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STUDY OF CHARACTERISTICS & HOUSING

OWNERSHIP OF LOW-INCOME COMMUNITIES IN WPP E MEDAN

Abstract. Housing offers central importance to everyone’s quality of life and health. The city of Medan has an increased number of the low-income community which poses an extra challenge for the government to fulfil the need for shelter which is one of the basic human needs. Due to the number of low-income communities, the need for shelter as a basic human need is difficult to be fulfilled. This raises the realization that no decent housing should be built in the areas that do not fulfil the requirements, like around the rail track and on the river banks. Slum areas and poor households in WPP E Medan are located in the Medan Helvetia District, Medan Selayang District, and Medan Barat District. This research aims to analyze the characteristics and the housing ownership of low-income community in WPP E Medan. A number of questions were asked to identify the characteristics and housing ownership, including the degree to which respondents managed their household income. A total of 100 questionnaires were analyzed and had formed the database for the quantitative analysis. The results of this study indicated that most of the respondents were tenants, and only 19% of them were able to own their houses. The price of low-cost housing that did not meet the consumers' target had led to the inability of the low-income communities in WPP E Medan to own their houses and prefer to rent or stay in their relatives' houses rather than to have their own houses.
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1. Introduction

Housing is very important to human life as one of the
basic human needs. And as the need, a house is meant to provide safety, and it is not intended to shield the occupants like a fortress, but it is a protection which is opened and integrated as part of its environment. Based on the data from the Central Bureau of Statistics (2002), 4.8% (94,266 people) in the city of Medan is a low-income community. Meanwhile, the percentage of low-income communities in the city of Medan in 2003 was 7.25% or about 144,536 lives of 1,993,602 people (BPS, 2003). Based on the above data the number of low-income communities has increased to 2.45%. By the year 2007, the number of poor households in WPP E Medan was 15,272 poor households [1]. Due to the number of low-income communities, the need for shelter is a basic human need that can sometimes be a complex agenda to fulfil. The number of houses that are built in unsafe areas such as near the railway track and riverbank has escalated because of the difficulties to own proper housing. Therefore, the Government of Medan city is trying to overcome problems of housing for the low-income community by establishing the centre for regional development to make a fair distribution of the population and to provide assistance through the low-cost housing.

As an emerging major city, Medan has the employment problem that comes along with the development of the city, as well as the number of housing that are not equal to the population growth, resulting in many emerging shelters that are built on unsuitable sites. Low-income communities face the problem, to own a proper shelter due to their economy and their lack of information on the government financial assistance to have their own houses.

Therefore, this study is needed to make a direct observation on the houses of the low-income communities, regarding their abilities to have their own houses (housing ownership). This paper focuses on the concept of housing ownership of the low-income community and the study area is chosen to be located in the WPP E Medan city. The respondents of this study are the low-income communities who live in WPP E Medan city which covers...
five districts namely Medan Tuntungan, Medan Selayang, Medan Sunggal, Medan Helvetia, and Medan Barat.

2. Low-Income Community and Housing Ownership
A house is a place where people go back to, normally at the end of the day, which explains why building a house is one important thing that should be constructed carefully, according to the needs tailored by the family or individuals that will occupy the house. According to Budiharjo (1998) building, a house is basically an everyday activity which is performed by an individual, family or the community itself. Yet, today’s housing industry has become an activity that is very complex and sophisticated, which is considered merely as a commodity, as the final product or finished goods [2]. Socio-cultural aspects, economic prosperity, human values and behaviour would go unnoticed. Budiharjo also stresses the need to give an opportunity or a chance to every part of the family to manifest, loaded with creative innovation, plan and build their own houses with full flexibility and to always respond to any changes. Yudohusodo (1991) has further mentioned that low-income communities in the city basically can construct their own settlements by process, starting the construction of their homes with simple recycled materials but gradually, they can repair their settlements to become better quality houses, even earning enough to finally own their own permanent houses [3].

Low-income communities can be assessed based on the income and expenses that a family earns each month, in a family where the monthly income can only meet the primary needs of life such as food. The definition of poor or low-income communities also revolves around the circumstances in which the deprivation of life experienced by a person can not fulfil the minimum needs, but is only capable of fulfilling the basic needs in life [1]. According to the Central Bureau of Statistics, the budget for the minimum necessities of life differs from one region to other regions depending on the habits, transportation and purposes of expenses. In this study, the low-income segments of the community are considered according to
the group of people with monthly income entitled to be granted with subsidized houses as can be seen in Table 1 below [4].

