, The Psychology of Place, London: The Architectural Press Ltd., 1977.
- Chermayeff, Serge and Christopher Alexander. Community and Privacy. New York: Doubleday, 1963.
- Cheyne, J. A. and M. G. Efran. "The Effect of Spatial and Interpersonal Variables on the Innovation of Group Control Territories." Sociometry 35.3 (1972): 477-489.
- Churchman, Arza and Gilbert Herbert. "Privacy Aspects in the Dwelling: Design Considerations." Journal of Architectural Research 6.3 (July 1978): 19-27
- Cooper, C. Easter Hill Village: Some Social Implications of Design. New York: Free Press, 1975.
- Cooper, C. "The House as a Symbol of the Self." Designing for Human Behavior. Eds. J. Lang et al. Stroudsburg, PA: Dowden, 1979.
- Cooper-Marcus, Clare and Wendy Sarkissian. Housing As if People Mattered. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1986.
- Daghmi, Muhammad Rakan. Himayat al-hayah al-khassah fi al-shariah al-Islamiyah. al-Tabah 1. al-Qahirah: Dar al-Salam, 1985.
- Daunton, Martin J. "The Social Meaning of Space: The City in the West and Islam." Urbanism in Islam: the proc. of the International Conference on Urbanism in Islam (I CUIT), Tokyo: The Middle Eastern Culture Center, 1989, 26-58.
- DeLong, A. J. "Territorial Stability and Hierarchical Formation." Small Group Behavior. 4.1 (1973): 56-63.
- Derlaga, V. J. and A. L. Chaiken. "Privacy and Self-Disclosure in Social Relationships." Journal of Social Issues 33.3 (1977): 102-115.
- Edney, J. J. and M. A. Buda. "Distinguishing Territoriality and Privacy." Human Ecology 4.4 (1976): 283-296
- Edney, J. J. "Human Territories: Comment on Functional Properties." Environment & Behavior 8 (1976): 31-47.
- Edney, J. J., "Human Territoriality." Psychological Bulletin 81.12 (1974): 959-975.
- Ellis, S. "Privacy in Byzantine and Ottoman Houses." Byzantinische Forschungen 16 (1991): 151-158.
- Eoyang, C. K. "Effects of Group Size and Privacy in Residential Crowding." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 30.3 (1974): 389-392.
- Ernst J. Grube. et al. Architecture of the Islamic World: Its History and Social Meaning. Ed. George Michell. New York: Morrow, 1978.
- Esser, A. H. "Theoretical and Empirical Issues with Regard To Privacy, Territoriality, Personal Space and Crowding." Environment and Behaviour 8.1 (Mar. 1976): 117-124.
- Esser, Aristide H. "Designed Communalities: A Synergic Context for Community and Privacy." Design for Communalities and Privacy. Eds. A.H. Esser and B. B. Greenbie. New York: Plenum Press, 1978.
- Esser, Aristide H. "Theoretical and Empirical Issues with Regard to Privacy, Territoriality, Personal Space and Crowding." Environment and Behavior 8.1 (March 1976): 117-124.
- Finighan, W. R. "Privacy, People and Property." Architectural Science Review 22.1 (March 1979): 2-6.
- Florence, L. S. Our Private Lives. Toronto: George G. Harrap, 1944.
- Fried, Charles. "Privacy." Yale Law Journal 77 (1968): 475.
- Friedhelm, Ernst. Arab Americans in Nordamerika: zur Geschichte und zu gegenwartigen Strukturen und Problemen arabischer Einwanderungs-communities. Berlin: Das Arabische Buch, 1986.
- Fukushima, Masaharu. "An Analysis of the Transition between Community and Privacy In Urban Housing." M.A. Thesis, McGill University, 1975.**
- Goffman, Erving. Behavior in Public Places. New York: Free Press, 1963.
- Gottlieb, Lois. D. Environment and Design in Housing. New York: Macmillan, 1965.
- Greenbie, B. B. "Social Privacy in the Community of Diversity." Design for Communalities and Privacy. Eds. A.H. Esser and B.B. Greenbie. New York: Plenum Press, 1978.
- Guardo, C. J. "Personal Space in Children." Child Development 40 (1969): 143-151.

