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Abstract

The adoption of modernisation as the national development strategy has put Indonesian cities at the centre of development for boosting economic advancement. Occasionally, as those cities grow through processes of densification and agglomeration, some of the indigenous settlement (kampung) areas are put at risk of disappearing under corporate sector investments. However to some extent there is an indication that the kampung dwellers, the corporate-sector developers and those who are involved in the wider activities of the corporate sector, have an economic and social symbiotic relationship.

The aim of this research is to identify the processes of change in a low-income inner city neighbourhood’s community system, in an area that is being encroached upon by modern business activities and other aspect of modernity, to explore shifts between conventionally understood roles of the kampungs, and to speculate on present theory in throwing light on processes of change which might be able to lead to new paths for urban development. The research approach is to work through the relevant literature, and then to move on to a case study approach in an Indonesian city, through which it will be possible to reflect back on the efficacy of prevailing theory. Surabaya was chosen as a representative city and kampung Kaliasin as the observed area.

The outcome was to observe that the kampung is no longer simply ‘traditional’, but involved in a wider urban, metropolitan and even global economy and community. The process of Indonesian modernisation has blurred the previously prominent and distinctive social characteristics of urban and rural communities, while also influencing in new ways the structure of the habitats. A process of encroachment in the present era is tolerated because encroachment is seen to be lucrative. The immediate gain of capital to some of the displaced might be pleasing, as it enables them to freely choose their new quarters, and as they might well like to move to a ‘higher level’ neighbourhood, though the present study has clearly revealed that this is far from the case for everyone. The kampung presents a community and physical environment that for many is of the greatest value. In this context, the current city planning for kampung Kaliasin must be seen as extraordinarily oblivious of the real processes of the city’s evolution and of its persisting culture and spatial practices. It offers a form of space and of local community organization that might well be considered as an archetype for new settlements, that is more appropriate (perhaps even more ‘Indonesian’) that the proliferating housing estates of the recent past.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Through the 1980s and 1990s Indonesia experienced rapid growth in its cities, in terms of both its population and its economy. The adoption of ‘modernisation’ as the national development strategy and the placing of cities at the centre of development have accelerated this process of growth. The complex processes of modernization, variously defined, that have gone along with this development have caused many changes in the cities: physically, such as in the city’s structure, function and performance, and culturally, such as in the inhabitants’ views of living and what might be called the rhythm of everyday life.

The cities of Indonesia appear to offer many opportunities for doing business and choosing shelter. People can undertake business activities in both ‘formal’ and ‘informal’ economic sectors, as part of what will subsequently be identified as an urban subsistence economy, or at an entirely different level as part of the global business network; and then they can search out a place to live, ranging from formal-sector housing estates to indigenous, largely unplanned and informal Indonesian settlements, which are called kampungs.

This question of urban subsistence economy is problematic, but is central to the arguments and analyses to follow. It is useful to introduce it by reference to work of Hans-Dieter Evers and Rüdiger Korff based on Jakarta studies. Having loosely defined the ‘formal’ sector of the corporatised and
taxed economy and an ‘informal’ sector of indigenous, flexible, relatively small and closed market practices (2000:20), they go on to insist on the inevitability of a third sector:

For the bottom of the urban population, money income is not enough to survive. ... [In Jakarta] an important part of domestic consumption derives from a third sector which we should like to call urban subsistence production. The concept of subsistence or subsistence production is normally associated with the agrarian sector and it denotes a form of economy in which a major part of production is for domestic consumption (Evers and Korff, 2000:21).

In the urban economy (and in the agrarian, one might question?), this money-less production and exchange, based in cooperation, mutual self-help and reciprocity, stretches far wider than mere food:

But urban subsistence production is by no means limited to food. Houses and shacks are often put together or improved from waste materials, roads are built, clothing is produced in the home, wells are sunk and water fetched, firewood is collected from garbage and household tools are also produced domestically (Evers and Korff, 2000:22).

In subsequent chapters this flexibility and inventiveness will be described as a sort of indigenous ‘genius of innovation’, and it will be suggested that it can constitute a distinguishing characteristic of kampung society. Another distinguishing characteristic however is that this subsistence production sector will have a deep interpenetration with the other economic sectors.

There is practically no such thing as a subsistence economy in which everything produced is also consumed by the producers. Similarly, there is no such thing as market economy in which all goods and services are distributed solely through market outlets. No economy or society can function without subsistence production in small entities (Evers, Clauss and Wong, 1984:29; also see Evers and Korff, 2000:140).

While this interlinking of economic sectors might indeed be in part a characteristic of the functioning of societies and markets, in the case of
Indonesian *kampung* society I would have to suggest that it also derives from sheer necessity, as an earlier study of the Evers group suggests:

... a stratum of society which has a very precarious basis of subsistence will try to survive and secure its reproduction by using all possible economic niches, by high mobility in the search for work, and by combining several production and income sources (Elwert, Evers and Wilkens, 1983).

Certainly a picture of such complex interpenetrations and interdependences of economic sectors emerges from analysis of the combination of subsistence production and wage labour in Jakarta, reported in Korff (1986).

The question that emerges from this body of work however relates to how these processes are manifested in space. For many generations, *kampungs* have been offering a legitimate place to live and in part to work. These settlements are important, especially for low-income urban people. Not only do they offer a suitable environment for cultural life, especially for those who have just arrived as immigrants from the rural villages, but they also offer a variety of localities, as they are scattered in many parts of the city. It also seems that in many ways *kampungs* can manage to interact with the fast growing city development more broadly, and can have a role participating in both the formal and informal economic activities around them. There is indication that, to some extent, the *kampung* dwellers, the corporate-sector developers and those who are involved in the wider activities of the corporate (formal) sector, have something of a symbiotic relationship, interdependence, and tolerance for each other, which makes the area alive in an entirely distinctive way.

As the Indonesian cities usually grow through processes of the densification and agglomeration of these indigenous settlements, occasionally this puts some areas at risk of disappearing under corporate sector investments, especially when the city’s development is scarcely following any pre-determined and rigorously implemented plan, but instead following the
market opportunities perceived by each entrepreneur. In these circumstances, master plans seem to be unreliable and at worst disregarded, and the city development looks more like a jumbled pattern of commercial trade-offs. For developers, the growth of the city business centres is always contentious, especially in inner city areas where such growth occurs over existing built-up areas such as the kampungs. On the one hand this development has an important role in boosting the city's economic advancement, and undoubtedly such developments receive a priority response from the local government. However it seems inevitable that the kampung dwellers in such situations will find that they are scarcely in a good bargaining position, and old communities can find themselves under constant threat from the demands of 'higher uses'. Such indeed have been the findings from Jellinek's (1991) study of a Jakarta kampung, and of more recent explorations – also of Jakarta – reported in Sihombing (2005) and Winayanti (2005).

In many cases, land and houses in this kind of kampung are subject to irresistible offers and threats of eviction from developers, who assess the area as a profitable business and trading centre for the future. These developers have many ways to persuade the occupants to sell their land and houses, ranging from legal offers, to intimidation, to incremental occupation. Both the irresistible offers and less benign acquisition actions can, either intentionally or unintentionally, lead to the disappearance of the kampungs, with the area then being transformed into a new modern business and trading area (or worse, into the urban blight of vacant land waiting for some hoped-for future development).

Some scholars (whose work is to be reviewed following) believe that the disappearance of this kind of low-income settlement would not only jeopardise the life of the residents, socially and economically, but also reduce the (low-wage) labour force available for business, and damage the viability of enterprises that might depend on the labour and services of the kampung.
Therefore, at a theoretical level, while the present research explores ideas and arguments in current Indonesian discourse on the city and its development, it also attempts to reconsider concepts and ideas that are current in Western urban theory relating to the urbanisation process and inner city change (and which interact with more distinctively indigenous ideas and debates), but in the context of an Indonesian city. These sorts of concepts or ideas are not however value-free, but rather imply certain policy prescriptions and actions. At a practical level the research will therefore inevitably raise questions concerning the policies and actions that might support the existence of low-income urban settlements, such as assisting and maintaining autochthonous informal housing.

An outcome from these various considerations must therefore be some questioning of presently prevailing theory, and of its appropriateness to the Indonesian situation.

1.2 AIM AND SCOPE

The aim of the present research is to explore the processes of change in a low-income inner city neighbourhood's community system, in an area that is being encroached upon by modern business activities.

The spatial manifestations of these processes - their spatial contexts and consequences - will be central to the investigation, and again it is useful to quote from the work of Evers and Korff (who, however, fail to address systematically the spatial dimension to which they allude):

The coexistence of economic forms like subsistence production, based primarily on local social relations like the family, neighbours and friends with informal sector activities and ... big business in the cities finds a counterpart in the coexistence of different spaces in the city ... The kampung is the sphere of a locally organized informal sector and of subsistence production, while the commercial districts are global spheres in their architecture as well as the economic activities which take place within them (Evers and Korff, 2000:23).
The key terms here are 'community' and 'encroachment', and the question is what are the processes of community change as the kampung and the space of the formal economy confront each other in space? It is recognised at the outset that the idea of 'community' is problematic in the context of kampung, but consideration of that debate is for now postponed to a later chapter.

A second and more specific aim derives from that outlined above: namely to explore shifts between conventionally understood roles of the kampungs in enabling the form of low-income 'subsistence urbanism' introduced in 1.1, and their apparently emerging roles linked to a wider urban, metropolitan and even global economy and community. It is the question of shifts in the interactions between economic sectors - subsistence, informal, formal, as variously defined. Related to this are issues of public policy appropriate to these shifts in the nature of indigenous urban communities.

A third, linked aim is to speculate on the adequacy or otherwise of present theory in throwing light on these processes of change observable in Indonesian cities. Stated rather baldly, it is a question of whether these communities are to be classified as obsolete, of the past, even slums, or rather to be seen as yielding lessons for a new urban 'archetype' - defined, following the Oxford English Dictionary, as original model - suggesting directions for the future city.

1.3 RESEARCH APPROACH

The questions implied in this three-part aim will be explored through what is essentially a single case, albeit supported by consideration of a range of other studies previously reported in a diverse literature. That case will be kampung Kaliasin, in the inner city area of Surabaya, Java. While the justification for its
selection lies ahead (in Chapter 4), the point can be made here that it presents as an extraordinarily clear exemplar of the sorts of issues introduced in 1.1 above: it is a large kampung, in seemingly good social and physical order (in contrast to conditions of social disfunction reported in Sihombing, 2005, for studied kampungs in Jakarta); it is literally up against the high-rise towers and shopping malls of Surabaya's corporate centre; and it presents a dilemma - is this spatial contiguity the context for interaction between economic sectors, even symbiosis, as implied in the work of Evers and colleagues described previously, or is it more relations of tension and confrontation that were more typical of the results from the work of Jellinek, Sihombing and Winayanti? Or do we observe a far more complex interplay of processes - interdependence and confrontation in various forms?

The limitations of a single case study are certainly to be recognised: one cannot from this one case generalise even to any other of Surabaya's many kampungs, let alone to kampungs more broadly. Rather, the value of the study is in how it might compel reconsideration of existing ideas or 'conventional wisdom' concerning processes of change in this form of settlement, or perhaps ideas about the settlements themselves, or about the effectiveness of existing policies for them. Such a study also has the advantage of being able to be set alongside other case studies, from other researchers, so that the effects of different contexts can be observed and in turn theorised. (Such comparisons will however be beyond the scope of the present study - they constitute a direction for future research.

Kampung Kaliasin and its functioning will be directly observed, and structured interviews conducted with systematic samples of its occupants - residents, resident business people, and non-resident business people. Its immediate corporate sector neighbours will also be observed, and approached for their views. Although the author is a resident of Surabaya and a long-time participant in its life, the observation of the kampung will be,
as far as possible, non-participant. (Clearly I, researcher, has my own inevitable biases, which would tend to favour the residents and their interests. Hence every effort is made place those interests and my own participation in the life of the city at a distance from the research and its analysis.)

1.4 OUTLINE OF THE THESIS

The general structure of the thesis is as follows. Chapter 2 explores aspects of the idea of 'modernisation', which has been virtually universally adopted as the claimed essence of strategic planning for the national development process, and as the driving force of the urbanisation process, particularly in developing countries, including Indonesia. In turn this process of urbanisation has led to the emergence of a complexity of urban settlements, particularly low-income settlements, which appear to exist in an ambiguous world of both tradition and modernity. The Chapter in effect explores issues raised in the introduction of section 1.1 above. It needs to be emphasized at the outset that terms like modernisation, modernity and urbanization are problematic and ambiguous: we are dealing with diverse ideas of modernization, 'multiple modernities' and highly complex issues of urbanization: the ambiguities and complexities will not be simply defined away but, rather, are to be accepted as part of the issues being explored.

In order to understand the problems of and the opportunities for such low-income urban settlement redevelopment, Chapter 3 gives an overview of the condition of low-income urban settlements in developing countries, and reviews existing urban settlement development programs and projects, with a specific focus on Indonesia.

Chapter 4 outlines the design of the research, in effect elaborating on the research outline given in 1-3 above. It starts with a closer examination of the
problem in order to focus more sharply on the research questions, followed by the selection and description of appropriate research methods and the selection of a research location. Chapter 5 then describes the development of Surabaya and *kampung* Kaliasin, as an appropriate study area that could help to carry the research forward.

Chapters 6 and 7 cover the outcome from the two main stages of the fieldwork conducted on *kampung* Kaliasin, in June 1998 and August to December 1999. The first stage led to somewhat unexpected insights (reported in Chapter 6), to the effect that the interpenetrations of economic sectors, in the sense discussed above, were at a wider scale than had been anticipated from a critical reading of previous studies – of the *kampung* with the broader metropolis rather than with some more immediately accessible locale, like the abutting towers and malls. Accordingly the survey questions and the analysis were redirected to explore these more metropolitan scale issues (subsequently reported in Chapter 7).

Chapter 8 constitutes a broad discussion directed towards exploring the implications of the fieldwork results described in Chapters 6 and 7, to reflect on theoretical issues raised in earlier chapters, and to speculate on an approach to future housing development. It is not so much an attempt to summarise Chapters 6 and 7 as an exploration of wider issues: what sorts of speculations does the overall study give rise to? Chapter 9 provides a conclusion to the project: to what extent have the aims been met, and what might be needed directions for future research?
Figure 1.1 Incompatible worlds: View of Kampung Kaliasin, Surabaya, from the roof of the parking building of Tunjungan Plaza shopping centre.
Chapter 2

PROCESSES OF URBANISATION

2.1. INTRODUCTION

The introductory chapter indicated that the emergence of complex urban settlements has been accelerated by the processes of urbanisation in Indonesia's post-Independence period, which are linked in part to the lure of the city, since urban areas have been the places for most modern-era innovations in industry, commerce, education, health care and broader culture, with their attendant opportunities. The aim of this chapter is to follow up the above statement, by exploring the phenomenon of 'modernisation', which has been universally hailed as the essence of strategic planning for the national development process in the 'developing' economies.

The chapter consists of three parts. The first illustrates the debate on modernisation as a world-wide phenomenon and guiding idea in both developed and developing countries, but with a focus on Indonesia. It explores the ways in which government pursues it as a goal, in order to understand something of the context of changes both in rural areas and in the attractiveness of the city versus the countryside (section 2.2). All the time the 'slipperiness' of the concept is acknowledged, especially in the context of the problem of 'multiple modernities' alluded to in Chapter 1 and to be explored more rigorously here. The second part describes the impact of modernisation in mobilising population and transforming culture, and the extent to which it could have an effect on the performance of the city (section 2.3). The last part describes the growth of the city to accommodate this development, and the
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effect of this growth on low-income urban settlements. There is then a brief concluding section.

2.2. MODERNISATION

In Indonesia, the term modernisation (modernisasi) is frequently heard in political pronouncements, academic debate, business rhetoric and popular culture. It has a vast range of implications, and its meaning will often vary with whoever is using the term. However, it tends to encapsulate the current range of both changes and aspirations prevailing in Indonesia.

Some of its aspects need to be articulated here, as context for the shifts occurring in the cities and in urban life. Many of the phenomena subsumed under the term 'modernisation' would be similarly encompassed in the term 'urbanisation', though the former is more usefully seen as offering a broader framework for the changes in economic relations, social structure, broader culture and political practices that constitute, in most minds, modernisation. The concept of modernisation will be discussed under two headings: political pronouncements and academic debate.

As will be argued in this section, it is not possible to think about development without putting it into a context of modernisation. In the context of an extended and sometimes acrimonious debate on modernity vis-à-vis postmodernity, David Harvey has argued that the latter is merely part of the former - a mere episode in the advance of the modern. While the debate does not concern us here, Harvey's discursive approach to defining modernity (and by implication modernisation) is instructive and useful. Harvey (1990:12) claimed that modernity, as understood from Habermas:

'... is part of the Enlightenment thinker's project for using the knowledge produced by individuals working freely and creatively for the pursuit of human emancipation and the enrichment of daily life'.

(Harvey, 1990: 12)
Harvey then, drawing on Cassier's thought, argued that the idea of the European Enlightenment incorporated the ideal of progress, that required a break with history and tradition, and which modernity promotes. (And as the 'postmodern turn' is itself just such a break, it too is to be seen as embedded in modernity!) Further, as Harvey (1990:10-11) quoted from Baudelaire (1863):

... modernity is the transient, the fleeting, the contingent, and the only security of modernity is its insecurity, its penchant, even, for totalising chaos.

For that reason, Harvey (1990:10) argued that modernity can have no respect even for its own past, let alone for that of any pre-modern social order, and that modern life might be characterized by ephemerality and change. 'It is a never-ending process of internal ruptures and fragmentation'; however he added that its outcome is positivistic, techno-centric and rationalistic, as imposed by the work of the elites (planners, artists, architects, critics and other guardians of high taste). He also cited Berman (1982) to the effect that 'to be modern is to find ourselves in an environment that promises adventure, power, joy, growth, and transformation of ourselves and the world', or 'to be part of the world', as argued by Marx.

Schech and Haggis (2000:9,11) summarised the theorists' point of view on modernisation by saying that it is a revolutionary process in developing societies, a complex process including industrialisation, urbanisation and social mobilisation with all their consequences, and a systemic process of economic development and cultural and political change.

Modernisation dominated the development thinking of the 1950s and 1960s, which were preoccupied with the idea of progress. Therefore, modernisation cannot be separated from development although, it will be noted (in 2.2.2 following), development is to be variously and diversely defined, and especially in Indonesian debates on modernisation. However, since its concept is rooted in Western thinking, it also easily slips to the concept
of the West or Westernisation. Schech and Haggis (2000:30) then concluded that 'the connection of these three slippery words are development = modernisation = westernisation'.

2.2.1. Political Pronouncements

The 1950s to the 1960s was the time when the European countries lost control of their colonies as the latter declared themselves as new independent countries, the United States of America emerged as the world's superpower, and communism and related socialist variants spread through much of the world. This condition triggered many social movements in many parts of the world, and especially in the newly developing countries (Schech and Haggis, 2000:33).

The new emerging Indonesia resolved to be part of that modernising world but different from it, which meant not attaching to either capitalism (the United State of America) or communism (the previous USSR or China), and to move away from the country's past colonial situation. Early in its independence, Soekarno, the first president and one of the Indonesian revolutionary leaders, set modernisation as a tool to bring about a sense of nationhood and national development for the country.