Table 1. Low-Income Community Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>1.400.000 &lt; income &lt; 2.000.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>800.000 &lt; income &lt; 1.400.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Income &lt; 800.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Surat Keputusan Menteri Negara Perumahan Rakyat, 2005)

According to Panudju (1999), in determining the priority in choosing a house, low-income communities mostly will choose houses that are located near to the place where they can earn their living. Without having an advantage or convenience to go to work to fulfil their daily needs, it will be very difficult for them to go on with their lives. Then obtaining housing ownership is secondary in their list of priorities in life, while the form or the quality of houses merely becomes their last source of worry [5]. The most important thing for them is that they have a house as a place for shelter and rest, to sustain their lives.

According to Laquian (1983) in order to be able to obtain housing ownership, it will basically depend on the family income, monthly income and the monthly expenses for housing, in which the amount that could be spent on housing is the maximum amount that can be paid for the housing payment where it depends on the family income and the number of family members [6]. More specifically relating to housing for low-income people in urban areas, JFC Turner (1976) quotes that the important thing from the house is not what it is, but what it does to the lives and livelihood of residents or owners [7]. Tanphiphat (1983) proposes that the government through the National Housing Agency provides a long-term loan program
between 15-25 years to low-income communities, to enable them to buy land and so that they can afford the housing costs. Tanphiphat suggests this concept because in the absence of such facilities, low-income communities may not have a lot to be able to build their homes legally [8].

Therefore, to help low-income communities to have proper housing the government of Indonesia has established Perumnas. Perumnas was formed in 1974 as a state venture engaged in the provision of public housing. After the Perum Perumnas Regional, I managed to build housing and its facilities and infrastructure, and develop the western city of Medan, also the east, south and centre of the city, starting in 1995 Perumnas development had been directed to areas of the northern city of Medan to the Martubung region. Currently, the Griya Martubung Housing is still opening its market for the sales of housing units. It has a land area of 276.56 hectares consisting of three adjacent sites, namely Martubung I covering 106.31 hectares, an area of 40.20 ha of Martubung II, and Martubung III with the area of 130.05 ha [9]. The price list of houses in the Griya Martubung Housing can be seen in Table 2 below.

Table 2. The Low-Cost Housing Price

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Price (Rp)</th>
<th>DP (Rp)</th>
<th>Monthly Payment (Rp)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five years</td>
<td>39,000,000</td>
<td>8,450,000</td>
<td>655,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten years</td>
<td>393,721</td>
<td></td>
<td>311,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RI
42.000.000
8.800.000
854.924
556.244
468.350
RS
56.000.000
12.900.000
1.202.660
822.053
716.995
(Perumahan Nasional Martubung with KPR BTN, 2008)
From table 2 above, there are three types of houses built for the low-income community. To add, the bank serves as one of the institutions that provide financial assistance in the form of housing loan such as the KPR, where the applicants can choose the payment period from five to fifteen years.

3. Methodology

The type of research in this paper can be categorized as a descriptive research. The sample population of this study was all of the poor households belonging to the class of low-income communities in WPP E Medan. Based on the statistical data from BPS Medan (2008), the number of poor households in WPP E Medan City totalled approximately 15.272 poor households or by 17.65% of the total populace. By using the formula from Krueckberg and Silvers (1974) in determining the sample size, the expected error in the calculation was set at 10%, and the total study sample was 99.35 poor households that were rounded up to 100 poor households. The questionnaires were distributed in several sub-districts of WPP E Medan city which contained poor households and slum areas such as Medan Helvetia, Medan Selayang (Tanjung Sari & Asam Kumbang), and the Medan Barat (P. Brayan Kota) and they were analyzed with the assistance of the SPSS program to facilitate the accurate and qualified study results. The questionnaire consisted of four
major parts. The first part consisted of seven questions, aiming to find out about the respondents' background. The second part consisted of four questions which sought to disclose the member of the respondents' family in the house. The third part consisted of four questions which looked at the status and the housing conditions. Finally, the fourth part consisted of ten questions, which aimed to find out about the respondents' economic conditions.

4. Data Collection and Analysis

The data were collected through questionnaire dissemination, and 100 completed questionnaires were analyzed and had formed the database for the quantitative analysis. From 100 respondents, most of them were in the age between 36 – 45 years old and most of them had high school diploma as their educational background. The number of family members with whom the respondents' lived with mostly was between 3 to 5 persons (59 respondents, 59%). Mostly only one person in each family worked to fulfil the family needs (53%). Meanwhile, the majority of the respondents' family members who did not work were ranging from 2 to 4 persons (79%), and the number of family members who were still studying in school ranged from 2 to 4 persons (38 respondents, 38%).