-
- Haddad, Yvonne Yazbeck and Adair T. Lummis. Islamic Values in the United States: A Comparative Study. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Haddad, Yvonne Yazbeck and Jane Idleman Smith, eds. Muslim Communities in North America. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1994.
- Haddad, Yvonne Yazbeck, ed. The Muslims of America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Haddad, Yvonne Yazbeck. A Century of Islam in America. Washington, D.C.: Islamic Affairs Programs, The Middle East Institute, 1986.
- Hagopian, Elaine Catherine and Ann Paden, eds. The Arab Americans; Studies in Assimilation. Wilmette Medina University Press International 1969.
- Hakim, Besim S. Arabic-Islamic Cities: Building and Planning Principles. New York: Sydney and Henley, 1986.
- Hall, Edward T. "The Anthropology of Space: An Organising Model." Environmental Psychology: Man and His Physical setting. Eds. H.M. Proshansky, W.H. Ittelson and L.G Rivlin. London: Holt, 1970.
- Hall, Edward T. The Hidden Dimension. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- Hall, Edward T., The Silent Language, Anchor Press/Doubleday: New York, 1973.
- Hill, A. R. "Visibility and Privacy." Architectural Psychology, Ed. D.V Canter. London: RIBA Publications, 1970.
- Hillier, B. and J. Hanson. The Social Logic of Space. New York: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Hitti, Philip Khuri. History of Syria including Lebanon and Palestine. New York: Macmillan, 1951.
- Hitti, Philip Khuri. History of the Arabs From the Earliest Times to the Present. 10th Ed. New York: St Martin's Press, 1970.
- Hitti, Philip Khuri. Islam and the West, a Historical Cultural Survey. Princeton: N.J. Van Nostrand, 1962.
- Hitti, Philip Khuri. Islam, a Way of Life. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1970.
- Hogben, Murray. "The Socio-Religious Behavior of Muslims in Canada: An Overview" The Muslim Community in North America. Eds. Earle H. Waugh, Baha Abu-Laban, and Regula Qureshi. Edmonton: The University of Alberta Press, 1983.
- Husaini, Zohra. Muslims in the Canadian Mosaic: Socio-Cultural and Economic links with their Countries of Origin. Edmonton: Muslim Research Foundation, 1990.
- Hutt, Antony. Arab Architecture, Past and Present. Durham, England: Centre for Middle Eastern & Islamic Studies, University of Durham, 1983.
- Joiner, Duncan. "Social Ritual and Architectural Space." Architectural Research and Teaching 1.3 (April 1971): 11-20.
- Kalay, Y. and E. Shaviv. "A Method for Evaluating Activities Layout in Dwelling Units." Building and Environment. 14 (1979): 227-234.
- Kelman, H. C. "Privacy and Research with Human Beings." Journal of Social Issues 33.3 (1977): 169-195.
- Kelvin, Peter. "A Social-Psychological Examination of Privacy." British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology. 12 (1973): 248-261.
- Kinney, J. M. , M. A. P. Stephens, and A. M. Brockmann. "Personal and Environmental Correlates of Territoriality and Use of Space." Environment and Behavior 19.6 (Nov. 1987): 722-737.
- Klopfer, P. H. and D. I. Rubenstein. "The Concept of Privacy and Its Biological Bases." Journal of Social Issues 33.3 (1977): 52-65.
- Knowles, E. S. "Boundaries around Social Space: Dyadic Responses to an Invader." Environment and Behavior 4.4 (Dec. 1972): 437-445.
- Kuroda, Toshio. "On the nature of community in the Arab-Muslim world." Nature of the Islamic Community. Eds. Kuroda, Toshio and Richard I. Lawless. Tokyo: Keiso Shobo, 1991.
- Kutub, Muhammad. Al-tatawur Wa Al-Thabat fi Hayat Al-bashariah. al-tabah 8. Beirut: Dar Al-Shuruq, 1991.
- Lang, Jon. Creating Architectural Theory: The Role of the Behavioural Sciences in Environmental Design. New York: Reinhold, 1987.
- Laufer, R. S. and F. Wolfe. "Privacy as a Concept and a Social Issue: A Multidimensional Development Theory." Journal of Social Issues 33.3 (1977): 22-50.