Soekarno was determined to prove that modern Indonesia was part of world society. It could do what the West did, but keep a strong sense of its own values and revolutionary tradition (Abeyasekere, 1987:170). In the words of one of his rhetorical statements he said:

'Let us prove that we can also build the country like the Europeans and Americans do because we are equal'. (Prijotomo, 2001:3)

He sought to modernise Indonesia by, among other strategies, constructing physical images of progress in Indonesian cities and reorganising agricultural performance in rural areas.
Soekarno could only hold on to authority until 1965, when the New Order government took over power. In the early emergence of the New Order regime, politicians, especially those who were in the Centre for Strategic and International Study (CSIS), used the term ‘acceleration of modernisation’ (Akselerasi modernisasi) in order to legitimise their new location at the centre of power and authority (Anwar, 1997). Subsequently ‘modernisation’ was also the favoured term used by the new government and politicians to promote their development schemes.

This new government tried to stabilise the country while preparing a national development plan. Moertopo (1972), a member of the CSIS who then became one of the ministers in the New Order government and allegedly ‘Suharto’s main political troubleshooter (Hadiz, 2003:102), said that being a developing country, Indonesia had a problem in choosing the right system of development. However, he argued that ‘modernisation’ was the right policy for Indonesia, since development requires planning, careful implementation, and increasing financial support. He asserted that modernisation is a process whereby development is ordered, arranged and carried out based on the idea of using all available means, scientific knowledge, skills, as well as a proper ethical orientation, to achieve one’s goal as efficiently as possible. Therefore Moertopo (1972) promoted the idea of ‘acceleration of modernisation’ as a development concept (Anwar, 1997). This accommodated the proposition of Schech and Haggis (2000:10):

'Modernisation at this time involved development planning as a key strategy to achieve desired change, with the state playing an important role. (Schech and Haggis, 2000: 10)

---

1 A. Moertopo was very influential in the earlier part of the New Order (Suharto) era, with the president strongly sympathetic with his analysis and ideas. He is therefore cited here as a reliable authority concerning the objective of government at that time.
Moertopo (1972) further argued that modernisation necessitated leaving behind the ideals of the past for the new era and future; thus it should change the socio-cultural aspects of life, as well as technical, economic and political aspects. Yet the problem was, he said, that Indonesian society was still largely traditional, and therefore modernisation should also mean changing norms that are no longer functional in the development of society and that hinder development. It was the modernisation theorists' argument that a wholesale change must take place in underdeveloped society in order to break the vicious cycle of poverty, ignorance and low productivity. Therefore not only the economy had to be transformed, but also the education system and the ways of thinking, acting and living (Shech and Haggis, 2000:9). Soedjatmoko (1974:15) stated a popular belief of the 1970s to the effect that traditional ways of thinking hindered modernisation, and that tradition was the leftovers after the better qualities of every single thing had been claimed as modern. As an example, in industrial practice modernisation meant inviting innovation and implementing new management systems, and therefore commending the modernisation that would be carried out by, for instance, the State Salt Corporation in producing pure Natrium or Sodium Chloride rather than the edible salt as produced traditionally by the salt collecting peasants. Industrialised production would replace traditional production (Kompas, 11 Desember 1999).

The new government believed that modernisation could not be separated from technology, although technology was not the goal but an accelerator in the process of modernisation. Therefore, the government prepared four strategies to introduce new technology to the society: imitation, adaptation, revolution and integration. The imitation strategy used vocational training (given in school and on the job) as a shock therapy to change the society, while the adaptation strategy maintained the traditional model while simultaneously introducing new technology. The third strategy, the revolution strategy,
directly introduced new technology to the society to achieve sudden change, although for a time with a relatively simple application. The last strategy, namely integration, introduced advanced technology by interlinking it with an intermediate technology. This action would conform with Mead’s (1974) statement that there were differences in the processes of modernisation that have accompanied different levels of technology in different periods in time. Thus, in a broader view, new nations would not have to be put through the same agonies that industrialisation had meant for workers in the developed countries, but that different approaches could be taken to development and material progress.

Mead (1974) also pointed out that by the early 1960s, instead of listening to those who sounded the alarm that the developed countries were not able to export modernised technology to everybody, and that not everyone would benefit from it, governments in developing countries started to subscribe to the idea of modernization whereby their countries should depend upon the income that would come from getting people to grow crops that were commercially valuable in the world’s markets. These schemes usually involved people who had previously lived on subsistence agriculture.

These sorts of ideas were then promoted in the Indonesia Development Plans, which were to be implemented through the government’s policies. *Modernisasi desa* (rural modernisation), import substitution, industrialisation and a few others strategies which lead to a free market policy for joining the global economy, were promoted to advance Indonesia as a modern country.

After the collapse of the New Order in 1998, some thirty-three years after its formation, ‘modernisation’ was not as popular a catchcry as ‘reformation’, the spirit of the more recent social movement. However, some current politicians still use the word ‘modernisation’ in ‘reforming’ their parties, which means reviewing the existing conditions of the political parties, that is the
structure, organisation, internal management, and education of cadres, in order to obtain people's trust (Anggoro, 2000).

2.2.2. Academic Debate

'Modernisation' is also preoccupying the Indonesian academic discourse; many debates occur in trying to locate it in a national development context and as in the political arena, it remains a slippery concept, defying any single rigorous definition. Supangkat (2000), supporting ideas of Kartodirdjo, argued that the Indonesian nationalism movements in the early 20th century were already part of Indonesian modernisation, not only politically but also socially, economically and culturally. The young Indonesians who had the opportunity to get a European education became the agents for this change, and a process of transformation (from tradition to modernity) developed through the movement. This movement very much underlay Indonesia's revolt for independence, and the struggle to set up a politically and economically stable nation. However, he notes, the ideas that would connect nationalism and modernisation were not further developed, since modernisation was seen as dominated by the promise of a form of modernism that was ultimately rooted in industrial capitalism.

Later, in the early 1960s, a discussion group of young Indonesian scholars was interested in interpreting the contemporary jargon term, 'modernisation', in order to understand the 'current Indonesia', and to propose some ideas for the future Indonesia, post-Soekarno (the first President). They concluded that 'modernisation' is perplexing, and therefore to simplify the discussion and unify their perception of modernisation, they agreed to accommodate Barbara Ward's assertion that 'modernisation is aiming to raise living standards and give people some hope of a better life'. Accordingly, the scholars emphasised that modernisation should be neither Westernisation, nor an overpowering of the mind, nor profane (Anwar, 1997). However, despite converging in that
definition, 'modernisation' is still being invoked in every step of Indonesia's progress, but it remains confused with a range of meanings.

Koentjorojekti (1996), a well-known Indonesian economist but also significant in the arts, noted that modernisation was different from industrialisation. He asked that artists should properly understand development jargon before they presumed to reject, accept or react to it, since this jargon was taken from and developed from the experiences of other countries. Therefore artists and others should be clear in their minds that industrialisation was different from modernisation. He emphasised that industrialisation needs modernisation, but modernisation does not necessarily need industrialisation. He argued that modernisation brings about a qualitative change, such as transformation of social values, structures and behaviour, while industrialisation brings about measurable outputs, such as numbers of factories, labourers, infrastructures, etc. Therefore, he asserted that once industrialisation has been chosen, its consequences have to be tackled, such as factory construction, as well as its effects on urbanisation and the need for increasing education.

In the debate on modernisation versus tradition, there are some pros and cons. Those in favour of modernisation argue that it is not the opponent of tradition. Modernity offers the hope of progress, civilisation and emancipation, although it is also inseparable from nostalgia, rootlessness, fragmentation and uncertainty (Jervis, 1998), therefore they would certainly remark that any effort towards standardizing values that could bring traditions and their diversity to an end should be fought against.

The common expert view of Indonesian modern art seems not to see any contradiction between the modern and tradition. Modern art developed from traditional art within the present community in order to be more acceptable and to satisfy the consumer. It should not only satisfy the local admiration for nature as in the traditional arts, but also accommodate the representation of
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current events and ideas and serve as a social critique (Rusyana, Kompas, 25 Juni 1999).

Prijotomo (2001), in considering Maclaine Pont’s ideas on modern Indonesian architecture, stated that Maclaine Pont focused neither on modernising indigenous architecture, nor the Indonesianisation of European modern architecture. Maclaine Pont’s works were, rather, on the integration of modern construction technology with indigenous Indonesian architectural philosophy and forms. Therefore his designs can be seen to have signified the beginning of a modern Indonesian architecture movement, in line with Soekarno’s nationalistic criticism of Indonesians for being ‘Western’ in their modernisation movements. Prijotomo then argued that the architects who practised in the 1970s could be blamed for Westernising Indonesian architecture, since they often treated the term Westernisation as interchangeable with modernisation.

This argument corresponds with Hutabarat’s work on respecting traditional values but also pleasing the consumers of modern fashion. Hutabarat (2000) argues that modern women should find expression in traditional costume; therefore ‘Kebaya modern’ is modified from the values and the beauty of traditional apparel but accommodating present practical needs. Modern styling should be more flexible and free; therefore it is argued that the latest accessories such as the latest Versace shoes or handbags could go with Kebaya modern. Some artists believed that exploring and opening tradition to the broader society should not always relate to something basic and rigid, but to the more dynamic aspects of the culture. This appreciation could be seen as opposing Kant’s recognition, cited by Harvey (1990:19), that aesthetic judgement had to be construed as distinct from practical reason and

---

2 Henry Maclaine Pont was a noted Dutch architect who practised in Indonesia
understanding. The blurring of modes of reasoning or judgement could be liberating.

The current Balinese community has also experienced a process of renewal or modernisation of their traditional arts. This is indicated by the emergence of new ideas in the traditional arts, and is a reflection of the realisation that Balinese artists would have let their traditional art stagnate if it had not experienced a renewal and resurgence, albeit in part market inspired. (Dibia, Kompas, 13 Agustus 1999). Further, Bandem (Kompas, 13 Agustus 1999) observes that modernisation is a process of change that has come about to accommodate the inquiries of a modern community, and therefore it is difficult to distinguish between traditional arts and modern arts. There is no need to argue which is which, the traditional or the modern; rather, the important thing is how the artist is continually being creative and brilliant. As Frank Lloyd Wright observed (cited by Harvey, 1990:19), artists must not only comprehend the spirit of their age but also initiate the process of changing it. Modernity is as much a culture of representation as it is a form of experience or a period of history (Jervis, 1998).

Madjid (1997) notes that the development of science and technology has seemed to promise lots of progress and an easy path for those dealing with modernisation, although in some cases modernisation causes a crisis in spiritual values and the broader culture. He also observes that in modern society not only are there many expectations and opportunities but also challenges. Syamsulhadi (Kompas, 12 Maret 1999) claims that modernisation ignites social conflict. Rapid social change arising from modernisation, industrialisation and the advance of science and technology, has brought changes in how people think and behave. Many people were fascinated by modernisation, and thought that modernisation would bring instant

---

3 The Balinese are arguably the most famous ethnic group in Indonesia in term of their guardianship of traditional culture and arts.
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prosperity; but there is an agony in modernisation for those who cannot compete, and there is unemployment, criminality, drug abuse, the absence of welfare support, and other social disorders. The reaction of individuals to the pressures on living standards was one of stress. Further he states that rapid social change could also cause loss of identity. Although Simbolon (2000) argues that ethnicity would not be subdued by modernisation, yet modernisation could cause social disintegration. Mead (1974) stated that this was the argument people used when they were talking about modernisation as implying an alien, imperialistic and negative transformation, with impact on certain societies against their will, while Giddens (1991) stated that:

'The modern world is a 'runaway world': not only is the pace of social change much faster than any prior system, so also is its scope, and the profoundness with which it affects pre-existing social practices and modes of behaviour' (Giddens, 1991: 16)

2.2.3. Multiple Modernities

The intricacies of this debate bring the attention back to the notion of multiple modernities foreshadowed in Chapter 1. Adrian Vickers insists that Indonesian (Javanese) constructions of modernity are 'imagined' in the Andersonian sense (see Anderson, 1991), and are contested. While criticising John Pemberton's analysis of the New Order (Solonese) 'modernisation' as turning back to the Dutch, and seeing it as weakly theorised, Vickers (2004:30) further insists that:

Forms of Islamic modernity, or the 1990s clashes between Ikatan Cendekiawan Muslim Indonesia (ICMI) technocratic modernities and Suhartoist mystical invented traditions do not intrude into [Pemberton's] elegant narrative. We catch glimpses of resistance in the refusals of modernity by rural mystics, but such forms of agency are denied to urbanised Javanese, who are judged as passive acceptors of the New Order, for example in their enthusiasm for the kitschy Taman Mini theme park (Vickers, 2004:30).
Tim Bunnell, looking at the Malay Peninsula, similarly stresses (and moves to theorise) the problem of multiple co-existing modernities:

Modernity's multiplicity is not to be conceptualised in terms of an 'easy pluralism' of contextualisation through which: (1) an implicitly Western 'global' is localised in 'other' places; or (2) a transcendent 'political economic' is modified in relation to diverse 'cultural' knowledges. Rather, to recognise the modernity of other(s') places is to acknowledge the non-West as a source of self-theorisation and truth claims - the non-West as producer, as well as mediator, of knowledge which is extra-local, even global in scope (Bunnell, 2004:20).

Bunnell notes further (2004:150 n5) that this understanding would necessitate a dialectical conception of the global and the local. The global is therefore not to be seen as some monolithic whole, but as 'a set of situated and interrelated knowledges and practices, all of which are simultaneously global and local' (Moore, 1996:9).

Bunnell's observation thereby sets a theoretical context in which to observe intersecting worlds of the kampung and the corporate towers and malls: both are 'modern' (and 'modernising'), but differently so. It is a point that Evers and Korff similarly make:

The modernity of the Southeast Asian city ... consists of both, the slum and the high-rise, subsistence production and global finances (Evers and Korff, 2000:23).

And it is interesting to note that much earlier Terry McGee had similarly argued for this sense of cultural modernity's multiplicity:

The Southeast Asian city is a mosaic of cultural worlds each invoking the memory of other lands and people (McGee, 1967:24).

It is partly in this context that Armstrong and McGee (1980) write of an 'urban involution', with the co-existence of a firm-type modern economy with a bazaar-type economy (and on the bazaar or informal economy see also McGee and Yeung, 1978).
Citing work by Terry McGee from the 1960s and early 70s to the effect that Indonesia is a case of 'urban involution', Evers and Korff (2000:44) observe that Java is very densely populated, but exhibits only a low level of urbanisation. While people were pushed from the countryside into the cities, nevertheless economic development was not proceeding fast enough to provide employment for the urban population, 'Thus the majority of population in the cities moves into a labour-intensive traditional economic sector characterized by underemployment, low productivity, and very low incomes' (McGee, 1976:70).

[In Indonesia] ... cities grow, despite their failure to industrialize, not because of industrialization' (McGee, 1967:18)

Arguably the most important point here is that, following Bunnell, the kampung is to be seen as a locus for the production of knowledge that is modern, to be accorded equal legitimacy with that of the corporate capitalist world, and equally global in its significance to its own time. And, following McGee, it will draw on a vast diversity of experiences and memories, and diverse (even rival) economies will co-exist.

2.2.4. Government Actions and Plans

In implementing his concepts of modernisation, Soekarno promoted a modern Indonesia by joining and hosting some international events for other neighbouring developing countries. Among those events were the fourth Asian Games, the first Ganefo (Games of the New Emerging Force) and the Bandung Summit, and initiating the emergence of the Non Block Countries Alliance. He challenged Jakarta, the capital city, to become 'the gateway of the country' and the 'beacon of the Asia and Africa emerging nations' (Kusno, 2000:54). Soekarno raised the profile of Jakarta by constructing modern
buildings and infrastructure, which were then intended to become a model for other Indonesian cities.

This was the initiating era of mass urbanisation in Indonesia, especially in Jakarta, when adventurous people tried to express their liberation by engaging in the development of the city, although between 1947 and 1957, which marks the revolutionary period, Indonesia was economically and politically unstable. At least eight different government coalitions attempted to direct the country, and the government lost control over its military expenditures, the cost of imported rice, subsidised goods, show-case projects and discretionary funds (Prawiro, 1998).

Along with these booster developments, strengthening the national economy was also seen as an urgent task for Indonesian self-determination; as the government claimed, economic development was essential. Agriculture was the main vehicle for this development. The city would support rural development, which in turn could ensure sustainable food supplies. Modernisation would ‘help’ the peasants to develop and to manage their agriculture better by using a promoted modern management method called Koperasi (Co-operative, implying co-operation and mutual self-help and benefit). This Koperasi would inspire peasants to go through the process of agricultural modernisation, not only by introducing new organisations in society, but also a new economic approach, shifting from barter to cash, and thereby changing rural people’s concepts of traditional community structure and relationships (Soedjatmoko, 1984:4-5; Prawiro, 1998).

Moenadi, the governor of Central Java Province, for example, declared that the Regional Development Plan (Pola Dasar Pembangunan Daerah Tingkat I Jawa Tengah) for the Central Java Province was rural modernisation (modernisasi desa) (Suara Merdeka, 1974). He claimed that ‘rural modernisation’ was a perfect scheme not only for getting a better life but also for protecting both the community and the government from the spread of communism, the
prime political enemy for the New Order government. He believed that rural areas, in which most of the people lived in poverty, would become a fertile ground for spreading communist ideas. He stated that, in principle, modernisation was leading to new ways of thinking, new ways of working, new organisation and all other things that would suit the current development needs. He noted that rural areas, which used to be seen negatively (politically, economically and even culturally), should be transformed to become actively capable of taking care, governing, developing, and improving themselves in all aspects of life, especially the socio-economic ones.

In echoing the United Nations modernisation approach in agricultural development, especially the program for improving the quality of the main crops for daily consumption, rural modernisation was organized in national mass intensification (intensifikasi massal or Inmas) and mass community guidance (bimbingan massal or Bimas) programs throughout Indonesia. These programs not only promoted varieties of new hybrid rice seeds, for example, but also new techniques and methods for cultivating them. The rural co-operative organisation (Koperasi) became much more prominent in this movement, especially for managing the circulation of peasants' money during cultivation, and the supply of seeds and fertilizer.

This program became much stronger in 1980 as the government implemented specific intensification (intensifikasi khusus/Insus) and pre-specific intensification (pra-Insus) programs, a new way of cultivating and benefiting from hybrid rice seeds. The challenge was to achieve national rice self-sufficiency. This objective was accomplished in 1984, when Suharto (the second president) received a UN award for this effort and even achieved oversupply a few years later. This oversupply of rice caused the government to establish a regulator, a stock bureau (Badan Urusan Logistik = BULOG), through which the peasants, the merchants and consumers could allegedly be protected.
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against disadvantage (Prawiro, 1998), although it was not so uncomplicated in its practice.

However in 1998 Tjahjadi, the co-ordinator of the Indonesian Pesticide Action Network and secretary of kelompok Tani Perintis Pertanian Organik Magelang, stated that although agricultural modernisation had been in place for more than thirty years, it had failed to raise the peasants' status and prosperity. This failure was because modernisation was irrelevant to the peasants' future, unless they could exercise their rights in managing their harvest, receiving incentives and credit for their organic crops, choosing their industrial union, and freeing themselves from the BULOG rice monopoly that inflicted losses upon them. The problem was that the agricultural modernisation had introduced new management of their harvest and new peasants' organisations that were however tightly controlled by the government.

Rice production however was not the only agriculture development promoted by the government at that time. It also promoted intensification of hard crops, such as clove (which boomed in the 1980s), sugar cane, palm (kelapa sawit), and other crops. These were not as successful as rice, since the programs only assisted some of the bigger farmers, but not ordinary peasants.