From 100 respondents, as many as 36 respondents (36%) also the heads of the family worked as ‘others’ (working as a pedicab driver, washing other clothes, masseuse, etc.). 26 respondents (26%) were traders, 24 persons (24%) were private employees, ten respondents (10%) were civil employees, and four respondents (4%) were farmers.

Table 3. The Status of housing ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family belonging</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From 100 houses, most of the status of the occupied houses at this time did not belong to the respondents themselves (63%). Only 19 houses (19%) were owned by the respondents, 18 respondents (18%) lived in the family’s houses or family-inherited houses, as can be seen in table 3. There were several reasons why the respondents did not buy a house and had chosen to rent a house or stay in relatives’ houses, as illustrated in fig. 1 below.
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Fig.1. Respondents’ Reasons Not to Buy Houses

Based on figure 1 from 63 respondents (the number of respondents who rented houses were 48 people, and the number of respondents who boarded were 15 people), where the main reason for them not to buy a house was due to the houses’ high prices, as answered by 23 respondents (36.5%), 18 respondents (28.5%) answered that the reason why they did not buy a house was because they were unable to pay the down payment / monthly payment, 11 respondents (17.46%) said that it was the difficulty of
getting the loan, and 11 other respondents (17.46%) said interest rates were too high which further hampered their inclination to purchase a house of their own.  

The amount of income that was earned by most of the respondents was between Rp.500,000 - Rp.999,000 as many as 46 people (46%). The next amount of income mostly earned was between Rp.1,000,000 - Rp.1,499,000 as many as 42 people (42%). The next amount of income that was earned by the respondents was less than Rp.500,000 which was as many as 11 people (11%). Finally, one respondent (1%) owned the amount of income between Rp.1,500,000 - Rp.2,000,000.

It has also been discovered that more than half of respondents (56%) had no side income. Meanwhile, 30 respondents (30%) had side income that was less than Rp.500,000. The side income between Rp.1,000,000 - Rp.1,500,000 was earned by 14 respondents (14%), while four respondents (4%) had had a side income of Rp.500,000 - Rp.999,000. Side income was used by the respondents as an addition to meet the needs of their everyday lives. By contrast, the remaining 14 respondents (14%) had an unstable income.

Table 4. Total of Respondents' Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total income</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Rp. 500,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp.500,000 - Rp.999,000</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp.1,000,000 - Rp.1,499,000</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp.1,500,000 - Rp.1,999,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp.2,000,000 - Rp.2,500,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Based on table 4, 45 respondents (45%) had a total income of between Rp.1.000.000 - Rp.1.499.000. The next 42 respondents (42%) had a total income of Rp.500.000 - Rp.999.000. A number of 8 respondents (8%) had a total income of less than Rp.500.000. The total income of Rp.2.000.000 - Rp.2.500.000 was owned by two respondents (2%) and two others (2%) had a total income of Rp.1.500.000 - Rp.1.999.000. One last respondent (1%) had a total income of more than Rp.2.500.000. Meanwhile, most respondents (as many as 59 respondents (59%)) lived with 3 to 5 persons in the household, and 32 respondents had a total income of Rp.500.000 - Rp.999.00
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Fig. 2. The Biggest Monthly Expenses
The biggest monthly expense allocated by respondents was for food (32%). The next biggest monthly expense was for school fees (16%). The next one was for transportation (14%), and then the next largest had been dedicated to the rent of the house (13%). The last one was for the needs of others (12%) as seen in figure 2.

The largest monthly expenses of respondents were Rp.500.000 - Rp.999.000 as claimed by 49 respondents (49%). The next amount of monthly expenses spent by respondents ranged from Rp.1.000.000 - Rp.1.499.000, with 28 respondents (28%). The next amount was less than Rp.500.000 with 20 respondents (20%). An additional two respondents (2%) had a monthly expense of Rp.1.5.00.000 - Rp.2.000.000. Meanwhile, the number of monthly expenses of more than Rp.2.000.000 was given by one respondent (1%), which had an income of more than Rp.2.500.000 per month. Only some of the respondents claimed that they could make savings, where a number of 50 respondents (50%) had savings and could set aside part of their earnings every month. Meanwhile, 29 respondents (29%) had an unstable amount of money for savings, and 21 other respondents (21%) could not make any savings.