- Laufer, R. S., H. M. Proshansky, and M. Wolfe. "Some Analytic Dimensions of Privacy." Architectural Psychology, Proceedings of the Lund Conference. Ed. R. Kullter. Stroudsburg, PA.: Dowden, 1973.
- Lawrance, R. "Transition Spaces and Dwelling Design." Journal of Architecture and Planning Research 1.4 (1984): 261-271
- Lawton, M.P. and J. Bader. "Wish for Privacy by Young and Old." Journal of Gerontology 25.1 (1970): 48-54.
- Levy, Reuben. The Social Structure of Islam. 2d Ed. Cambridge: University Press, 1962.
- Little, V. R. and M. Kane. "Person-Thing Orientation and Privacy." Man Environment Systems 4.6 (Nov. 1974): 361-364.

-
- Longrig, S. H. The Middle East: A Social Geography. 2nd ed. London: Gerald Duckworth, 1970.
- Lyman, S. M. and M. B. Scott. "Territoriality: A Neglected Sociological Dimension." Social Problems 15 (1967): 235-249.
- MacCormic, M. J. "Privacy: A New American Dilemma." Social Casework (Apr. 1978): 211-220.
- Madge, Charles. "Private and Public Spaces." Human Relations 3 (1950): 187-199.
- Madge, John. "Privacy and Social Interaction." Transactions of Bartlett Society. Vol. 3, London: Bartlett School of Architecture, University College London, 1964-1965, 122-141.
- Marcus, Abraham. "Privacy in Eighteenth-Century Aleppo: the Limits of Cultural Ideals." International journal of Middle East studies 18 (1986): 165-183.
- Margulis, S. T., ed. "Privacy as a Behavioural Phenomenon: Introduction." Journal of Social Issues 33.3 (1977): 1-4.
- Margulis, S. T. "Conceptions of Privacy: Current Status and Next Steps." Journal of Social Issues 33.3 (1977): 5-21.
- Marshall, N. J. "Privacy and environment." Human Ecology 1.2 (1972): 93-110.
- Marty, Martin E. and R. Scott Appleby, eds. Fundamentalisms and Society: Reclaiming the Sciences, the Family, and Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Maslow, Abraham. Motivation and Personality. 2nd. ed. New York: Harper Row 1954, 1970
- Mawdudi, Syed Abdul A'Ala. Islamic Way of Life. Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: Co-operative Office for Call and Guidance Communities Dept., 1990.
- McBride, Glenorchy. "Privacy: A Relationship Model." Man-Environment Systems 7.3 (May 1977): 145-154.
- Meisels, M. and C. J. Guardo. "Development of Personal Space Schematas." Child Development 40: 1167-1178.
- Moore, Barrington, Jr. Privacy: Studies in Social and Cultural History. New York: Armondk, M. E. Sharpe, 1984.
- Moore, Barrington. Privacy: Studies in Social and Cultural History. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.
- Murphy, Robert F. "Social Distance and the Veil." Philosophical Dimensions of Privacy. Ed. Ferdinand David Schoeman. New York: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Naff, Alixa. Becoming American: the Early Arab Immigrant Experience. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, c1985.
- Olsen, Donald. J. "Victorian London: Specialization, Segregation, and Privacy." Victorian Studies 17.3 (Spring 1974): 256-278.
- Pardailhe-Galabrun, Annik. The Birth of Intimacy: Privacy and Domestic Life in Early Modern Paris. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991.
- Parke, R. D. "Children's Privacy in the Home: Developmental, Ecological and Child-Rearing Determinants." Environment and Behaviour 11.1 (Mar. 1979): 87-104.
- Pastalan, Leon. A. "Privacy as an Expression of Human Territoriality." Spatial Behavior of Older People. Ed. Leon A. Pastalan and Daniel H. Carson. Michigan: Institute of Gerontology, University of Michigan-Wayne State University, 1970, 88-101.
- Posner, A. R. "An Economic Theory of Privacy." Philosophical Dimensions of Privacy. Ed. Ferdinand David Schoeman. New York: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Proshansky, H. M. et al., eds. Environmental Psychology: Man and His Physical Setting. New York: Holt, 1970.