Yudohusodo (1999) claimed that the Indonesian agricultural development program could succeed only by developing new agriculture areas on modern agricultural principles, with a dynamic and progressive approach to agricultural business which was market oriented, profit oriented, flexible in accommodating needs, and productive. He suggested that the idea of modern agricultural cultivation could be broadly explained and demonstrated, since it could swing the idea of subsistence agriculture towards a mechanised agri-business, in turn supporting agri-industries in the same or neighbouring areas. Sadjad (1998) added that modernisation is also about developing knowledge, especially in approaches to production, such as
reaching and maintaining quality standards, and improving marketing management.

Transmigration is another government approach in both apportioning opportunities to people as well as distributing labour throughout the Indonesian region, with the objective of extending working opportunities, developing local capacity, eliminating regional divergence, alleviating poverty, and strengthening national unity. However, Yudohusodo (1996) has argued that there were some obstacles such as cultural differences and unequal employment opportunities, and in particular the attractiveness of Java over other regions of the Archipelago, especially for the owners of capital and for skilled or educated persons. There was also the effect of other government policies that favoured Java.

A further approach to the ideal of successful modernisation, or in other words to support for the national development program, related to education, or human resource investment on which economic development was ultimately most dependent. Starting from 1984, the government launched the compulsory primary-education policy, which gave all Indonesian citizens access to primary education, either regularly or in special courses. By 1990, 92% of the elementary school age children were in school (BPS, 1990). This was followed by the compulsory secondary education policy in 1989. These policies brought about a major transformation for Indonesia, and were expected to increase the adult literacy rate from 81.5% in 1990 to 85.3% in 1996 (UNDP-BPS, 1996). Formal education becomes the basic requirement for participating in modern business activities; the higher the level of education, the more opportunities people would have. Likewise however, this is also raising the expectations of the younger generation of rural peasants, as they look to get prestigious clerical work in the city and escape from the laborious, muddy work in the field.
Along with the education development program was the health development program. The government has provided health service centres in each district, supported by health service posts in every neighbourhood unit since the third five-yearly national development plan (*Rencana Pembangunan Lima Tahun /Repelita III 1978-1983*). This program proceeded with the help of the international foundations that promoted fulfilment of the citizens' basic needs, which Schech and Haggis (2000) stated was a change for the better as it was a shift away from the development model of narrowly-conceived modernisation. The basic needs approach was a program promoted by the World Bank for the developing countries, for correcting the effects of the unsuccessful trickle-down economic theory. This health improvement program has helped Indonesia to increase the life expectancy rate from 63.2 years in 1990 to 66.0 years in 1996, and to decrease the infant mortality rate from 56 per 1000 babies in 1990 to 44 per 1000 babies in 1996. Furthermore, as proposed by Lipton (1988), this health development program is not only improving the living condition of Indonesians, but also increasing labour productivity that could enhance industrialisation.

As a consequence of modernisation policy, Indonesians also struggled with the establishment of a new structure and new values for society (Moertopo, 1972; Soedjatmoko, 1974). In this context the government also adopted the cultural approach for development (Taum, 1996), in which mutually reinforcing links between cultural meaning and the process of socio-economic transition would be created. In some ways this approach could be seen as social engineering where motivational programs, such as *Inmas, Bimas, Kredit KIK* (small investment credit), and motivational organisations such as *Koperasi, BULOG,* and *Kelompencapir* (Kelompok Pendengar, Pembaca dan Pemirsa) were actively employed.

---

4 *Kelompencapir* (Kelompok Pendengar, Pembaca dan Pemirsa) is a group of peasants who are actively involved in agricultural development learning programs carried out by the
There are many critics of the government's rhetoric and its attendant modern development schemes throughout Indonesia. There were also many negative impacts of the development, such as the shifting of community life patterns from self-sufficiency to dependency, the disappearance of traditional culture (local languages and dialects, local subsistence production and its attendant skills and technologies, village-based crafts, local myths and their supporting oral traditions), the emergence of social jealousy as a result of discrimination, apathy, and increasing disaffection with the government.

Harvey (1990) observed that modernisation since 1948 has been very much an urban phenomenon, that it existed in a 'restless but intricate relationship' with the experience of explosive urban growth, strong rural to urban migration, industrialisation, mechanisation, massive re-ordering of the built environments, and politically based urban movements. Modernisation is a creature of cities and evidently finds its natural habitat in cities - the urban experience is important in shaping the cultural dynamics of diverse modernist movements. De Certeau (1984, in Harvey 1990) stated that in the practice of everyday life he saw the city as 'simultaneously the machinery and the hero of modernity'. It appears that cities will be the centre of modernisation, while rural areas will support it and be supported by it.

The Nature of Investments

Lipton (1988) claims that an urban-biased government will neglect rural projects as they are apparently less profitable (and hence less 'bankable') and will tend to cut down its own effort if donors step up theirs. Therefore, he states that the urban bias in development, especially in poor countries, is

government via Radio Republik Indonesia/RRI (the Republic of Indonesia Broadcasting Services), learning assistance (by government fieldworkers) and Televisi Republik Indonesia/TVRI (the Republic of Indonesia Television Broadcasting Service).
damaging. It creates a potential conflict between the rural classes and the urban classes.

When Soekarno boosted Jakarta as the country's focus of attention, it was the start of an era of Indonesian modernisation that preferred the city. This continued into Suharto's New Order reign. Moertopo (1973) claimed that in the framework of Indonesian development, the economic function of a town is as a production centre for goods and services, while the function of villages is as a place of agricultural production. In that context, Indonesia has tried to develop some major cities as economic development centres by improving their infrastructures for attracting investment, and through support with other development programs, such as transmigration and other social developments. However, Jakarta is the central focus of Indonesian development. Under the New Order regime as a centralised government, Jakarta became not only the centre of power but also a magnet for the accumulation of national investment.

Transformation of the Countryside

Prawiro (1998) noted that until the 1970s the Indonesian peasant could not get into the formal economy. Most peasants lived in subsistence agriculture, not only because they believed that money was a risky possession, and therefore should be avoided, but also because they explicitly trusted the barter system of Indonesian agriculture. According to the government however, the barter economy should be eliminated and replaced by trading using money for transactions in order to create national economic stability. Therefore the government drew the peasants towards cash or a monetary economy and away from a barter system, in order to set up a strong foundation for economic development.

Two methods were implemented: first, using its development agents, BULOG and Koperasi, the government encouraged peasants to sell their products for money, rather than by bartering for other products, and it
promoted new seeds and fertilizers for purchase. Secondly, they set up banking networks in villages, which offered credit to farmers for improving their agriculture products. Prawiro (1998) noted that the government believed that this village monetary program would not only improve the prosperity of villagers by integrating their work into the monetary economy, but also would accumulate a large amount of investment capital that could be of benefit for national development.

As a sociologist, Rahardjo (1998) noted that social dynamics, development, and industrialisation-modernisation, which have occurred intensively since the 1970s, have changed national behaviour. Money economics, rational thought, and labour efficiency have become a new ideology. 'If there is money there is a service' has replaced the old institution of mutual-help (gotong royong). He was unhappy that the Indonesian traditional law could not provide resources for the community to defend itself from modern 'fascism'; as a result many traditional communities could not defend themselves against the movement towards the industrial community. He suggested that Indonesia should enforce its own traditional institutions in order to compete with the new environment that is already leading to a society that is much more individualistic, materialistic and commercial. Japan was seen as a good example of keeping traditional institutions while adjusting society to modernisation.

Yudohusodo (1999) also noted that there have been many changes and rapid development in rural areas, not only in their physical condition but also in people's perceptions of their livelihood. The rural community is changing, as rural people adopt a commercial orientation and demand stronger prosperity. He saw this as a good value, but unfortunately agricultural land in rural areas has been converted to other purposes: across the whole country over the 1983-93 decade, it had shrunk from 0.93 ha to 0.83 ha per person, and
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for Java island from 0.58 ha to 0.47 ha per person (Sensus Pertanian 1983-1993). This condition has hindered the development of agricultural business and pushed people to participate in other seemingly promising business activities. He blames this shift in thinking on their education, and on the development of agricultural cultivation technology which has caused an educated generation no longer to wish to participate in 'hoe-agrarian' agricultural practices. Moreover, introducing the new concept of government land (tanah negara) to replace community land (tanah ulayat), and the industrial culture as a substitute for rural or agricultural culture, has caused the community to become strangers in their own land.

Earlier Sudjatmoko (1958) had argued that, under the Koperasi (Co-operative) development programs, the introduction of co-operative organisations, agricultural machinery and mechanical equipment for small-scale industries would change the people's moral philosophy from an agrarian to an industrial pattern, which in turn would lead the peasants to become industrial workers. This circumstance would then change the villagers' social relations and attitudes. Further he stated that the penetration of 'modern economic life' also influenced the villagers wishing to find new means of livelihood and seeking a better existence in the cities. In raising questions about 'incentives', he noted that when the surplus rural population drifted to the city, thereby turning their backs on the limited offerings of village life, they were supplying a labour force, which then carried on the urban economic development program. He also remarked that mastering modern technologies was also linked to accepting other expressions of modern culture. Rural modernisation is intricately linked with the urbanisation process, and there has

---

5 Approximate calculation from the national data of Land Utilization and number of population supported by National Statistic Bureau (2003), ten years later the agricultural land is more shrunken; 50,422,983 ha agricultural land should be divided by 206,264,595 people, so that only about 0.25 ha per person.
accordingly been a wide debate on how this process could influence the growth of the city and the quality of life of its citizens.

This Indonesian debate on modernisation has related to the situation and condition of Indonesian society in the period of early independence up till the collapse of the New Order in 1998. It reflects the interaction of social forces and government policies in transforming modern Indonesia. The phenomenon of modernisation with the politically based promotion of the 'enlightenment of daily life' all suggests a strong movement to advance investment, national life and populations to urban areas.

2.3. THE 'URBANISED' CITY

Clark (1996) claims that urbanisation, understood as the increase in the proportion of the population in towns and cities with a significant shift of population from rural to urban areas, has a long history, but was accelerated in the late nineteenth century by the emergence of industrial capitalism as a dominant economic and social formation. It was associated with the expansion of employment opportunities in the city and the decline in agricultural work caused by increased agricultural efficiency. This section will describe the process of urbanisation as it initiates the growth of a city, and will look at its impact on culture, especially as it has occurred in Indonesia, where cities are being urbanised principally by agglomeration and densification of local settlements.

2.3.1 Urbanisation

To explain the present process of urbanisation, Clark (1996) pulls together ideas of Taylor (1973), Castells (1977), Pred (1977), Goldfrank (1979), and Chace-Dunn (1989), to show that urbanisation has been in large measure a consequence of colonialism and imperialism in establishing external
relationships, yet nowadays this is changing with the developing world phenomenon of global economic demand. He emphasised that capitalism, with its concentrations of productive activity whereby workers and their spending are also concentrated in specific centres, underlies these later processes of urbanisation.

Further, Gugler (1996) argued that the distinct patterns of urbanisation in different regions are shaped by the legacy of their urban history as well as differences in per capita income. However, he noted that as long as employment conditions and transport costs permit, 'life in a dual system' pattern could be quite enduring for many urban men who work in the city and regularly visit their village-based families. One consequence of its development program is that Indonesia has experienced this 'dual system' phenomenon that is in some ways akin to the situation prevailing earlier in the industrial revolution of Europe. Factories, machines and cities and their proliferation were characteristics of the era of the New Order government. Populations in cities and most industrial areas grew larger, as people from rural areas migrated for work.

However, Gugler (1997) states that the urbanisation process in developing countries did not follow the Western pattern. The urbanisation process in developing countries is a result of the unbalanced growth of population and development between rural and urban areas. The faster growth of urban areas should have driven the emergence of the service sector along with the manufacturing sector and industrial growth. Since the formal sectors could not, however, support the levels of need for services, there have risen many informal sectors. Undoubtedly the new occupations associated with these rising informal sectors also allowed and encouraged people to move off the land.

Firman (1990) predicted that in the decade of the 1990s global economic development would effectively encourage more developing countries,
including Indonesia, to enhance their industrialisation and participate in the
global economic system. He urged that Indonesia should anticipate changes in
the global economic movement, otherwise it would jeopardise its urban
environment. He noted that industries will prefer big cities and their
surroundings as their operational location, since these areas provide better
infrastructure and production facilities and are equipped with support
facilities such as services and accommodation. Big cities such as Jakarta,
Bandung, Surabaya and Semarang can participate in these global economic
activities, by attracting not only industries but also people. The rapid
industrialisation and urbanisation will not only increase the demand for land
and urban facilities, but also change the nature of rural economic activities.
With the ratio between land and population decreasing, peasants cannot
depend on agricultural activity any longer, and are therefore much more
involved in non-farm economic activities or the informal sector.

As urbanisation has become a global phenomenon, it is not only
Indonesia that has experienced very rapid urbanisation. In 1993, problems of
urbanisation caused the members and associate members of the United
Nations' Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UN-
ESCAP), including Indonesia, to set up a Regional Action Plan on
Urbanisation. The consequent report (UN-ESCAP, 1994) stated that it was
projected that urban areas in the UN-ESCAP region would account for over
fifty five per cent of the region's population in the year 2020.

Urbanisation, which UN-ESCAP accepted was closely related with
national economic growth policy, has not only led to the growth of mega-
urban areas, but has also compelled governments to look for new management
skills. The report stated that governments should embrace urbanisation as an
important resource for urban economy and productivity, as well as a great
challenge to ensure that physical, environmental, social and economic
development can complement each other, although urban poverty and urban
Modernisation and Urbanisation

environment are the crucial issues. There were six recommendations and proposals for actions that could be applied, namely: formulate and implement urbanisation strategies and policies; reform economic policies and resource allocations; promote intra-governmental coordination and cooperation; strengthen local authorities; invest in human capital; and improve urban information and research.

Dick and Rimmer (1998) confirmed the idea that the city is the frontier of modern Southeast Asia nations. He noted that the proportion of the total population in these urban areas was predicted to rise from 22 per cent in 1975 to 37 per cent by 2000 and 55 per cent by 2025 (UN, 1995), with industrialisation as the driving force of urbanisation.

Tjiptoherijanto (1997) remarks that in 1990, 30.9 per cent of the total Indonesian population (or 55.4 million people) lived in urban areas, with forty per cent of these people living in big cities (of more than 1 million population), 20 per cent in medium cities (from 500,000 to 1,000,000 people) while another 40 per cent lived in small cities. However, it should be noted that 27 of the 43 cities with more than 100,000 people were in Java Island, and these will increase as economic activity drives most migrants into cities, and increasingly into those of Java. Government policies on economic development that offer work opportunities are especially significant in underpinning the direction and flow of the migrants.

2.3.2 Cultural Transformation

The Question of Culture

We will be concerned following with the notion of 'the culture of the kampung', but the term is not unproblematic. In one sense culture is everything – language, tradition, myth, technology, relations of family and clan, art and craft, religion, beliefs. However as the present project is essentially concerned
with community and space, it is useful to approach the idea of culture via some consideration of its role in the production of a distinct space, and in such an endeavour the ideas of Henri Lefebvre are especially potent.

Lefebvre argued that space is socially produced. Every society, in every age and in every mode of production, produces its own space. This frames and assigns places to the relations of production (including biological reproduction, the social and cultural reproduction of labour power and social relations, and the reproduction of appropriately supportive beliefs and ideas). There must be specialised locations associated with production, representation, control and repression; thus dominant spaces of 'the centre' will determine the subordinate spaces of 'the periphery' (at one level the Jakarta versus Surabaya dilemma!). The on-going production and reproduction of this space involved the complex relations between (1) 'representational spaces' (physical settings, the actual lived and experienced space – the kampungs, their houses, laneways and stalls, the corporate towers, shopping malls and the rest), (2)'spatial practices' (human interrelationships with space, thus our perceptions or 'reading' of space, how we use it and in turn shape it by our use), and (3) 'representations of space' (the meanings of space, space as conceived or interpreted, both our own ideas of an ideal space and the utopias that governments or reformers would foist upon us) (Lefebvre, 1991:31-33; 37-39; 53). Our discursive understanding of this production of space – our ability to distinguish and comprehend this tripartite spatial formation process – will in turn affect the processes of space's reproduction.

A definition of culture, for present purposes, can usefully be limited to the interactions of 'spatial practices' and the popular (as distinct from elitist or official) 'representations of space', in the Lefebvrian sense. And in this understanding, local culture will constantly be modulated and re-formed by the actual 'representational spaces' in which people find themselves – it is a reflexive process, akin to Anthony Giddens' notion of 'structuration', or the
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structuring of social relations across time and space, in virtue of 'the duality of structure'. The duality of structure refers to the argument that 'structure [is both] the medium and the outcome of the conduct ['spatial practices', in the present context] it recursively organizes; the structural properties of social systems do not exist outside of action but are chronically implicated in its production and reproduction' (Giddens, 1984:374).

It is in the context of this notion of structuration that Giddens invokes the question of tradition, as 'the moral command of 'what went before' over the continuity of everyday life'. But, he adds, tradition is never 'wholly refractory to change or to diversification of conduct' (1984:200). So tradition will be part of culture, but it will not block the development of new spatial practices, and hence the production of new forms of space. While the kampung might be seen as 'a traditional settlement form', it is also one of increasingly rapid change and evolution.

Urban Culture

'Urban' is a label for a particular type of place and specific patterns of association, values and behaviour. Traditionally it was only used to refer to those who experienced and actually lived in cities, and whose lifestyles were distinctively urban in character and fundamentally differed from those elsewhere. In 1996, Clark argued that many people who live in remote locations have a lifestyle similar to that of the city as a result of long-distance travel, telecommunications, and the mass media: illustrating the arguments of Lefebvre and Giddens outlined above, their lifestyles (cultural formations) are transformed by their forms of engagement ('spatial practices') with the new 'representational space' that is 'represented' in emerging Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs). Such observations have however led some critics to a 'substitutionist approach' to the analysis of urban culture, whereby new ICTs are seen to 'substitute' for older forms of human contact.
and communication (for example Virilio, 1997), and the cities are increasingly caught up in a 'space of flows' (Castells, 2004). It is however useful to observe warnings, for example from Thrift (1997), Mitchell (2004:124-125) and Graham (2004), against the over-simplification of such views: instead, these critics argue 'for a richly social and contingent view of the recombinations of face-to-face and mediated communications' (Graham, 2004:98).

Clark (1996) also however noted that there are many people in the developing world's mega-cities who retain associations and behaviour patterns that are more like those in rural areas: their attitudes and values are permeated and constrained by the traditional influence of religions, family and geographical parochialism. He also believes that the first and second generations of in-migrants have not yet been fully affected by incorporation within urban society. Thus the culture of the kampung might usefully be viewed as characterised by transformations and recombination of 'presence' (face-to-face communication) and 'telepresence', as argued by Mitchell (2004:124), but also a 'distanced presence' reinforced by memory and possibly nostalgia.

'Presence', in this sense, is also transformed by the numbers of people in interaction, that is by migration into and out of the kampung. Illustrating urban culture, Clark (1996) cited Wirth (1938) to the effect that the size of the social group determines the nature of human relationships. Increasing the number of inhabitants in a community beyond a certain level reduces the possibility of knowing all other members personally. On the other hand, Gugler (1996) argues that the history of urbanisation and current patterns of migration have had a major impact on urban social organisation and culture, since kinship patterns still tie the migrants to kin and to the people of their home villages.

However, Schech (2000) claims that there are some important points of contact that should be looked at between culture and development. Some of these are at the point where development, modernisation, and Westernisation
占用the same place, even stand in for each other; but also at the point where reflection on development and culture is equated with modernisation as a process and in anthropology is seen as a field of study; and the point where modernisation is equated with development and defined as 'the right culture' and, most importantly, where the culture and development cannot be understood without each other.