From 79 respondents (79%) were able to make savings, most were the respondents with an income of Rp.1.000.000 - Rp.1.499.000 (39 respondents (39%)). Respondents with an income between Rp.500.000 - Rp.999.000 were the second of those respondents who had savings, which were 30 respondents (30%). The next respondents who were able to make savings were respondents with an income of less than Rp.5.500.000 with five respondents (5%).

Respondents with an income between Rp.2.000.000 - Rp.2.500.000 and the number of respondents with an income of Rp.1.500.000 - Rp.1.999.000 were both represented by two respondents (2%). One respondent (1%) with an income of more than Rp.2.500.000 was the last number of respondents who had savings.
the amount of income that can be saved by respondents every month at most was less than Rp.100.000 with the number of 41 respondents (41%). The second largest amount of income that could be saved by respondents ranged between Rp.100.000 - Rp.399.000 with 30 respondents (30%).

The bank is one of the institutions that provide financial assistance in the form of housing loan such as the KPR, where the applicants can choose the payment period from five to fifteen years. However, as much as this will help the low-income community, the KPR has requirements that should be closely followed by the applicants. One of the requirements is that the amount of the monthly payment should not exceed 1/3 of the applicants' total income every month as seen in table 5 below. The low-income communities were grouped in accordance with their total income from A to F.

Table 5. Total Income and the Loan Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Income</th>
<th>Loan Requirement (1/3 Total Income)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Rp. 500.000</td>
<td>A (&lt; Rp.166.666)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp.500.000 - Rp.999.000</td>
<td>B (Rp.166.666 - Rp.333.000)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp.1.000.000 - Rp.1.499.000</td>
<td>C (Rp.333.300 - Rp.499.000)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp.1.500.000 - Rp.1.999.000</td>
<td>D (Rp.499.000 - Rp.832.000)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp.2.000.000 - Rp.2.499.999</td>
<td>E (some Rp.832.000 - Rp.1.299.999)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp.2.500.000 - Rp.2.999.999</td>
<td>F (some Rp.1.299.999 - Rp.1.799.999)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on figure 3 above, 75 respondents could make a monthly payment to own houses less than Rp.100,000/month. 12 respondents could make a monthly payment between Rp.100,000 - Rp.399,000. Nine respondents could make a monthly payment between Rp.300,000 – Rp.499,000. 2 respondents were able to make a monthly payment of more than Rp.500,000, and two more respondents claimed that they did not have any ability to make a monthly payment. Therefore, the number of respondents who were able to make monthly payment in terms of the amount of their monthly income and were able to meet the requirement to obtain bank loans for low-cost housing was the low income communities in groups C, D, E, and F which covered 50 respondents, in accordance with the monthly payment of Rp.311,085, this was the lowest but had shown to be the longest period of payment.
From the analysis and discussion above, it can be concluded that most of the respondents were unable to own their houses. The results of this study indicated that most of the respondents did not own the houses where they lived, and most of them were tenants (48%) and only 19% of them were the rightful owners of their houses, while 37% more lived in houses belonging to their families or those that were handed down by their family.

5. Conclusion

It is perhaps, an understatement to say that everyone needs a house, when it has been established that a house remains to be one of the basic human needs and the very fundamental human rights. This study indicates that the low-income communities who live in the WPP E Medan City mostly are tenants who do not have their own houses, which means that the number of housing ownership in the WPP E Medan is extremely low, represented by only 19% out of 100 respondents. Because of their low monthly income, the low-income communities in the WPP E Medan City are having difficulties in gaining housing ownership. Their monthly income has mostly already been used to fulfil their other basic daily needs. Therefore we understand their difficulty in saving some amount of money to be entitled to the bank loan application let alone to make a home their permanent place of abode. Besides, they also face problems due to the price of low-cost housing which still does not seem affordable by the poorer population, and which in effect, makes the low-income communities in WPP E Medan to prefer to rent or stay in their relatives' houses rather than to have their own houses.

The results imply the need for the government to pay more attention to the low-income communities and their basic need for housing. Efforts should be geared towards increasing the income of the low-income communities and to make decent housing more accessible to them. All players in the industry should play their role in helping
these disadvantaged communities. The government should consider building a decent housing that meets the consumers' target as well as providing financial assistance and distributing continuous information to guide them to obtain housing ownership that will not financially trouble them in the future. Giving proper education and skills to low-income communities will also equip them for the betterment of life. There are many more that can be done as long as all players in the industry work with each other to facilitate low-income communities to fulfil their basic needs of housing and to demonstrate that the communities are not denied their rights.
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