- Rahbar, Mehrdad. "Privacy in Row Houses of Montreal." M. A. Thesis. Montreal: McGill University, 1996.
- Rapoport, A. Human Aspects of Urban Form: Towards a Man-Environment Approach to Urban Form and Design. New York: Pergamon Press, 1977.
- Rapoport, Amos. House Form and Culture. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice, 1969.
- Rapoport, Amos. "Human and Psychological Reactions." Architectural Science Review. 1.4 (Dec. 1971): 95-97.
- Rapoport, Amos. "Sacred Places, Sacred Occasions, and Sacred Environments." Architectural Design 52.1/10 (1982): 75-82.
- Rapoport, Amos. "Thinking of Home Environment." Home Environment. Ed. Irwin. Altman, New York: Plenum Press, 1985
- Reiman, H. J. "Intimacy and Personhood." Philosophical Dimensions of Privacy. Ed. Ferdinand David Schoeman. New York: Cambridge UP. 1984.
- Robertson, A. H. Privacy and Human Rights. Manchester: University Press, 1973.
- Ruebhausen, O. M. and O. G. Brim Jr. "Privacy and Behavioral Research." American Psychologist 21 (1966): 423-437.
- Sawaie, Mohammed. Arabic-speaking Immigrants in the United States and Canada: A Bibliographical Guide with Annotation. Lexington, KY.: Mazda Publishers, 1985.
- Schoenauer, Norbert, 6000 Years of Housing: The Oriental Urban House. Vol. 2. London: Garland STPM Press, 1981.

-
- Schwartz, Barry. "The Social Psychology of Privacy." American Journal of Sociology 73 (1968): 541-542.
- Simmel, A. "Privacy is not an Isolated Freedom." Privacy. Eds. J. R. Pennock and J. W. Chapman. New York: Atherton, 1971, 71-88
- Smith, R. H. et al. "Privacy and Interaction Within the Family as Related to Dwelling space." Journal of Marriage and the Family (Aug. 1969): 559-566.
- Smith, D. E. "Privacy and Corrections: A reexamination. American." Journal of Community Psychology 10.2 (1982): 207-224.
- Sommer, Robert. "Small Group Ecology." Psychological Bulletin 67.2 (1967): 145-152.
- Sundstorm, Eric. "Field Study of Territorial Behavior and Dominance." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 30.1, 1974: 115-124.
- Translations of the Qur'an. Trans. Ali, Yusuf. 18 Feb 1999 <<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/>>
- Vaziritavar, Shahram. "Design and Privacy in Modern and Traditional Housing in Iran." Diss. Oxford University, 1990.
- Waddy, Charis. The Muslim Mind. 2nd ed. London: Longman Group, 1982
- Warren, C and B. Laslett. Privacy and Secrecy: A Conceptual Comparison. Journal of Social Issues 33.3 (1977): 43-51.
- Watson, O. M. Proxemic Behavior: A Cross-Cultural Study. Paris: Mouton the Hague, 1970.
- Waugh, Earle H., Baha Abu-Laban, and Regula B. Qureshi. The Muslim Community in North America. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1983.
- Webster's Encyclopedic Dictionary of the English Language. Canadian Ed. New York: Lexicon Publications, 1988.
- Westin, Alan. F. Privacy and Freedom. New York: Atheneum, 1967.
- Willis, Margaret. "Designing for Privacy: Personal Relationships." The Architects' Journal 137.24 (12 June 1963): 1231-1236.
- Willis, Margaret. "Designing for Privacy: What is Privacy?" The Architects' Journal 137.22 (29 May 1963): 1137-1141.
- Willis, Margaret. "Planning for Privacy." The Architects' Journal 137.23 (5 June 1963): 1181-1187.
- Willis, Margaret. "What is Privacy?" The Architects' Journal 137.22 (29 May 1963): 1137-1151.
- Wilson, S. and G. Scott. "Architecture and an Ecology of Man." Architectural Science Review 15.4 (Dec. 1972): 69-76.
- Wolfe, M. and R. Laufer. "The concept of privacy in childhood and adolescence." EDRA:_ Privacy. Ed. S.T. Margulis. 5: Part 6 (1974): 29-54.