Culture of the kampungs

The idea of 'urban culture' introduced above is useful as description, but is ultimately reductionist - simply, cultures are radically diverse. Something of their specificity however is to be read from their spaces and spatial practices. So Hardoy and Satterthwaite (1989) argued that people's culture has always been reflected in the houses, neighbourhoods and settlements that they develop for themselves, as culture is also to be seen as representing accumulation and refinement of experiences over long periods of time.

Pratt (1998) has emphasised the links between place and identity, and if we accordingly accept that identities are 'a process, a project, and a performance', then it is compatible with such an understanding that a stable identity is re-enacted (reproduced, in the sense argued above) through daily life. Therefore, places not only enable but express the performance of particular gender, class, and racial identity. Therefore she argued that there is a need to take seriously the historical geography of identity formation. Massey (1994) also argues that it is inappropriate to view places as bounded because any boundaries are permeable, the global flows through the local, and the local is always dynamic.

In the specific low-income settlement forms of Indonesia, the kampung communities are in some of their characteristics similar to other low-income neighbourhoods in third world countries, which Clark (1996) indicates are blended communities resulting from an urbanisation process, but retaining
strong characteristics of rural community. The kampungs that served the agricultural communities have changed in character to serve the people of the cities. The transformation from rural-like settlements into urban kampungs involves a process of transformation from village dwellers into kampung dwellers (Haryadi, 1989, after Atman, 1975 and Williams, 1975). At the same time the occupational structure of the kampung dwellers has changed from agricultural to non-agricultural work, which then brings about the emergence of new forms of social organisation. Geertz (1956) claimed that this change had been a period of adaptation; it was not simply disintegration, as urbanisation is so often described. O'Connor (1983) described it as the growth of communities within communities. He argued that this was characteristic of the structure of the later cities and the distinctions of the social hierarchy in indigenous Southeast Asian urbanism. Further, he noted that the transformation from rural-like settlements into urban kampungs involves a process of transformation from village dwellers into kampung dwellers. This supports Silas's (1999) argument of kampung as a nurturing place for cultural sustenance.

Although kampung communities may have changed from homogeneity to heterogeneity, they have however successfully maintained their relationships, as Haryadi (1989) noted in his examination of the strategies of residents in coping with environmental pressure. The story of kampung Kebon Kacang, as studied by Jellinek (1992), described the close relationships among the residents, although this kampung accommodated migrants from a range of ethnicities and origins. In some cities kampungs can become a place to accommodate specific ethnic groups from other places. However, they tend not to become isolated settlements that do not accept others. (These are issues that will be taken up further in Chapter 3, following.)
2.4. **URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

Clark (1996) theorised that global urban development is a consequence of two linked processes: changes in the way in which wealth is accumulated (sequential development of the prevailing economic system from mercantilism, through industrial and monopoly capitalism, to transnational corporate capitalism), and the evolution of the world-system of nations (concerned with the division of the world into progressively larger spheres of economic association and exchange based upon changing space relations and systems of supply). This condition applies to the development of the Indonesian coastal cities. As most historians argue, their development followed the pattern of the original trading harbours (Geertz, 1965, Rutz, 1987, Wiryomartono, 1989). This section illustrates the process of growth of the Indonesia cities that leads to a complex problem of urban settlements.

2.4.1. The Growth of the City

Geertz (1965) noted that the structure of cities in Indonesia could be mostly characterised into two types, the coastal cities and the inland cities. The development of the coastal cities was more influenced by trading and business activities, while the inland cities were more influenced by the power of authorities (kingdoms, religions and others) (and see also Wertheim, 1980; Evers and Korff, 2000:27-28):

The growth of Indonesian cities has been subject to a series of different cultural influences. As Rutz (1987) summarised, there was initially no urban culture in the sense discussed above; however, the original single supra-local settlements had a town-like structure, the basic form of which is still recognisable as today's 'kampung'. The oldest towns were predominantly shaped by Indian-Hindu culture, which was then enriched by the Chinese migrants' tradition of building structures, polished by the European's
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(Portuguese, Spanish and Dutch) building styles, and later in the late 19th and 20th centuries by European planning influenced by industrialisation. This juxtaposition of numerous different elements characterised the urban landscape; the mixture of elements within a confined area constitutes one of the peculiarities of towns and cities in Indonesia. Towns of the colonials were initially little more than overgrown villages (Baks, 1988, after Wertheim, 1958). As the town’s population grew, the village people settled in the existing native quarter or kampungs. Thus the kampung grew by more than the natural increase of its population. Population spread to adjacent desas or rural villages, turning desas into kampungs. Thus previous rural settlements ultimately turned into native town quarters, or kampungs. Therefore the Javanese town is a collection of great numbers of kampungs. Differences among towns depend on their functions and economic base – most notably between the coastal and the inland towns (and see Evers and Korff, 2000: 31-39).

By 1920, the danger of urban sprawl and total disorder, with the accompanying strain on the urban community, had been recognised, and a number of improvements were implemented up to the end of the Dutch colonial period. Attempted improvements however were only moderately successful, because of the economic crisis of the Soekarno period and the continuation of rural to urban migration.

The chaotic Soekarno years did not encourage progress, since they were dominated by the quest for prestige. Later the New Order regime, impelled by increasing population, created a new type of imbalance by its policy of favouring cities (Rutz, 1987).

Clark (1996) and Berg et al. (1982, expanding on Hall et al. 1973), believed that western cities evolved in a clearly defined sequence of development stages, which were urbanisation, exurbanisation, counterurbanisation and reurbanisation. The evolution followed a 'logistic curve' that leads to an achievement of functional balance between rural and urban populations.
Further, remarking on the ideas of Berg et al., Clark argued that a 'stages of development' model is only a descriptive model that relates to the shift of population within and around the city with reference of the strength of the daily urban system between the city core (a central business district of shops and offices surrounded by an inner area of mixed industrial, wholesaling, warehouse and residential uses), and the outer ring. It provides a useful conceptual framework, but it has no predictive content; therefore it cannot explain the recent African and Asian phenomenon where cities only have a few signs of significant exurbanisation or of the next evolutionary stages.

Tjiptoherijanto (1997) claimed that in the period of 1971-1990 the Indonesian urban distribution tended to be of an integrated but spatially dispersed city structure. Some big cities tended to become mega-urban as they integrated with some smaller cities surrounding them, such as Jabotabek (the broader region of Jakarta-Bogor-Tangerang-Bekasi), and Gerbangkerto-susila (Gresik-Bangkalan-Mojokerto-Surabaya-Sidoardjo-Lamongan), which could be regarded as primate cities, structured with dependent cities surrounding them. These dependent cities would consume and rely on the facilities of their core cities, and therefore could lessen the public services, such as provision of water supply, electricity, waste disposal, which then could create environmental degradation, slums, industrial pollution, insufficiency in public transport, and other problems.

Population mobility was the other major factor in urbanisation. Tjiptoherijanto (1997) summarised two contradictory theories describing the relations between economic development processes and population mobility and distribution. The first is the equilibrium model, which holds that without government intervention the periphery would share the benefit of the central development (the city) by a trickle-down effect. This model states that central development not only increases the productivity of village labour and increases demand, but also takes in unemployed city labourers. The second is
Myrdal's theory of circular and cumulative causation, whereby people, goods, investments and the privatisation spirit are sucked out of the villages and come to the cities. To avoid this, government intervention over spatial distribution is needed. Rondinelli and Ruddle (1978) pointed out that this latter was the most common condition in third world countries, since in most of them investments and resources are concentrated in the city.

2.4.2. Inner City Change

The city as an engine of growth (Hall, 1992) would lead one to expect the value of land to reflect the level of economic activity. Therefore the debate on inner city change is usually based on the transfer of high value land from poorer groups to business activities, since the land would become too valuable for their settlement conditions. This process of city development based on economic development can scarcely be argued against, as we observe cities becoming more spatially differentiated, with relatively prosperous areas and pockets of deprivation surrounding. The developed countries experienced this condition decades ago and have had to face the problem of how inner-city based business and nearby employment opportunities can proliferate and grow for the benefit of the inner city residents. They thus recognised that inner city regeneration will require a radically different approach, which includes social programs (Boston, 1997). Home (1982) in this context argued that: first, problems and perceptions of the inner-city situation constantly change; second, adverse effects of rising unemployment and structural changes in the economy have overtaken the approach of tackling localized pockets of urban deprivation through social programs; and third, local government and local agencies have a specific role in seeking real solutions. He stated however that third world experience and that of the developed world cities are not transposable, as causes are very different.
However, despite the different causes of change, similar situations are also arising in modern cities of the third world, with reducing opportunities for low-income people staying in inner city areas.

2.4.3. The Urban Settlement Enigma

Hardoy and Satterthwaite (1989) explain that the rapid growth of cities in developing countries has been caused by the movement of rural people to cities since the 1950s or 1960s, as most of the colonial empires broke up and independent governments were set up after World War II. They see rapid and uncontrolled growth as a big problem for third world cities, since many people are living in illegal settlements or slums, and are unemployed. However, they insisted that the growth of those illegal settlements can be viewed not as the growth of slums but as the development of cities in a way more appropriate to local culture, climate and conditions than that advocated by the government.

Government low-cost housing projects have delivered too little and their products have usually ended up in the possession of middle-income groups. This is usually due to the government's limited financial capacity and the complex and poorly organised bureaucracy. The affordability of housing is a major concern (Hardoy, 1989). The elaborate stages of the process required to get a house, and the difficulties of the low-income community to get 'formal' housing which is safe, convenient and legal, have especially been commented on by Marcel (1979).

Usually low-income people who try to find an adequate income or to make a living in cities end up in low paying, poor quality jobs. Family income is never sufficient to pay for a decent house; therefore moving becomes an escape from unsatisfactory conditions, giving hope of better conditions in a new location.

Low-income housing in the formal sector is unaffordable (there are fewer options and a greater gap between the wish and the fulfilment), and the
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government is blamed for its unwillingness/inability to increase the supply, reduce the cost, provide land, and assure provision of infrastructure and services (Tipple, 1998, Hardoy and Satterthwaite 1989). Therefore the consequence is that low-income housing is always inadequate, dangerous, overcrowded, insecure and typically poorly located.

However, in understanding the need to develop ties between local authorities and national or international agencies, the inadequate quality of low-income houses is a point of dispute. The simplest example of a housing program to address inadequate quality is eviction. In simple terms, eviction prohibits people from living in a particular house or place, and requires their movement to other areas. However, in some places eviction could have a similar meaning with simple displacement, forced removal, house demolition, land expropriation, population transfer, relocation, resettlement, slum clearance or even ethnic cleansing or expulsion. Although the right to adequate housing has been strongly advocated by the UN Commission on Human Rights, Resolution 1993/77, its full attainment is still a long way off.

In the urban context, there are various excuses made to justify eviction, but '... for the sake of development...' is usually the preferred one. Such development could be associated with projects such as re-organising urban spaces, removing or reducing housing subsides for low income groups, holding a prestigious international event (e.g. world summit, sports), implementing infrastructure projects (e.g., construction of subways, new central business districts), doing urban redevelopment projects or city 'beautification'. This condition puts the community under the threat of forced removals, housing demolition, land expropriation, population transfer, relocation, or resettlement.

In describing such a displacement, Jellinek (1997) tells of an experience of migrants to Jakarta who were subsequently forced to take involuntary resettlement. She quoted the case of Sumira, who was representative of other
people who had lived in a kampung for many decades but had to move. The government replaced her old and illegal kampung with new apartments, which then became available for the previous kampung dwellers. Living in apartments was a different experience from living in a kampung. They had to adjust to the 'modern' system such as paying instalments, being a good customer for electricity and water corporations, maintaining their new apartments and, last but not least, being prohibited from using their flats for making their living as they used to do in their old kampung houses. Jellinek (1997) noticed that life in the apartments was empty compared to kampung life years ago; she remembered the colour, and the hustle and bustle, with neighbours beavering away at different activities.

Forced evictions and associated forms of displacement have emerged as a key form of social disruption. For example, the changes of school and loss of friends cause great difficulties for the whole family in maintaining social relations, and business people have to set up new business relationships. Yet, this is similar to the process of gentrification in western cities, a transfer of high value land from poorer groups (although in the third world case their ownership or occupation may always have been illegal). This practice of forced displacement has many serious aspects that should be highlighted (Smith, 1986).

Low-income people will always struggle for houses if the opportunities are reduced. Therefore the more they are unable to find affordable houses the greater the gap between their expectations and the realities. The point is, if low-income families could find decent housing that they could afford, it could break the cycle of constant moving and the heavy cost imposed on all family members. The traditional kampung, it will be seen following, has tended to supply those opportunities.
2.5. CONCLUSIONS

From the above discussion on modernization and its impact, we can draw a few observations relevant to the low-income settlement pattern of Indonesian cities. First, we would expect a disorientation among the new residents of the city, as they bring poor levels of 'urban' skills, poor education, limited experiences, but great expectations to a modern metropolis. Stated otherwise, expectations are likely to be unrealistic. Second, the old mutual-help (gotong-royong) is eroded by money economy. Third, money economy in turn implies the eroding effect of the formal economic sector: the kampung could manifest all the confusions of a dual (formal and informal) – or is it tripartite (formal, informal and subsistence production and exchange)? – economy. Similarly, there can be a dual social structure, as the kampung dwellers might reside in their kampung, but their hearts and identity are back in their rural village (desa), while all the time there is the transforming effect of new information and communication technologies, even if only 'on the sidelines'. And following on from this dual social structure and identity, there will most likely be a long persistence of essentially rural customs, values and ways of seeing the world.

Finally, the official (or elitist) view can increasingly see the kampungs as 'substandard', presenting the wrong image of the city – or perhaps as presenting the opportunity for other, 'higher and better' uses. So there can arise pressures for the displacement of the kampungs.
Chapter 3

THE DEVELOPMENT OF LOW-INCOME URBAN SETTLEMENTS

3.1. INTRODUCTION

Chapter 2 argued that urbanisation, driven by processes of modernisation in both city and rural areas, continues to transform the urban environment. Cities grow to accommodate people and their proliferating activities; the more activities there are the more space is needed and it is increasingly difficult to meet this increasing demand for space. Sometimes a place has to be fought for, when a space for living is confronted by other activities that are commercially more 'valuable', and whose proponents can pay a higher price. In such cases the low-income settlements, and especially those in the inner city, seem to be most vulnerable. This circumstance seems to add more troubles to the provision of low-income housing.

To obtain a clear description of the housing problem for the low-income group, the aim of this chapter is to observe the nature of their settlements, their experiences in finding a place to live, and it reviews the practical experience of various institutions in implementing low-income housing assistance programmes and projects.

It starts with a description of low-income urban settlements (in section 3.2), including their nature, with emphasis on the Indonesian context, and moves on to review attempts to improve affordability through government policy development, especially Indonesian housing-policy development (in 3.3). It then explores a variety of approaches to alleviating the housing
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problem, such as clearance and redevelopment, gentrification, urban renewal, relocation and settlement improvement, including infrastructure improvement, housing improvement schemes, and resettlement (section 3.4). The strengths and weaknesses of these approaches are discussed as a basis for setting up a context for particular housing problems, bearing in mind that some of these actions could also create other problems. The last section of the chapter (3.5) explores a special approach to improving low-income settlements in Indonesia that has been claimed to have a positive impact on the community, namely the Kampung Improvement Programme. Conclusions are then drawn in section 3.6.

3.2. LOW-INCOME URBAN SETTLEMENTS

A low-income urban settlement is a housing estate for the less fortunate urban inhabitants, who have less opportunity to obtain adequate housing. However, in many cities this kind of settlement is frequently labelled as a squatter settlement or a slum (Yadav, 1987). Yadav points out that it is also very difficult to define slum, since the idea of slum itself is so vague, arguable and sometimes politically slanted. However, he claimed that this jargon could be mapped out, based on the idea in which it was developed, has diverged, been adopted or distorted. This section will describe the environmental conditions of low-income urban settlements and their position in the housing provision debate.

3.2.1. The Nature of Low-income Settlements

Yadav's work in 1987 was a very elaborate exploration of low-income settlements. He noted that there are many titles for low-income settlements, with different cities or regions having different conceptions and classifications.
A low-income settlement emerges as a slum when local authorities or researchers decide it to be part of the city that should be declared so and prepared for improvement (albeit sometimes the decidedly draconian 'improvement' of eradication!). It is an area in which the social and physical environment is judged so unhealthy as to be a hazard in a variety of aspects of life (physically, mentally, socially or psychologically).

For sociologists, Yadav (1987) noted, this kind of area is familiar variously as a grey area, a lower class neighbourhood, a low-income area, a renewal area, a deteriorated area, an inner core area or a blight area. In academic terms, this same area would be variously labelled as a marginal area, a transitional area, an uncontrolled settlement, a spontaneous settlement, a substandard settlement, an unplanned settlement, an autonomous settlement, a provisional settlement or an unconventional settlement. Moreover, Yadav (1987) also noted that in their places of origin these areas would have their own 'regional names' such as Bustee, Jhuggi, Johnpri, or Chawl in India; Favela, Barrios, Calumpass or Jaeala in Latin America, and others elsewhere.

Yadav (1987) drew from studies back as far as the early industrialisation era in the 18th century, when the word slum was used as a term for squalid housing in densely populated districts in industrial cities. From studies of Robertson, Ford, Partridge, and Clinard, he summarised that a slum is an unwholesome dwelling with a filthy environment and deteriorated physical condition, with basic repairs no longer being made. It is situated in a crowded district of town and inhabited by low-income classes or very poor people.

In the studies of the Chicago School's sociologists in the 1920s, he noted that slums were always denominated as social units that were submerged and detached from the city as a whole; they were areas that had reached the limits of decay, extreme poverty and all sorts of social evil. Further he stated that based on studies by Prakasa, Seely, Hunter and others in the 1960s,
despite the fact that slums were the locus of poverty, this did not mean that they were not engaged in the economic and social development of the city. This contradicted a UN report (1981), which mentioned that slums and squatters in selected cities in developing countries are uncontrolled settlements with marginal inhabitants who do not have any capability to contribute to national economic growth. Yadav (1987) also noted that urban slums have a role in providing cheap rent or self-built housing for rural migrants starting their new life in the cities.

Hardoy and Satterthwaite (1989) claimed that migrants are neither the problem themselves, nor the main cause of housing problems. They are not the only low-income groups searching for shelter in the city. They argued that in many cities, there are many more city-born people than recent migrants living in very poor accommodation. They spend almost their entire life just surviving, with only limited chances to find a stable income and better accommodation. Their lack of income hinders them from acquiring good quality housing. Hardoy and Satterthwaite (1989) went on to note some common ways in which poor people find their accommodation in a city. Commonly they build or buy a house or a shack in an illegal settlement, rent a room in an inner city dwelling or cheap boarding house, share a house or room with friends or family, or live or sleep in public properties, depending on their particular needs. Accommodation within easy reach of jobs or places where income can be earned is the most preferred, rather than housing that might be more suitable for its cost, size, quality or access to services. Specifically Hardoy and Satterthwaite (1989) also noted that the poorer the individual or household and the less stable their source of income, the less flexibility they have in terms of where they can live and how much they can pay.

In Indonesia, as observed earlier, a low-income settlement is commonly called a *kampung*, both in urban and in suburban areas. However in some
Indonesian regions, an autochthonous settlement is also called a *kampung*, whether it is for low-income groups or not. Therefore, defining this low-income settlement as a slum is also debatable, as it reminds us of Yadav’s statement on the debatable definitions of slums.

Many scholars have tried to describe and define *kampung*, Geertz (1965) stated that within *kampung* most houses are small with very little space between them, and constructed of bamboo or a combination of brick and bamboo. In addition, he also stated that over the years, as *kampungs* undergo changes in their density and the heterogeneity of their residents, the *kampung* remains less integrated into the city system than other urban residential areas.

Sullivan (1980) stated that *kampung* is a maze of alleys and compact dwellings with a variety of building conditions, from ‘permanent’, through ‘semi-permanent’ to definitely ‘temporary’, with some houses inaccessible by car or any other means of transport wider than a person. Gugler (1982) previous to Baross argued that *kampung* is also a working place since there is an imbalance between the supply and demand of formal services. This statement is supported by Baross (1983). He noted that besides its function as a human settlement, a more important characteristic of *kampungs* is that they are also human workplaces. For many residents the use of the *kampung* as a work place is more important than its use as a place to live. Most of the *kampung* enterprises are informal economic activities in the sense observed in Chapter 1. These *kampungs* then develop from rural *kampungs* to semi-rural *kampungs*, to semi-urban *kampungs*, and finally to urban *kampungs*. This idea is supported by Barks (1988), who stated that *kampung* is a native quarter whose population has grown by more than its natural increase, spreading to adjacent *desa* (rural villages) and transforming them into urban *kampungs*. Funo (1987) imagined the inner-city *kampung* as a half-boiled egg: the
*kampung* is enclosed by solid buildings along the major streets, but is amorphous inside, with a mixture of housing types.

Many other researchers have also tried to describe *kampungs*. As many towns in Indonesia develop by engulfing the agricultural land and rural villages that surround them, Haryadi (1989, after Atman, 1975, and Williams, 1975) stated that most *kampungs* begin as rural villages. In a specific reference to the city of Yogyakarta, Guinness (1989) stated that *kampung* was traditionally a compound for the nobles and their retainers, the servants of the palace, specific groups of artists, traders or even foreigners. By the early twentieth century the term *kampung* was designated to be an off-street neighbourhood inhabited by the lower classes of the city. Haryadi (1989, after McGee) described *kampung* as originally a rural-like settlement in the city with a low density of houses, homogeneous residents and enriched by different types of vegetation. Irrespective of the way *kampungs* have developed, Haryadi (1989, after Rapoport, 1983) noted that their most important characteristic is that the physical structure tends to persist during the process of transformation from a rural to an urban *kampung*.

Administratively, some *kampungs* are legal and some are illegal. They are often at the back of upper class properties without easy access, have less infrastructure and fewer public facilities, and are beyond the reach of government laws (Guinness, 1989).

However, Silas (1990) is claiming that Surabaya does not have a slum area. He mentioned that *kampungs* cannot be classified as slums, because their condition does not commonly match the slum criteria such as lack of infrastructure, undesigned, isolated from other communities and overcrowded. On his work for the Municipal Government of Surabaya, Silas described the *kampung* as follows (1992):

*It is not a squatter settlement or slum; it is continuous and incrementally developed self-help housing, mostly on traditionally owned land in traditional ways... It is an indigenous concept of*
housing and community of various sizes, shapes and densities. Kampungs are strategically located in all parts of the city, providing easy access to different employment opportunities and services. It generates within itself vast home industries ranging from manufacturing of leather, cloth, and metal goods, to various ready made food and services. Kampungs housed about two thirds of the urban population, offering different standards of housing at different price levels, mostly for low and middle low income families. After improvements by Kampung Improvement Project (KIP), a kampung is an opportunity for 'east' (indigenous) to meet 'west' (modern) in its originally preserved context, life style and uniqueness. (Silas, 1992: 18)

Wiryomartono (1995) sees kampungs as a characteristic feature of Indonesian cities. Kampungs are to be perceived not only through their physical characteristics, but also as a manifestation of the efforts of their inhabitants in responding to their environment.

A review from the Habitat report (UNCHS, 2000) stated that kampungs are informal, low-income housing areas, which are self-built through traditional and informal housing systems. Most kampungs have some claim to historical land rights, which still prevail, and may be complemented by other tenure systems, formal, traditional or customary (Silas, 1988). In this context, the kampung can be understood as a place of living for Indonesians, especially low-income urban inhabitants. It is generally agreed that this type of settlement has helped low-income people to fulfil their housing needs. Nevertheless, they are often deficient in their physical structures and lacking necessary infrastructure.

3.2.2 The Provision of Low-income Housing

Tipple and Willis (1991) noted that in developing countries there are many policies and programmes for reducing major housing problems, especially the shortage of affordable accommodation for the urban poor or the low-income majority. However, those programmes tend to result from political
appropriateness rather than a rational and informed analysis of the situation and the demands of individual households for housing.

Tipple and Willis further stated that for the last three decades housing programmes for the urban poor have failed, especially for the poorest twenty to forty per cent of the population. First, this is because of the inability of poorer nations to set aside enough of their annual public sector budgets to provide enough dwellings (generally only around 2% of public sector budgets) (after Woodfield, 1989:8). Second, many squatters tend to move out of formal housing since they wish to combine affordability and usefulness in relation to employment and trading opportunities (after Jagannathan and Halder, 1987). Third, housing is only assessed in terms of size and quality of the building structures, but hardly ever assessed as an important setting for the broader aspects of the people’s lives.

The following section will discuss two regular types of housing supply, namely direct government provided or controlled housing, which is labelled as formal housing, and community based housing, which is usually labelled as informal housing, both in a theoretical and a practical sense. This discussion is focused on developing countries in general and on Indonesia in particular.

**Formal versus informal housing provision**

The need for housing varies and changes over time. Therefore, if the government provides only standard solutions in terms of particular locations with little or no choice on prices, repayment conditions and size, especially for poor people, projects will fail (Hardoy and Satterthwaite, 1989). This is a criticism of the formal housing system operated by the government or its agents in an authoritarian and inflexible way. In contrast is the private-sector housing supply system that can combine semi-formal production with formal (public-sector) control – though such control is usually very weak or non-
existent – and that accommodates the efforts and work of individuals or
communities, especially that of low-income people, to provide themselves
with appropriate housing. This system derives from the recognition that most
of the housing in developing countries is based on this self-help approach.
People do build their own houses, although only some are legally registered;
most are built as substandard housing and unregistered, and sometimes are
built on informal or illegally occupied land.

Hardoy and Satterthwaite (1989) outlined two possibilities for low-
income people to find accommodation in existing cities. The first way is by
converting existing apartment houses in central districts, that were originally
built for middle or upper class people who had now moved to suburbs, by
putting partition walls in for three or more families. He said that this
happened in some Latin American cities such as Sao Paulo, Rio de Janeiro,
Buenos Aires, Mexico City; or in Asian cities such as Colombo, Bombay,
Delhi, and Lahore, or in African cities such as Ibadan or Kano Zaria. In some
slum areas, such as in Calcutta and in the recent past in Korea, the process of
subdivision resulted in five-square metres or less for a single industrial
worker, or even worse, with two or three people sharing the same bed in turn
over the twenty-four hours.

The second possible way is finding accommodation in cheap (legal or
sometimes illegal) settlements. In the case of Indonesia, the kampung is the
first choice (either legal or illegal). The legal kampungs are those that
developed from traditional settlements and are administered in the
municipality as residential areas, while the illegal kampungs are those that
developed by occupying unattended land (that legally belongs to someone),
cemeteries, river-banks, safety easements along rail tracks and other non
residential areas. Later, some of these settlements could be legalised by the
municipality as residential areas.
Urban *kampung* is on all the evidence the most favoured alternative for low-income urban housing in Indonesia. Not only does it give a wide range of alternatives, in terms of type of accommodation, tenure, sizes and price, but also it guarantees housing flexibility for different socio-economic and cultural status groups (Silas, 1983). Furthermore Silas points out that, although *kampungs* cover only 30% of the built area, they take care of some 70% of the urban housing needs.

**Community housing**

Community-based housing is actually a means of enabling low-income groups to build their own houses with or without assistance from housing institutions. This section discusses community based housing that is built without assistance from housing institutions, whether non-government organisations or a government organisation. There are many forms of community initiative and effort to assist people to build their own houses.

Not surprisingly, low-income groups always try to get their housing resources cheaply. They usually try to get cheap *land* in marginal areas including illegal areas, or sometimes by illegally subdividing their parents' or ancestors' land. The *building materials* will commonly be a rejected building material or sub-standard products, and will often also be second-hand or recycled. They also adopt what is commonly termed *appropriate technology*, through simple or traditional techniques. Subsequently the *human resources*, that is the people who will help them to build the house, are the local house builder, relatives, neighbours or even immediate family members, who can be paid in small amounts of cash or sometimes in kind. They usually get the *housing finance* by patiently saving or sometimes using inherited money. As they commonly must build in stages, the part of the dwelling that they need most urgently will be built first, with further stages and improvements in quality to follow later. Frequently, community groups such as groups of
fishermen, farmers, rickshaw or taxi drivers or company employees will set up cooperative arrangements to build or improve their settlements. They will organise and manage all of the housing resources. Ways of securing land, building materials, builders and sometimes even a professional architect, will be financed jointly through a share-based scheme or by rotating savings.

The production process thus combines elements of both informal and subsistence production in the sense introduced in Chapter 1, incidentally thereby revealing the interdependence of different modes of production and exchange.

3.3. INDONESIAN HOUSING POLICY AND PRACTICE

Indonesia has a dual approach to its housing programmes, namely formal housing supply and informal housing supply. On the one hand housing is a government responsibility, but on the other hand people are allowed and encouraged to be housing providers. There are some agents that perform the formal housing supply function, such as Perum PERUMNAS (the National Housing Agency), private housing estate developers, housing co-operatives or housing foundations, and other government institutions and private corporations that supply houses for their own employees. One of the government agents for this formal housing supply is the Department of Transmigration, which provides houses for migrants under the national transmigration project. The informal housing supply is the work of the people themselves, with or without some small private entrepreneurs, as can be seen in both old and new community settlements such as the kampungs.

Historically, Indonesia had no significant and effective housing policy or programmes until the New Order government began its Five-Yearly National Development Plans (REPELITA). The identification of problems and the development of policy can be traced to this initiative. Problems in the formal housing sector and policies to tackle them can specifically be traced
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3.3.1 Pre-REPELITA

The first attempt to deal with the national housing problem after Indonesian independence was by organising a congress on Healthy Housing in 1950. This congress concluded with three assignments for the government:

- First, the establishment of a Housing Division in the Department of Public Works;
- Second, the establishment of Yayasan Kas Pembangunan/YKP (a Development Finance Institution); and
- Third, the development of national healthy-housing standards.

The Housing Division was established in 1952, while the YKP institution and the Housing Research Institute for establishing the national healthy-housing standards were established later, in 1954.

However, in the fifties, after the war for independence, the immediate action that needed to be taken was overcoming the rush of illegal housing occupancy. There were many houses and areas of land left behind during the war; and when the people, including some 'freedom-fighters', returned to the cities, they occupied those vacant and unattended houses and areas of land. Emergency regulations were then set up; occupation permits had to be applied for from the local military office, as the agency assigned by the housing office to administer a request before being endorsed by the institution. Some years afterwards, some personnel from the military and the housing offices used this right to control housing and development action, including the permit to build a new house. The government realised that this practice hindered any encouragement for building new houses, and therefore it promulgated law no.1/1964. This was the first introduced policy to
promote housing development, along with the operation of Yayasan Kas Pembangunan/YKP, in 120 cities and towns in Indonesia to build affordable houses for people. Unfortunately, some of these institutions had to be liquidated later due to the inflation that reached over 800% at that time.

Meanwhile the Housing Research Institute has continued to develop, and has been recognised and appointed by the United Nations as a Regional Housing Centre for studying housing in hot-humid areas. This research centre brought in many housing experts to Indonesia. However, there was almost no further housing policy development, until the first Five-year National Development Plan (Repelita) in 1969.

3.3.2 The Five-Yearly National Development Plans (REPELITAs)

In the first REPELITA (1969-1974), the identified housing problems were the imbalance between growth of population and housing supply, the emergence of illegal settlements, and the low quality of houses and basic services. To address these conditions, housing policy was designed to promote a basic needs approach.

In urban areas, the aim of the programme was to provide housing for those in minimal socio-economic and well-being situations, to prevent deterioration of the existing housing stock, and to introduce a physical facility to stimulate and mobilise community-housing resources. In rural areas, housing problems were seen and understood as part of broader community problems. Communal self-help (gotong royong), the traditional rural system of self-help, would be utilised and enhanced in promoting people’s awareness, skills development, and promotion activities for healthy settlements.

The second REPELITA (1974-1979) attempted to address the problems of the housing deficit. The prevailing economical weakness of the community
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In this period housing was seen as one aspect of economic growth, and therefore the aim of housing supply was to provide enough units, within a reasonable environment, to increase family productivity and improved resource distribution.

Housing policies of this period sought to meet housing needs and to support equal distribution of development programmes to all citizens, in a functional relationship between rural villages, towns and cities. The emphasis was to promote research on building materials, to develop construction industries, and to create an effective and efficient financial system. In practice not only housing institutions have been established, but also technical training and housing information dissemination. Together with the public sector/government, urban people were encouraged to reduce the housing deficit. The government provided land, urban services, mortgages, and improved the low-income settlements (kampungs), as part of its programmes on urban renewal. In addition, government also encouraged and increased the production of less expensive building materials as well as formulating national housing standards.

The rural housing programme was enhanced with information dissemination and technical training, along with the several Program Pembangunan Desa (Village Development programmes). For example, provision of infrastructure for sanitation and water supply would be initiated and related to the Village Development programme. The government would provide new rural housing or settlements only in transmigration areas or in resettlement and disaster relocation areas.

A set of housing programmes was implemented in 1976; some of these included the production of low-cost housing, the Kampung Improvement
Programmes (KIP), and the establishment of housing institutions (developers and real estate bodies) to supply middle and high-income housing. Towards the end of the period, some low-cost dwellings had been built and villages had been improved by the construction of group bath and toilet facilities, provision of drinking water, and also main road improvements.

The third REPELITA (1979-1984) faced a potential problem in the limitation on low-income people building their own houses. The main issue was access to land and funding, especially in urban areas. In this period about 20% of the population had already moved to urban areas, and mostly they were low-income people. They filled the urban kampungs where housing conditions were already sub-standard, and as a result the KIP needed to be increased.

At this time housing policy was tackling the problem of the affordability of housing, along with an integrated approach in housing programmes to improve the living standards of the people. Establishing a suitable housing finance system would increase mobilisation of resources and housing construction support from the low-income groups. Provision of services such as drinking water would be given a higher priority; and the promotion of building material production, training and improved building techniques would be continued.

Urban housing for low to middle-low income people was intended to be constructed by Perum PERUMNAS (the state-owned housing enterprise). By the end of this period, this would comprise 60,000 low-cost units, with a further 60,000 units in wider areas of Indonesian cities, which were supported by Kredit Pemilikan Rumah/KPR (housing ownership loan) from Bank Tabungan Negara/National Saving Bank (the first bank established for the provision of housing loans). Private housing developers were targeted to supply another 30,000 low cost houses. Simultaneously the Kampung Improvement Programmes would also be implemented for 15,000 hectares of kampung,
which would benefit some 3,500,000 persons. The Rural Housing Improvement Programme would be used to improve facilities in 6,000 villages, while water supply programmes for district towns would be implemented in over 600 locations.

The formal problems set for the fourth REPELITA (1984-1989) were the need for an integrated approach to the urban planning process to increase the effectiveness of settlement improvement programmes, especially in terms of infrastructure services. In this period housing policy assumed three roles: first, to improve the existing settlement conditions to reach a desired standard; second, to improve overall urban housing conditions by introducing standardised low cost housing; and third, to improve the performance of the housing programme system by basing it on research, development and information dissemination.

Therefore in this period, first the Kampung Improvement Programme would be more widely implemented, supported by national and international funding along with the national rural housing improvement programmes aimed at improving environmental health. Second, private developers would be supported to provide sixty percent of formal urban housing for middle and higher income groups. And third, research would especially be aimed at an integrated development approach in the overall urban programme.

In supporting and improving self-help low-income settlements the government had a number of approaches, such as the Kampung Improvement Programme (KIP), Kredit Pembangunan Perumahan (Housing Improvement Schemes), Pembangunan Perumahan Bertumpu Pada Kelompok/P2BPK (Community-based Housing Development), resettlement, and the presidential decree on land sharing. These various approaches were generally introduced in the context of REPELITA V and REPELITA VI.

In concluding this section it is useful to consider the impact of the strengthening debates on globalisation. Nas (1998) noted that the influence of
global ideas on 'proper' housing in Indonesia had clearly strengthened in relation to both the low-cost and the well-to-do segments of society. However, in challenging the somewhat speculative theory that with globalisation a 'third' culture had emerged and was surpassing national culture, he strongly argued that the Asian variants of globalisation with regional connotations have to be acknowledged. He put forward some reasons to support his idea. So he traced back to what he called the 'housing civilisation offensive', an early form of globalisation, when the Dutch implemented a western conception of health and hygiene in all of their colonies.

The above phenomena occurred not only in Indonesia, but all over the world, especially in developing countries with citizens struggling with their lives, while governments struggled to accommodate them and to cope with numerous problems of providing for basic needs, including housing, and attaining the conditions for a better future. In order to have a wider view on how the broader world deals with housing problems and sets up various development programmes, especially in the developing countries, the next section will describe some of these approaches.

### 3.4. CURRENT APPROACHES TO LOW-INCOME URBAN SETTLEMENT IMPROVEMENT

The perspectives on the urban housing problem have changed over the years, and urban settlement improvement programmes are only one of the approaches for taking care of those housing problems. It is a question of how government can tackle the existence of settlements that would be categorised as slums or degraded low-income settlements. Some approaches will be explored in this section: clearance and redevelopment; gentrification; urban renewal; and urban upgrading approaches.
3.4.1 Clearance and Redevelopment

The concept of slum clearance in developed countries was based on the idea that the use of renovation grants for physical upgrading of houses at the end of their economic life did not offer value-for-money (Carley, 1990). In certain conditions, however, it could be integrated in with other housing improvement programmes, either where the houses could not be improved at reasonable cost, or where the land was needed for the benefit of local residents (Thomas, 1986). In this approach the slums are replaced with new housing as the old settlements are cleared. The residents are temporarily moved, and then re-housed in the new buildings. High-rise is usually the choice, since it can fit more people into a given area of land and address housing standards. This form of development still allows people to remain in their favoured place.

In developing countries, governments used this kind of programme to clear illegal settlements or squatter settlements on illegal land. For example, in South Korea, from 1951 to 1965, the government used the clearance programme to remove squatter areas in parks or green zones. Government brought back the settlers to their original place, or resettled them in some suburban areas or in rental apartments, but the provision of rental apartments was subsequently discontinued because of government financial problems (Cho, 1995). The evaluation of this programme showed that there were many unsatisfied beneficiaries, especially those who were relocated in an isolated place away from their daily working area and with insufficient infrastructure. Further, the programme involved the expansion of low-income housing to the suburban area and a few years later these had to be included in urban renewal programmes. However Cho (1995) also stated that the action to some extent helped the South Korean government to counter problems of environmental and aesthetic deterioration, and somewhat return the land to its original use.
The Costa Rica government also utilised this kind of programme, designated as slums eradication, taking the form of a programme for replacing dilapidated housing in inner urban areas with improved housing units, physical infrastructure, and social services (Gutierrez et al, 1995). Gutierrez noted that despite the success in providing better housing (as fifty percent of those who lived in slum areas have been housed), problems do remain. This highly subsidised programme failed in some ways, such as lengthened cost recovery, losses owing to non-repayment of loans, and the action of some opportunistic beneficiaries (as people who got a housing grant would often put up their lot or house for sale at considerable profit, return to their original area, and come back some time later and once more claim to be eligible for a subsidy).

Indonesian experience on clearance programmes has some parallels with the above practices. Clearance would typically be aimed at achieving a better environment. However the evaluation of government slum clearances and redevelopment has shown that some of the provided apartments were subsequently sold by their recipients for various reasons, such as irresistible offers of money, ‘unfamiliar’ living conditions (different from their old kampung), and changes in the households’ economic and social relationships (Jellinek, 1991).

3.4.2 Gentrification

Another approach, which is more familiar in developed countries, is gentrification, especially in inner city areas. In questioning why the inner city issue remains relevant and important, Home (1982), who concentrated on the experience of American inner city development plans, said that the inner city could symbolise a wider upheaval in the economy and society as a whole, and therefore problems in inner city areas are prominent. He remarked that previously the working definition of the inner city was an old zone of mainly
19th century residential and industrial areas, lying between the city centres and the suburbs of the major conurbations, where urban deprivation (physical, social and economic problems) are concentrated. In many cases, 'the inner city' was used as another name for the working-class area.

In western experience, the issue of gentrification emerged in academic debate when discussions arose about the inner city problem of dealing with the unsuitable use of land (Home, 1982). This unsuitability can refer to the decreased value of the land in its original use, which could cause a crisis in the city. Home (1982, referring to Loney) also stated that there were more basic, submerged reasons for the inner city crisis that caused gentrification. Among these was the continued concentration of private assets and its inevitable consequence in the spatial segregation of rich and poor.

For that reason, Logan (1985) loosely defined gentrification as 'a movement of high status social groups into an area traditionally associated with low-income residents' that changes the environment in an inner city area. He stated that private investment in building improvements in the inner city, in the direction of renovation and conservation rather than redevelopment, has been picked up by new residents, while deteriorating areas in other parts of the city still prevailed. The improved area would then transform into a middle-class residential area, yielding 'a well suited house to the demands of modern life'. Gentrification thus becomes no more than revitalisation of inner suburbs both physically and socially by the entry of new middle-class residents.

Hamnett and Williams (1979) stated that gentrification is a process of simultaneous physical, social and cultural change; it involves housing renovation (physical), a new class of residents (social) with a new life style and set of tastes (cultural). One of the debatable aspects of the process of gentrification is the displacement of the original working class from their area. In regard to this matter, Hamnett and Williams (1979) supported
Anderson and Williams' notion that although gentrification improved the deteriorated housing, nevertheless by forcing the working class out of the inner city it has become increasingly difficult for certain activities such as hotels, offices, transport services and others that employed them. Moreover the problem of housing low-income people has been shifted elsewhere rather than eliminated.

The first world experience is not particularly relevant for inner city problems in developing countries, mainly because the developing countries' cities are still receiving large-scale migration, and the deterioration of the urban fabric is generally continuing. This is often consequent on rising unemployment and structural changes in the economy, and a greater mixture of socio-economic (and possibly ethnic) groups. There are similar hindrances for both developed and developing countries. Some of those will relate to ensuring an adequate return on capital investment for the developers, providing for workers to be within walking distance of their work, supplying a variety of housing types, and improving public services and facilities. Hardoy and Satterthwaite (1989) recognised that in some of the developing countries' inner city areas there was a tendency of losing population but increasing the number of jobs and commercial activities, which indicates that a transfer of occupations has taken place. Thus the upgrading of houses reduces the availability of cheap accommodation for low-income people, especially those whose source of income is in the city, and who have no possibilities for travelling to and from work.

3.4.3 Urban Renewal

Urban renewal was also popular to improve deteriorating areas. For example, in England in the 1960s, urban renewal was used in the Housing Shortage Give-away programme, which focused upon slum clearance and the provision of new municipal housing for displaced families (Robertson, 1997).
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In Japan, urban renewal has been used for rebuilding old residential areas while keeping the existing residents in place and maintaining their rights. Indonesia has also used the urban renewal approach to its housing problems, where one scheme dealing with low-income people was based on a presidential decree (Inpres no.5/1992).

**Presidential-decree (Inpres) no.5/1992**

This decree was intended to accelerate the improvement of the living condition of the low-income group, especially those in slum areas on government land, and was linked with the actions of an urban land use efficiency programme, and efforts to create the appearance of a well-organised city. The decree was to be carried out by the Ministry of Housing, the Ministry of National Development Planning/BAPPENAS, the Ministry of Population and Environment, the Ministry of Interior Affairs, the Ministry of Public Works, the Ministry of Social Affairs, the Ministry of Finance, the National Land Bureau (BPN), the Head of Provincial Government (Gubernur), and mayors or heads of Local Government (Bupati). The decree stated that:

- The settlement improvement is to include building multi-storey houses or flats complete with the environmental facilities and other buildings proper to the related urban spatial plan.

- The settlement improvement should give an opportunity to all of the previous residents to stay in the new settlements through low rents or a mortgage system, and should be based on community support.

- The settlement improvement will be based on land sharing. The developer will get a commercial area for development proportional to the amount that it has invested in the settlement improvement.

- The new flats will become government property, managed by the State Owned Housing Institute (PERUMNAS), and can then be rented or sold.
The settlement improvement finance could be supported by PERUMNAS, a charity or humane foundation, or a private developer.

The ratio of new settlement and commercial buildings should be declared by the Head of the Local Government (Bupati/Walikota) and approved by the Head of Provincial Government (Gubernur).

To the present time there has been only one implementation of this programme, in Jakarta, but unfortunately it remains in an unfinished state, terminated due to mismanagement factors. This project, flat Pulo Gadung, was designed to accommodate developing business in the area while improving the kampung's social, economic and physical condition.

3.4.4 Urban Upgrading

**Infrastructure Improvement Programmes**

Infrastructure programmes are being pursued in many developing countries as part of the housing improvement scheme, although Angel (1983) insisted that we should understand the underlying motives for pursuing them. He believed that the success of infrastructure programmes in low-income settlements depends (to a major extent) on generating sufficient common interest among the various, and differently motivated, participants: the 'housers' (those who are primarily interested in housing the poor), the municipal engineers, the community builders, politicians, international funding agencies, the slum dwellers. All see the process as having legitimate and strategic value. As all of them share many objectives, each should have room to manoeuvre, and consensus would be the goal, although in practice it is not easy to get this kind of consensus.

He noted that, first, slum infrastructure should be an essential component of housing programmes for supporting people's efforts in the
gradual improvement of housing as habitable human settlements. As governments have generally failed to provide adequate housing for the urban masses, the insistence is that government must assist the people to mobilize their own efforts to house themselves.

Second, slum infrastructure should be for public health. This is the objective of the municipal engineers, who are interested in providing basic public services throughout the city. They generally see that upgrading programmes engaged in temporary improvements would ultimately result in lower standards. Therefore, the extension of service to the slum areas should be part of the existing networks.

Third, slum infrastructure should strengthen community organization. This is the objective of the community builders, who are concerned with getting poor people to act together for their common benefit and further transform themselves into a just and caring society. They believe that infrastructure is a common and important issue around which a community could be organized and strengthened. Moreover, the community's participation in determining needs could help in effective allocation of urban resources.

Fourth, slum infrastructure is an effective measure for mobilising urban support. This is the point of view of the politicians, who see it as a realistic social welfare programme, yet also an effective mechanism for gaining popular support in low income-areas with less expenditure than housing programmes.

Fifth, for the international funding agencies such as the World Bank, the UN agencies, and other bilateral aid agencies, improving slum infrastructure can be seen as an economic attack on global poverty. These agencies tend to promote the idea of bringing slum property into a formal housing market, encouraging property ownership and strengthening the market mechanism, so that cost recovery can be reached.
Last, for the dwellers, slum infrastructure is something that they can get from the government that other citizens have already got. Therefore, cost recovery for the implementation does not make any sense at all.

The Kampung Improvement Programme is one of the programmes in this context that are implemented in Indonesia, and this will be explained in more detail later in this chapter.

**Housing Improvement Scheme**

The housing improvement scheme in Indonesia is part of the Public Works Department's tasks. Projects can be established in either an urban or a suburban area. The programme is principally intended for suburban areas, but could be utilised in kampungs. It consists of assistance to improve housing conditions with soft loans for the improvement or provision of building materials.

There are some other types of self-help housing for the low-income people in Indonesia, such as Community Based Housing, the Non Government Organisation (NGO) assistance housing, and the government assistance housing.

**Resettlement**

There are many resettlement models that have already been utilised by the government in Indonesia for various reasons, ranging from resettlement after natural and fire disasters, and components of settlement improvements, to city beautification.

### 3.5. KAMPUNG IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME (KIP)

The Kampung Improvement Programme (KIP) was introduced in the early 1920s by the Royal Dutch Government, and known as Kampoeng verbeterings programme, to prevent disease spreading from kampungs to the surrounding
neighbourhood units, which were typically higher-income residential areas. The *Kampong verbeterings programme* was a simple programme that consisted of providing drinking water, a drainage system and public toilets under government responsibility. Actually this was not a serious programme for the government since it was really subsumed as part of the Public Works Department's maintenance section, and only a few kampungs were improved because of budgetary limits. Nonetheless, it was the beginning of real community participation, as some of the targeted communities requested to co-finance the next few projects in local improvement programmes.

The Kampung Improvement Programme was reintroduced to local government in Jakarta and Surabaya in 1969. This consisted of providing basic urban infrastructure and upgrading the quality of low-income settlements.

Later there were other forms of assistance and funding to support KIP activities, for example through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and others. In view of the significance of such programmes to Indonesia, in an era when more direct forms of low-income housing provision are so seriously constrained by economic conditions, and in view of their relevance to the subject of the present study (that is, transformation of the kampung), the following sub-sections will outline these various KIP approaches.

### 3.5.1 Types of Kampung Improvement Programmes (KIP)

**KIP-IBRD (The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development)**

Two cities, Jakarta and Surabaya, asked the central government for cooperation in applying for assistance from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) for their KIP programme. The aim
was to increase the project's coverage, scale, scope, quality, and the speed of implementation, since more aspects of the kampungs needed to be improved and more people to be served. The first project of KIP-IBRD was in 1974, covered by a soft loan from the Bank, and implemented without complementary investment from the targeted people. In this case people did not have to pay for the project, but there were complementary activities that people could perform for it; for example they provided land and other spaces for project implementation, sometimes involving destroying fences, changing house frontages or even parts of their houses. However, in some of the poorest settlements the projects were totally implemented without complementary actions from the people.

This IBRD-KIP was somewhat similar to the old Public Works Programme, but actually it had three principal differences. First, the community could decide on priorities and preferences within the project's budget and components. Second, the community could utilise the projects to achieve their own settlement improvements. Third, the community could share with the government what they could and could not do for themselves. Thus this project could be part of a broader community building process.

**KIP-UNICEF (The United Nations Children's Fund)**

UNICEF had already been working in Indonesia for a long time when, in 1974, this organisation interested itself in assisting the KIP, especially in dealing with the health of mothers and children, and their more general welfare in the kampungs. The UNICEF project had a number of components:

- Awareness programme within the local community;
- Training for health promoters;
- Provision of various means to improve family health (especially that of the children and the family in general, for example by adding more public
water taps/stand pipes, provision of garbage bins and carts, constructing group wells and latrines); and

- Other welfare for the family as a whole, for example by kindergarten assistance (provision of books, furniture and creative toys), school age reading encouragement, library book supplies, provision of vocational training tools, community hall improvements, etc.

**KIP-UNEP (The United Nations Environment Programme)**

This project was directed to improving the environmental quality of kampungs, supported by community participation. This was the first attempt to deal with physical improvement of low-income settlements related to community socio-economic mobility. The project components were:

- Improving environmental quality by improving drainage, private wells and existing public toilets;

- Promoting solar energy household equipment;

- Introducing garbage collection and disposal systems;

- Setting up community centres and sub-centre appliances in the community halls that were constructed by joint funds of UNEP, the community and the local government;

- Training for community health development promoters;

- Vocational training for school drop-outs and establishing community youth organisations;

- Local community training for local observing and monitoring workers, and
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- Establishing organisations and management among local government bureaucrats, which was seen as an important condition for conducting future KIPs.

**KIP-W.R. Supratman**

This is another type of KIP, which was a response to a resource constraint. In simplifying the project, which had started in 1969, the Surabaya local government promoted complementary improvement elements, such as providing pre-cast concrete slabs and gutters. This improvement has to be initiated, requested and installed by the local community itself. The scheme received a good response from the communities, which were queuing to get these forms of assistance. It subsequently also became a cash assistance scheme in 1974. This kind of improvement became a familiar form of help to the communities who wanted to improve their environment. It could assist not only the low-income groups but also the legal 'middle-low' settlements, whereby the facilities would be constructed by the local people themselves or by the local government and other government agencies. At present, this kind of improvement has become part of the Public Works assignment. The project components are to the KIP basic standard: improvement of vehicular roads, footpaths, public water taps, drainage systems, and public group bath-toilet and washing facilities. In this sense, the Kampung Improvement Programme can be seen as part of housing supply support.

The project evaluation showed that after project implementation, people were motivated to further improve their neighbourhood. Physically, they improve their houses, their environment, and sometimes provide community facilities such as footpath lighting, signage, guardhouses, community halls, rubbish bins, and neighbourhood greenery. Socially, they strengthened their social relationships, with one of its good outcomes being the spirit to maintain their new environment, whether as a group or as individuals.
3.5.2 Post-KIP Programme and Project

Surabaya is the only city in Indonesia that has a post-Kampung Improvement Programme (post-KIP). It embraced the developed countries' idea of clearance and redevelopment. The Surabaya walk-up flat construction programme was claimed to be the continuation of KIP, or a post-KIP project. The first walk-up flat project was constructed in 1988 as a post-KIP project, in Dupak Bangunrejo - Surabaya.

The project was inspired by the realisation that almost all of the Surabaya kampungs have been in a condition that could and should be supported by a Kampung Improvement Programme, except those that really cannot be improved, such as very densely populated and over-crowded kampungs and those that are not on government land. Kampung Dupak Bangunrejo was slightly different, as this kampung had been improved, but the residents did not care for and did not maintain the improved environment, and so it was deteriorating again. The post-KIP evaluation discovered that most of the residents were tenants, since the area is near the northern Surabaya business and trading centre, and so rented flats were suitable to this condition.

This was the start of a new generation of walk-up flats in Indonesia (Silas, 1990). The flats were designed under a new method planned by the Laboratory for Housing and Human Settlement of Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember Surabaya (ITS) under the supervision of Prof. Johan Silas. It was based on studies to understand how kampung people appreciate and evaluate their houses and their neighbourhood. The flats were then designed to accommodate their activities as revealed from these studies. Unlike regular self-contained buildings, these flats do have some areas to be shared, as is usually the case in the kampungs, such as alleys for chatting, shared bathrooms and kitchens, and of course this sharing also could reduce the construction cost. However, most significantly the flats are designed as a
"friendly educator" for a new form of living place. An improved design was then applied in the next complex in Sombo. However, Silas (1990) has emphasised that walk-up flats as an approach for improving housing quality is not a straightforward alternative, especially for those who are desperately poor. This kind of flat, if it is to meet specific conditions of a specific community, cannot be based on standardised designs and mass production but has to be tailor-made.

3.5.3 KIP-Komprihensip (Comprehensive-KIP)

KIP-Komprihensip is another type of improvement that involves a financial plan for social and economic development alongside physical development funded by local government. KIP-Komprihensip has been implemented in Surabaya since 1996, but has not yet been evaluated.

The project invited 'development consultants' to help people to identify their problems, formulate their needs, and deal with the local government as part of a community participation project. The development consultant role was relatively new in Indonesia, though well established in other economies: facilitators, frequently linked to NGOs, would work with local communities and public agencies in effect to negotiate the details of programs and their implementation, in an extension of a role sometimes associated with architects. This latest project would be implemented in an area that had already been improved (by KIP), and accordingly the project was seen as supplementary to the previous one, and therefore the improvements were directed towards the unimproved infrastructures. Financial assistance schemes (as a loan) were granted for those who already had viable business activities and agreed to pay the instalments.

On the basis of this review we could remark that the policies and social trends represented in the KIPs are relevant to consideration of the housing task. Low-income settlements were previously always imagined as objects to
be upgraded, and too infrequently seen as places where people live and adapt to their use. It is obviously important to look at all aspects of community life and not just at housing in itself, and this is what the KIP has managed to do.

Housing delivery and settlement improvement programmes were too often in the past directed to meet standard solutions for better quality of housing in urban areas, overlooking consumer choice, the form of existing communities, and broader environmental concerns relating to city life. We might also expect that this practice was based on some ideas that improvement was unchallenged by other urban processes and pressures. Therefore it is necessary to look at an entirely different set of conditions, namely a kampung situation that is subject to such forces as extreme population mobility, and competition from other development, and this will be the focus of following chapters.

3.6. CONCLUSIONS

Despite all the good intentions of the housing reformers and devisers of housing programs, and despite many examples of good and innovative administration, the hard reality is that the great majority of Indonesians have not been supplied from the various programs outlined above, and likewise the great majority of households occupy informal rather than formal housing. Further, the dominant urban housing form remains the kampung.

It is altogether too easy to dismiss the failure of Indonesia to adequately house its population by simply referring to financial constraints on the government. Certainly the economy is an underlying cause, but there is also the inability to mobilise all the resources of the broader national community; the KIPs have attempted this, but they remain inadequate when faced with issues of proper tenure and access to land, and where national economic priorities remain un-addressed.
The tentative conclusion from this situation must be that attention has to be directed towards the *kampung*, to its issues of tenure, to the amelioration of the threat so frequently directed against it (for example from corporate sector developers and entrepreneurs seeking to build yet more unwanted high-rise offices or apartment blocks), and to the possibilities of more cooperative approaches to *kampung* improvement. For example, are 'partnerships' possible between the *kampung* community, their corporate neighbours, government facilitators, and the funding institutions?

It is also necessary to be reminded that the *kampungs*, their community life, and programs for their improvement exist in a context of the forces of modernisation and globalisation that were previously reviewed in Chapter 2. The *kampungs* are no longer simply 'traditional'.
Chapter 4

Research Design

4.1. Introduction

This research is aimed at understanding the processes of change in low-income communities being encroached upon by modern business activities, the pressures of 'higher and better' uses of their land, and other consequences of modernisation. In particular, the shifting roles of kampungs are to be observed, from their conventionally understood roles of enabling a form of low-income 'subsistence urbanism' in the sense discussed in the introduction of Chapter 1, together with apparently emerging roles linked to a wider urban, metropolitan and even global economy and community. (This is the issue raised in the first and second research questions outlined previously, in Chapter 1.)

A linked aim is to speculate on the adequacy or otherwise of present theory in throwing light on these processes of change observable in Indonesian cities (the theme of the third research question from Chapter 1).

This chapter describes the design of the research to move towards this understanding. It starts, in section 4.2, by identifying issues that emerge from the reviews in Chapters 2 and 3, and are specifically relevant to the research aims articulated above. These issues will then inform more specific questions, which lead in turn to a selection of an appropriate research approach, selection of a study area, selection of the techniques required to implement the research, and selection of analytical tools (in section 4.3). Conclusions are presented in section 4.4.
4.2. ISSUES

While the underlying aims or guiding questions that determine the direction of the project remain unaltered by the various insights emerging from the reviews of Chapters 2 and 3, nevertheless those chapters have raised a diversity of issues that further problematise the questions – they add to their complexity. These can be summarized as a series of points.

- Already in the Introduction (Chapter 1), a range of previous studies of Indonesian kampungs was drawn upon to illustrate the problematic issue of ‘modernity’ in an Indonesian urban context (Jellinek, Sihombing, Winayanti, also Guinness from Chapter 2). Its further exploration in Chapter 2, via ideas specifically of Harvey, Vickers, Bunnell, Schech and Harris, Habermas and Berman, led to the speculation of a ‘multiplicity of modernities’ – the researcher’s eye and ear needs to be sensitized to the likelihood that decidedly divergent ideas of ‘the modern’ can coexist in Indonesian space.

- Inevitably linked to ideas of modernity are those of modernisation, and Indonesia manifests a diversity of paths to modernisation at scales ranging from the local to the global. But modernisation becomes ambiguously confused with both development and Westernisation, with two consequences: there are tensions between ideals of emulation of the West versus the extolling of the local; and Indonesia is caught up in the struggles, real or imagined, against economic and cultural neo-colonialism (Clark, Gugler). The researcher expects to find these tensions and struggles manifested in the struggles over space and its representations (Lefebvre).

- The kampung, one is led to suspect, will be enmeshed in decidedly diverse economic sectors – formal, informal, and subsistence production and exchange (from Evers and colleagues). These are not to be simplistically labelled as ‘modern’ or ‘pre-modern’ or ‘postmodern’, as all are of ‘this
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time' – that is, all are aspects of modernity. The question for research is how these diverse sectors might be simultaneously interdependent and opposed – symbiotic, and mutually destructive of each other?

- While subsistence production and exchange is conventionally associated with agrarian community forms, it is equally to be looked for in the context of urban society, and especially in the kampung. Any exploration of kampung society will especially need to observe the conditions in which this economic sector thrives, and in which it withers. The term 'genius of innovation' has been coined above to refer to what is expected to be a flexibility in adapting to the changing circumstances of recent Indonesian society and economy.

- All the time, the researcher must be sensitised to the insights, notably from Lefebvre and Giddens, that space is not some neutral medium in which 'things happen' – space is socially produced, and peoples' actions and practices are both constrained by the spaces they occupy but in turn produce those spaces.

- While the focus of the present study will be squarely on this production of space – the complementing transformations of community and its space – its will be necessary to be aware that the space of a community is subject to profound shifts in technology. There is the burgeoning space of the mobile phone, the internet, the satellite dish and television (Virilio, Castells); and there is the continuing but metamorphosing community of face-to-face communication; and there are arguments that these are 'recombinant' in their effects (Thrift, Mitchell, Graham).

- In the case of the kampungs there are also the transformations that flow from the sheer pressure of increasing numbers consequent on migration from rural to urban occupation. And certainly in the major cities the kampungs transform through the agency of the Kampung Improvement Programmes (Chapter 3).
• Yet further transformations may relate to changes, sometimes differential and sometimes complementary, between economic sectors as described above. In Indonesian urban *kampung* communities, there are market forces that increase the interdependency between the low-income *kampung* residents offering low-cost labour, and the local or global firms seeking low-cost labour. However, there are also changing demands for labour, leading to an expansion of the labour market, and therefore population mobility.

• These various processes all come together to problematise any idea of 'community' (Clark, Mitchell). So the first aim of the present project articulated previously - namely to observe community transformation under conditions of pressure from 'higher and best uses' (the *kampung* versus the commercial sector) - is always already problematic, as it raises the question of what sort of community is a *kampung*? If, indeed, it is still to be seen as a community!

4.3. RESEARCH APPROACH

At the simplest level the aim of the present project can be brought down to an observational question: 'What is happening in the inner city settlements that are being encroached upon by new commercial development?' Four possible approaches to exploring this question can be suggested:

1. All of Indonesia's *kampungs*, and by extension all residents within them, might be observed and surveyed. While this might be the approach taken in a national census, it is scarcely feasible in the present circumstances. An alternative might be to focus on only a single city, but still to attempt comprehensiveness, though again the task would be considerable.
2. A sample residents in a sample of kampungs could be surveyed. If the sampling is careful and representative, this approach has the attraction that its results can be generalised to the broader population of the kampung dwellers within known statistical confidence levels. There would be at least two major problems with such a method: first, it would be very difficult to define the universe of urban kampungs, from which to sample: kampungs are varied in their characteristics ranging from small groups of squatter dwellings to long established and relatively affluent communities that take on many of the aspects of planned estates; boundaries are frequently poorly defined; and it is accordingly problematic to decide what is and is not to be defined as kampung. And, second, unless a very large number of interviews were planned, it should be difficult to achieve any in-depth understanding of any one kampung. Both of these options imply large surveys, and in both comprehensiveness and statistical distributions of answers to set questions might be achieved, but it will be at the expense of in-depth understanding of experiences, histories and processes. And, to repeat, the present project is directed towards processes! Alternatively, it would be possible to narrow the study down to a single city, with a single set of administration arrangements, economic processes and social conditions. This is an attractive option, although the problems of sampling and of depth of insight would still arise.

3. Instead of representative sampling, the researcher might instead seek a deeper exploration of just those cases that seem of most interest to the theoretical framework in which the research is set. In other words the attention is not on trends and generalisations, but on theoretical issues. Multiple case studies present the attraction of multiple viewpoints from which to observe the particular phenomena of concern to the project. The approach implies a less structured search for information and
understanding – there may be a reliance on open-ended interviews rather than routinised questionnaires, and content analysis of responses rather than, or in addition to, enumeration.

4. Alternatively, if a single case study will suffice to throw light on the phenomena under investigation, then this might be adopted, with the considerable advantage of a concentration of the project's resources.

It should be clear from the above that options 3 and 4 are the more appropriate to the present study, for reasons given under 3: we are interested in process, there are considerable theoretical difficulties embedded in the specific processes under investigation (as briefly summarised from Chapters 1 and 2 in 4.2 above), and in-depth insight is to be sought rather than generalisable distributions and trends. In the event, the chosen approach is 4 above: a single case study, of a single kampung, was mounted. One reason for this limiting of the study related simply to the resources available to the researcher, but the more pertinent reason – to be elaborated following – was that a single kampung was located that presented, in sharpest contrast, all of the dilemmas that seem to arise from the theoretical literature (from Chapter 2) and from the difficulties of present policy (from Chapter 3).

4.3.1 The Case Study Approach

As argued by Yin (1994:10), a case study is in effect an experiment; it does not represent a 'sample'. So the researcher's aim is to expand upon and generalize theories (that is, 'analytic generalizations') by utilizing a developed theoretical framework as a template or 'conceptual lens' through which to observe the case study and its empirical results (1994:31). Moreover, a case study approach is appropriate to a type of research in which: the complexity of the objects is contextually bounded and the researcher has very little control over the object of study. The generality of the case study does not derive from enumerated frequencies but from 'methodological values'
based on observed qualities of the case itself, the theoretical framework, and the methodological rigor underlying the interpretation of the case (Hamel et al, 1993:39-40; Yin, 1994:10; Shipman, 1997:61).

In the present project, the theoretical framework or 'conceptual lens' is multifaceted (as would seem inevitable when the locus of interest is a real community in all its complexity), and is in effect summarised in the points listed in 4.2 above.

4.3.2 Selection of Research Methods

Observation

Insights can be gained into aspects of the research question by simple observation: one can walk through the urban kampungs, noting how they in fact 'work' – do they appear to provide services for nearby business districts? Do the residents shift their consumption from local stalls, shops and markets to corporate supermarkets and shopping malls? Does this seem to be a transient population? Have the businesses of the business district recently expanded into the kampungs? Are there at present intentions to do so?

Simple observation, termed 'naïve observation' by Sarantakos (1993:222), refers to an everyday or unstructured way of looking at and perceiving things; it begins from the first moment the researcher sees a study area. Such perceptions develop with further experience and immersion in the area and its life. The researcher is far from neutral in this process however, having an active role in making choices, conscious or otherwise, about what to see and how to interpret (Hay, 2000:104-105).

While such an approach may tend to be unsystematic, it is one that yields significant data on 'spatial practices' (Lefebvre, 1991:31-33, reviewed in Chapter 2 above), and would enable ideas to become more sharply focused and thereby help to refine the research questions (May, 2002:146).
Non-participant versus participant observation

While observation in the present project is to be described as 'non-participant' or 'objective', a spill-over into the realm of participant observation is inevitable, for the reason given above: the researcher's own immersion in the life of the area and its life has inevitable effects on objectivity. Participant observation is concerned with developing understanding through being part of the spontaneity of everyday actions; its goal is an understanding of the real dynamics and meanings of everyday life, and immersion in that life is of its essence (Burgess, 1984:79; Hay, 2000:108).

As the present researcher is a long-time resident of Surabaya, some degree of 'participation' is inevitable. However the intention is to attempt a more objective observation of the study area and its life. There is to be an attempt at a methodology that is comprehensive (and at many points quantitative) within the context of the case itself, though at all times eschewing any delusion of transferability of results beyond that case. However the research will remain sharply conscious of the inevitable contradictions and ambivalences involved in all observation.

Interviews

In broadest terms, the present research aimed to observe present changes in urban kampungs, with a view to understanding how processes of economic and social modernisation might be leading to increasing interdependence between them and the business district, but simultaneously to competition for land and possibly for ‘image’, and to increasing labour mobility and population mobility. This would be coupled with discussions with planning agencies, academics, etc. on the question of appropriate public policy for improving the urban kampungs both as communities and as sources of low cost housing – what might be the varied 'representations of space', in Lefebvre's terms, held by various actors in the production of space?
Ultimately, a systematic, interview based survey is necessary to explore the extent to which the local population is shifting, and becoming more or less transient (or, alternatively, more or less stable), and the extent to which it is being tied in to the economic life of the formal-economy business district and moving away from the less formal (or even subsistence) economy. We need also to question the extent to which the firms/employers are dependent on a ready and mobile work force, and by contrast the extent to which they seek a more stable and predictable labour force.

In-depth, one-to-one, semi-structured interviews are used to enable the researcher to develop some understanding of the positions and issues surrounding a research interest from the interviewees' varied experiences and points of view (Hay, 2000:43). The semi-structured nature of the interview enables the interviewer to improvise reactions and new questions in response to the replies, in a way that has theoretical validity (Wengraf, 2001: 5).

In practical terms, and following on from the elaborating issues that were reviewed in 4.2 above, interviews of kampung residents, kampung business people, and corporate sector agents need to address four broad themes:

1. **Symbiotic or competitive relationship.** Is there any relationship between the diverse inhabitants of the area, namely the kampung dweller, street business, and large-scale (globally focused) enterprise? How do they relate to each other? How do the groups interact with each other economically and socially (as a community)? How do they perceive each other? We are observing what Giddens refers to as 'time-space edges' - 'connections, whether conflictual or symbiotic, between societies of different structural types (1984:377).

2. **Use of space.** How do the various groups perceive and use the space of the kampung and of the city more broadly? We are concerned here with
what are essentially dialectical processes of humans’ interactions with space – what Steele (1981:9) called ‘transactional systems’ where each gives and receives something from the other, or what Giddens (1984) termed ‘structuration’ whereby space both structures (enables, constrains) human agency and is the outcome of it.

3. *Housing significance.* What are the problems and the opportunities in the redevelopment of low-income urban settlements in Indonesia? More specifically, what are these problems and opportunities in the specific case of the inner city, as perceived by the various actors in the (re)production of the space of the *kampung*?

4. *Prospective future.* What is the preferred future of this specific form of neighbourhood? Do those diverse inhabitants have identical conceptions for the future of the *kampung* or are there significant divergences? Where lie the bases of any differences?

Analysis of the data from the above exploration will give insights into the theoretical dimensions of the research question. The implications of the transformations may then be investigated through interviews with planners, other policy makers and administrators, academics, etc.

### 4.3.3 Selection of the study area

In order to select a study area to accommodate the inquiry process, a set of criteria consistent with the arguments of Chapters 2 and 3 can be imposed:

1. The area has to be a low-income settlement (*kampung*), geographically located in the city as an inner-city settlement, without the peculiarity of the strong political involvement in development and *kampung* clearance commonly found for example in Jakarta.
2. It should be subject to some degree of threat from 'invasion' for business development, as well as evidencing some existing functional links with the current business sector.

3. In order to legitimise its existence and to canvass the city government's objectives for the area, it should be on the city government's plan. Stated otherwise, it should not be an illegal or squatter settlement as this would raise issues altogether extraneous to the processes under review.

Surabaya was chosen as the single city to be observed, for three reasons: it was rapid-growing, the nation's second largest city, and very much a city of kampungs; it was a magnet for the processes of urbanisation; and it was a familiar city to the author as researcher so that it would be easy to get formal, legal accessibility, and to win people's accessibility and acceptance. Based on the above, a suitable kampung in Surabaya was also quickly found. Kampung Kaliasin is in the very centre of the city; it is large, seemingly socially and economically active, but conveniently (for a researcher) threatened by the apparent expansion needs of the corporate world of downtown Surabaya - indeed at its perimeter it is already significantly intruded upon. This kampung is also listed as a redevelopment settlement, as indicated in Rencana Detil Tata Ruang Kota Unit Pengembangan Tegalsari (the local Detailed Spatial Plan).

This selection places one limitation on the study that needs to be acknowledged at this point: kampung Kaliasin is an exceptionally extensive kampung. While it will throw light on the processes of transformation involved in the engagements of an extensive kampung with a very large area of commercial development, Surabaya also manifests multiple examples on lesser intrusions, on to smaller kampungs. One is left to surmise that these 'lesser' cases would yield altogether different manifestations of the shifting links between diverse economic sectors.
4.3.4 Data Collection

The information needed for this research was collected from primary and secondary sources. Documentary information was acquired, and non-participant observations and interviews were conducted. The secondary data and the documentary information were about the *kampung*'s characteristics, and included maps and plans collected from the city government offices and other related institutions in Surabaya.

Structured interviews using an interview schedule were chosen as an additional source of data, since this method was appropriate for a complex situation and useful for collecting in-depth information in verbal or non-verbal situations. To provide variety and richness of information, some questions were formulated as open-ended questions (Kumar, 1996) which, moreover, enabled a relatively informal and friendly communication between subject and interviewer which would have been difficult using full questionnaire methods.

Three surveys were conducted for the research: preliminary observations (in January to February 1998), a first interview survey (in June 1998), and a second (or main) survey (in August to December 1999). These three were related and sequential, with each leading to the next; and each involved both non-participant observation and interviews.

The first survey, the preliminary observation, was conducted to get an overview of the selected *kampung*: The present physical condition and an impression of community lifestyles in the study area were observed.

The first full interview survey was then conducted in part to test the interview schedule and procedure, and in part to reconsider the research questions and to re-observe the physical condition of the *kampung*. The interview schedule was designed in part to test the hypothesis of a symbiotic relationship between downtown commercial areas and the cheap labour of an adjoining *kampung*, and to explore the threats to this relationship posed by
the corporate sector expansion into the *kampung* - the 'time-space edges' as defined by Giddens (1984:377), and referred to above.

To perform this role, the survey had to define the relationships among the study area inhabitants, who were classified into three groups: *kampung* dwellers, street businesses, and large-scale corporate business. The questions were about the whereabouts of the diverse occupants' and users' activities, their current situations, their feelings and perceptions about each other and also their expectations concerning the future of the *kampung*. Those questions were set out under the headings of relationships (the resources for the relationships, need for relationships, access to the relationships, and perception of the value of the relationships), and the perception of future development.

In order to get a general view of the *kampung* condition, yet within the limited time and budget available to the researcher, the interviewees were selected by randomly locating them (pin-pointing) on a map, to locate 'representative' households of each neighbourhood unit (*Rukun Tetangga/RT*). In the first main survey (that is, following the pilot survey), there were at least six residents and one to two business people selected for each RT. This technique clearly has limitations in generalizing from these small numbers of respondents, especially when the *kampung* was resided in by a heterogeneous population with a mixture of ethnicities, different levels of education, variety of employments, a range of incomes and other social or economic structure diversity. However, this was the most readily available technique for this sampling, and it does give a basis for observing the variations in population across the area of this very extensive *kampung*.

The second main interview survey was conducted to build on the results from the first main survey. Therefore, as soon as the first survey was finished, the questionnaires had to be analysed, and the results, to be discussed in Chapter 6, led to a re-shaping of the interview schedule and
modification of its viewpoint. It was found that the presumed symbiotic relationship between the participants in the downtown area and those of the adjoining kampung could not account for the importance of the inner city kampung to the life of the broader city. Hence some aspects of the research needed to be re-formulated. Therefore the second survey was redesigned to explore the broader processes of urbanisation at work in Surabaya and their implications for this area, and to give clues for a proper policy response for an area that was relatively transient, diverse, and apparently of significance as a temporary dormitory for people moving to Surabaya, or within the city.

Interview schedules were designed to seek the attitudes, beliefs and aspirations of people in Kampung Kaliasin and the attitudes of corporate sector representatives, and also to canvass ideas for 'improvement'. Those interviewed were the residents, the relevant city government officers such as city planners and, as additional contributors, selected business people in the study area, and academic scholars.

To explain the research, initial contact with the community was made by visiting the heads of the Neighbourhood Units (Rukun Tetangga/RT and Rukun Warga/RW). This was not only to explain the purpose of the research and its relevance, but also to gain permission to proceed with it. In the Indonesian context such permission was necessary both administratively, and to gain the confidence of respondents who would otherwise be suspicious of the exercise and probably resistant to it. The respondents from the study area were again chosen at random by mapping and proportional representation of the neighbourhood units. Potential respondents were first visited in order to get their agreement to participate in the study. The next-door neighbour replaced those few households who did not give their consent.
4.3.5 Analytical Tools

Two types of analytical tool were used in this research. The interview results from both the first survey and the second or main survey were explored by descriptive analysis methods using various tools provided through the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

To define an appropriate development approach acceptable to the inhabitants and other related parties, the open-ended questions from the main survey were analysed by thematic analysis. This is a process of analysis using qualitative information, which also allows a translation of qualitative information into quantitative data if the researcher desires (Boyatzis, 1998). This thematic analysis enables the researcher to use comprehensive information in a systematic manner that increases its precision or sensitivity in understanding and interpreting observations about people, events, and organisations.

Accordingly, analysis proceeded by using quotations from the respondents (field notes, transcription of interview and discussion with the respondents) and thematic analysis on the four themes outlined in 4.3.2 above: symbiotic relationship, use of space, housing significance, and prospective future.

4.4. CONCLUSION

It was decided to use a case study approach using interviews followed by thematic analysis. Surabaya was chosen as a representative city and Kampung Kaliasin as the observed area. There was a three part research program: first, preliminary observation to be familiar with the study area; this was followed by a first main survey to test the interview schedule and to initially explore
the questions structuring the research; then came the second main survey to address the research.

As will be seen in the results of first survey in Chapter 6, a challenge emerged from that survey that drove the research to a new observation of the inner city kampung in a broader context of urbanisation processes. Accordingly, several themes were added, such as: How can one improve a kampung where the population is highly transient, with little long-term loyalty to either the local community or the physical fabric of the kampung itself? Are there any inconsistencies in the needs of firms/employers for a mobile pool of low-cost labour that is readily accessible, and on the other hand their need for space to expand into neighbouring land? Stated otherwise, are there pressures for firms/employers to simultaneously nurture the kampung and invade it? If there are such contradictory forces, what are the implications for public policy?
Chapter 5

SURABAYA

5.1 INTRODUCTION

As discussed in Chapter 4, Surabaya was chosen as a case-study city because of its appropriate character for the research: it is a fast-growing city, it is a magnet for the processes of urbanisation and it is encountering problems of the disappearance of low-income settlements because of the expansion of new modern development areas into their territories.

This chapter begins with a description of Surabaya, the city where the study is to be conducted, in order to portray something of the atmosphere of the area, from its origins, in section 5.2, to its current state of development, elaborating on the riddle of the existing kampungs, the low-income housing in the inner city area (in section 5.3). Section 5.4 conveys a picture of the detailed plans of one of the Surabaya local areas (Unit Pengembangan Tegalsari) in which Kampung Kaliasin, the study area, is located. Then in detail, section 5.5 describes the kampung with the support of secondary and primary data from the observational survey (while the results of the interview surveys are to be described in detail in Chapters 6 and 7). Conclusions are dealt with in section 5.6.

5.2 SURABAYA: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Surabaya is a typical Indonesian city that has grown from an indigenous settlement. More specifically, Nas (1986) has categorised it as an Indonesian coastal city (and see also Wertheim, 1980; Evers and Korff,
Surabaya is a municipality in East Java Province, one of the twenty-six provinces of Indonesia. It is also the capital city of East Java Province, and has been stated in the National Development Plan as one of the Indonesia’s Centres of Development (see Figure 5.1).

In this section the development of Surabaya as a city will be traced from its early establishment, through the Dutch colonial period, to the present day.

5.2.1 The Old Surabaya

Surabaya is one of the oldest cities in Indonesia. It had been recognised as early as the 10th century, during the great Mataram (Hindu) kingdom, as a
potential place for developing this inland kingdom’s power over economic and inter-island relationships. The Surabaya Urban Development Planning History (Surabaya City Government, 1990) notes its identification in a 10th century archaic plaque, and then more clearly in 12th century Chinese and Javanese books, where it was a place called Hujunggaluh, a trading river-harbour on one of the Brantas river estuaries, a place for bay salt, sheep and cockatoos (Kakakatua). As a settlement it may have presented an image of dispersed informality anticipatory of later desa and kampung, as Evers and Korff (2000:108) have suggested:

In contrast to the Theravadha Buddhist cities in Sri Lanka and mainland Southeast Asia, the early Indonesian or Javanese capitals do not seem to have had an urban image.

And again, in relation to the modern Indonesian city (specifically Jakarta), the suggestion is that something of this ‘non-urbanism’ persists:

The (ancient) large Indonesian settlements show cosmic dualism, as pointed out by Peter Nas, but little ‘urbanism’. ... The new Javanese ritual structure of Jakarta is not directed at the city, but the realm, the national territory. Modern Jakarta is, to paraphrase Oswald Spengler ... “a very large settlement but, nevertheless, not a city” (Evers and Korff, 2000:118).

Though most Chinese immigrants to the Malay Peninsula and the Indonesian Archipelago originally came from rural areas in Southern China, they nevertheless brought with them the image of life centred on the city of that region – Surabaya became a settlement of ‘dual imagery’. As written by those Chinese-travelers’ (in Surabaya City Government 1990), at that time Surabaya was also seen as a place of houses, similar to a traditional settlement in (Southern) China, laid out on a flat area of land with many river-harbours. Rivers were the essential method of transportation at that time. Later, the first Trowulan archaic plaque mentioned that there was a place named Surabaya, a traditional settlement on one of the Brantas river estuaries, in the Galuhhan area. Sometime
around the 12th or 13th century, Hujunggaluh (sometime called Galuhan) became part of Surabaya.

According to Handinoto (1996:5), Von Faber hypothesised that Surabaya was built in 1275 by King Kertanegara as a new settlement for the special armed force that had conquered the Kemuruhan rebels. This settlement was located in the northern part of the Glagah Arum area. As shown in Figure 5.2, it is surrounded by two rivers (kali\(^1\) Pegirian to the east and kali Mas to the west), and two canals, in the north and the south.

---

**Figure 5.2** Two hypothesised maps of the original Surabaya

---

\(^1\) kali means river, therefore kali Pegirian = Pegirian river
Unfortunately, there are no archaeological traces or surviving information about the shape and the structure of the old pre-colonial city. Graff (1986) argues that this is because of the Great War in 1719, which destroyed the Surabaya palace and the whole city; however researchers such as Silas, Santoso, and Graff have all tried to reconstruct the shape of the old city of Surabaya (Handinoto, 1996:12-17).

It was a strategic place for trade, with access to the main spice trading line between the Molucas Islands (in east Indonesia), the Sriwijaya Kingdom (in Sumatra island, west Indonesia), India and China, although as a trading port it was not as successful as Tuban, Sidayu and Gresik were at that time (Frederick, 1978:7).

In the 15th century, after being consecutively controlled by the indigenous Hindu kingdoms (the Singasari, Kediri and Majapahit), Surabaya became a centre of Islamic development for the northern coast of Java. This significance was not only a consequence of the rise of the Islamic kingdoms in Java, but also of its good relationship with Melaka (Malaysia),

Figure 5.3 Location of Old Surabaya (Hujunggaluh)
which was at that time a centre of spice trading, but also a centre for Islamic development in Asia.

As an Islamic centre, people built a grand mosque in the city, which was named after their leader, Sunan Ampel. It was not insignificant that later on this area not only brought in scholars but also Arab traders. As they settled down near the mosque, the area became known as Kampung Arab. In this period the city was still concentrated around the harbour area and was still an important trading city. In 1706 a Dutch priest, Valentijn, noted that Surabaya was a big, flourishing and famous city with 10,000 households governed by prince Sukadana, who lived in a beautiful palace with a beautiful barn for his elephants, the transport mode for princes in that time (Handinoto, 1996:21).

5.2.2 The Dutch Period

Portuguese were the first Europeans to come to East Java, in 1511, before the English and later the Dutch in 1596, for spice trading. In 1743, as part of the power shift in Java, Surabaya was transformed from a Mataram (Islamic) kingdom’s vassal to a base for the Dutch spice trading company, Vereenigde Oost Indische Compagnie (VOC). It was part of the Mataram kingdom’s agreement with the VOC that Surabaya, along with all of the northern Java coastal harbours, would be the reward for the company (as the VOC had successfully helped the Kingdom to end the rebellion of the dissident prince, Trunojoyo). Initially the Dutch did not pay any attention to the trading that was already taking place in the central market, between what was subsequently the company fortress and the alun-alun (large public square).

Van Imhoff, the first Dutch official representative, came to Surabaya in 1746, along the kali Mas to the Keputran area, a fertile and densely populated area, surrounded by rice fields and gardens. He set up the first
army barracks and fort near the recently constructed Governor's office on the *kali* Mas riverbank and developed Surabaya as important place for the Dutch (at that time Semarang was higher in the official hierarchy than Surabaya).

The next officer, van Hogendorp (1794-1798), expanded the Dutch area to the north to the Jembatan Merah area for official buildings, and to the south to Simpang (Jalan Pemuda), where he built a beautiful garden house (at present still in use as the official house of the East Java Governor). From this time roads were also established to link these various properties, supplementing the river access. In 1795 the company became bankrupt, and as a consequence all of its authority and properties were transferred to the Dutch government, and Surabaya became part of the Dutch colony.

The fastest development in the Dutch era was under Governor Daendels (1808-1811), who developed Surabaya as a naval base and centre for defence works. As the military force was strengthened, he built another military barracks (in Jotangan), a fort (in the *kali* Mas estuary), an artillery factory (near the prison in Kalisosok), and a military hospital in Jalan Simpang (Jalan Pemuda). He also built a church (which later became a bank-note printing office), and a suspension bridge (Jembatan Merah, a noted historical artefact) on *Kali* Mas, which divided the Dutch settlement from the Chinese and Malay settlements. At this time, there was a regulation that each ethnic group should be in their own definite area: Chinese, Arab, Malay or the indigenous people. Handinoto (1996:28) stated that based on a Memoir of Conquest of Java (1813) for Mayor William Thron, the development of Surabaya as a port city at this time was impressive.

Surabaya has been developed by three different groups of communities: the indigenous people, the Europeans and the Far-
Easterners. The indigenous people comprised both the common people as well as the aristocrats who had received positions in the Dutch government. The Europeans were British, Germans, Belgians, French and others, but mostly Dutch (based on the 1825 census), while the Far-Easterners were the Chinese and the Arabians. Each of these groups had separate settlements, not only because of their close-knit linkages, but also because of the Dutch political tactic for controlling the power of each ethnic group. It was a social segmentation and plurality of imagery that would persist.

The Dutch stayed in the area surrounding the fort; the Chinese had their Chinese town to the east of the fort, where they built their houses as well as their commercial settlement, next to the Arabians; and the Javanese stayed in their spreading kampungs throughout the Surabaya area (see Figure 5.4).
The European people, especially the Dutch, dominated the formal occupations such as government employees and professionals, while the Chinese and some of the Arabians were principally traders. The other Arabians were Moslem leaders. The Chinese society had a tight, closed and self-sufficient community. They did not receive a lot of services and facilities from the Dutch government, but tended instead to provide their own. As part of their focus on business activities and alliances, the Chinese were principally engaged in the field of retail stores, textiles, and
other trade. The Arabians, on the other hand, were quite likely to mix with the indigenous people.

To support his mission of enlarging the military power in order to extract much more agricultural produce from the island, Daendels constructed a thousand-kilometre road along the coastline of north Java, from Anyer in west Java, to Panarukan in east Java. As part of this activity, the Dutch built some amenities in a number of potential cities along the road. In Surabaya they built the fort and military and marine workshops already referred to, while to support their political and economic strategy they provided services such as a central post office and hospital, and built up a dockyard for the maritime fleet. These activities were located around the harbour area, along the kali Mas’s riverbank to the Jembatan Merah. At this time, Jembatan Merah was a potential business centre, as it not only offered transportation by river or road, but also accommodated the needs of the producers, traders and consumers. Jembatan Merah was the Dutch industrial and business area, while the eastern part was the Chinese residential and business area. Jembatan Merah was also the junction of the main roads of the city, from west to east and from north to south. In 1837, the Dutch government strengthened the defences and protected its community by building Prins Hendrik fort. But it did not serve this defensive function for long, since the Dutch soon became more politically open.

The Dutch economic development policy in 1841 led to the city’s expansion as an industry and trading city. The government tried to encourage private industries and traders in the Netherlands to open their outlets in Ost Hindies (Indonesian) cities, including Surabaya.

The other circumstance that affected Surabaya in becoming a more significant harbour and trading city was the Dutch Cultivation Law in 1870. The objective of this law was to encourage the European, and
especially Dutch, businessmen to open plantations. East Java was good for
tobacco and other plantation crops, but most suitable of all for sugar. In
only a few years East Java was successful in the sugar business. In order to
advance the plantation sector, the Dutch government improved the
harbour facilities and roads, and constructed a railroad to Malang in 1873,
in the cooler highland country to the southeast, which then became a
resort area. The main road encouraged the southward growth of Surabaya.
By 1895 Surabaya had been modified to suit the needs and tastes of the
small minority of Europeans (Frederick, 1978:15). Figure 5.5 shows the
expansion of permanent buildings, which were in the main the Dutch
official and private sector buildings for business and trading offices,
spreading throughout the city, but more directly to the south.
Figure 5.5 The spread of Dutch government and private sector buildings for business and trading offices.
Source: Pemerintah Daerah Tingkat II Kotamadya Surabaya, 1990

On the 1905 map (Figure 5.6), transportation routes can be seen to be expanding. There were railroads that connected some of the sugar plantations to the harbour, and Surabaya became the central distributor of farming products from all of the East Java hinterland. The business area continued to grow along the main road, from Jembatan Merah to Pasar Besar, Tunjungan, Simpang and Kaliasin.
1906 was the year of the establishment of the Surabaya city government, covering an area of 103 sq. km and consisting of six districts
This was also the time for Surabaya to begin to pay attention to the quality of its development. The government decided to promote human development and to maintain public facilities and services. Schools were one of its main preoccupations: supported by private associations, it built not only primary and secondary schools, but also vocational and tertiary schools, such as the School of Medicine in Gubeng, which subsequently became the University of Airlangga. There was another restructuring of the city government authority in 1916: as part of the Dutch decentralisation policy, a Mayor would henceforth administer Surabaya.

To carry out city development, it established the Jawatan Pembangunan dan Perumahan (City Development and Housing Institution) in 1916, to administer the housing regulations and draw up a city plan, and later the Surabaya detailed plan for 1949 (Stads plan 1949) (See Figure 5.7).

One of the city's more notable statements in 1916 was that future industries should be constructed in the new industrial zone (Ngagel), in the southern part of the city. They should no longer be located near the harbour, though still on the kali Mas riverbank. This new location was next to the new Dutch housing estate (Darmo). In the 1930 map, Surabaya was divided into two districts, the inner city and the outer city. The inner city district consisted of five urban villages: Nyamploengan, Kapasan, Kranggan, Koepang, and Krembangan, while the outer city district consisted of two urban villages: Seokolilo (an expansion of the previous Gubeng) and Wonokromo.
The 1949 *Stad plan* indicated that Surabaya would be developed as a compact city with proper land-use and administrative planning. It would develop from the harbour in the north, to the Zoo in the south, with clear objectives. The city centre would be in the Jembatan Merah area, surrounded by houses and some other activities. At least three type of houses were in the city: houses without yards (in the inner city area); houses with yards together with unstructured houses in fringe areas (*kampung* houses); and real estate houses (in Simpang and Darmo). There would also be a new airport and horse-race track in the north-west of the city near the Dupak industrial estate. This planning was eventually to accommodate a population of 1,318,930 on 82.8 sq. km of city land by 1960. The city plan and its implementation process continued more or less unaltered after Independence until 1958, except for changes in the region to be developed. There was a period of Japanese rule in 1942-1945, during
World War II, but there were no significant changes in the city during that time nor during the Independence struggle, until the period of Indonesian national government.

5.2.3 The Independence Period

There were some changes in administrative regulations in the early Indonesia period, which affected the administrative structure and planning process. During that early period Surabaya experienced the inflation of 1950, seriously impeding development of its industry and trading. After Independence many property assets were transferred, from the Dutch to the government of Indonesia, or to private Indonesian organizations, or simply to Indonesian individuals. This process was identified as 'Indonesianisation'.

In 1957, for administrative reasons, Surabaya was divided into three regions, consisting of eleven districts of thirty-eight urban villages, as seen in the 1961 maps. The city’s area was expanded in 1965 in conjunction with political changes and structural adjustments of that year and later again in 1989 (see Figure 5.8).

![The 1961 Administrative map of Surabaya](image1)
![The 1965 Administrative map of Surabaya](image2)
![The 1989 Administrative map of Surabaya](image3)

Figure 5.8 The additional area to Surabaya municipality, from 11 districts to 16 districts in 1965, and the subdivision into 19 districts in 1989

Source: Pemerintah Daerah Tingkat II Kotamadya Surabaya, 1990
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The Outline Plan that was approved in 1970 accepted the prevailing pattern of urban development as a basis for the future planning of Surabaya. This outline stated that the city government would increase the community standard of living and develop the city infrastructure and services. It recognised Surabaya as a city of industry, trading, maritime activity, and education. Furthermore, it determined to maintain Surabaya as a well-governed city and to preserve it as a Kota-Pahlawan. To maintain Surabaya as a heritage city, its planning would control changes to the inner city area, and focus on developing its broader region. Three defined areas were given planning priority.

First, the previous European enclave (Jalan Pabean Cantikan, Jalan Pesapen, Jalan Kembang Jepun, and Jalan Niaga) would be renewed block by block to form a business district. Second, there would be strict control on the architectural values of the old government and public buildings surrounding Tugu Pahlawan (the Heroes Monument), as this would become a government area, together with encouragement for the setting up of foreign agencies surrounding it. Third, a city forest would be created between the industrial and residential zones in Tandes, as well as an open space area along the east coast of the city. Housing would be distributed out from the inner city, with the inner city maintained as the economic development centre, especially on the two main axes of Jalan Tunjungan and Jalan Jakarta. Three outer districts would be equipped as self-reliance areas, which would not depend on the city centre, namely: Rungkut in the far southeast, and Tandes and Karang Pilang in the far northwest area. These areas were each promoted as an industrial zone with support services and a centre of development in each. This plan effectively spread the city further to the southeast and northwest.

2 Kota means city and Pahlawan means hero. Kota pahlawan means heroic city. Surabaya is titled the heroic city because of its dominant role in the revolutionary era of Indonesia.
The next step was to prepare the Master Plan Surabaya 2000. This master plan was then confirmed by the local House of Representatives, *Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah (DPRD)*, in 1978. See Figure 5.9.

![Figure 5.9 Map showing proposed developments in Master Plan Surabaya 2000](image)

*Source: Pemerintah Daerah Tingkat II Kotamadya Surabaya, 1990*

The Master Plan has been implemented in steps, with five-yearly assessments and evaluations. As stated in national regulations, city development planning is derived from national and regional development planning, as well as taking into account local resources. This plan still retained the previous (nationally sanctioned) goals for Surabaya, but added to them the goal of improving the community’s standard of living. Therefore it aimed to create greater job opportunities, housing and related titled the heroic city because of its dominant role in the revolutionary era of Indonesia.
The planning covered a number of key principles, consistent with Surabaya's stated role as a city of \textit{Industri, Dagang, Maritim dan Pendidikan / INDAMARDI}, which means city for industry, trading, maritime activities and education. Its industrial development mission, based on a strong workforce and appropriate location, has developed the industrial estates Tandes (to the west) and Rungkut (to the south east). As a trading city, the aim was to cover all scales of markets (the local, the regional and the international) in order to support a full urban economic life. Therefore central markets, and wholesale and retail outlets would be supported by reliable services such as loading and transport facilities, especially for the Tandes area.

As a maritime-activities city, Surabaya was to be maintained as a harbour city not only for trading and travelling, but also for military purposes, as it is one of the national naval bases. Additionally, it would also be maintained as the centre for the fishery industry. As an educational city, it would provide areas for constructing and developing schools and universities, concentrated in the Sukolilo district, along with promoting the city's forests and open spaces as a field of study (in the east coast area). Surabaya would like to maintain all of its historical places and buildings, related to the Battle of Surabaya during the War of Independence, which led to its being designated as a \textit{Kota Pahlawan}. As a defence city, it would retain the army and navy areas.

In supporting regional planning, Master Plan Surabaya 2000 was also prepared in the context of a greater metropolitan development plan: the \textit{GERBANG KERTOSUSILA} Regional Planning (the shortened name for the six regions which are designated to be the central development area for East Java Province, namely Gresik, Bangkalan, Mojokerto, Surabaya, Sidoarjo, and Lamongan) (see Figure 5.10).
East Java Province, namely Gresik, Bangkalan, Mojokerto, Surabaya, Sidoarjo, and Lamongan) (see Figure 5.10).

Figure 5.10 GERBANGKERTOSUSILA Region
Source: Pemerintah Daerah Tingkat II Kotamadya Surabaya, 1990

In addition to being part of the East Java central development, Surabaya is also seen as the Capital City of the Zone Five and Zone Seven Indonesia Development regions. The Zone Five Indonesia Development region includes the East Java and Bali provinces, while Zone Seven includes East Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan and South Kalimantan Provinces. Those roles require Surabaya to especially excel in its administrative services.

Some of the notes to be appended to the Surabaya development plans were:

- **Clarification and further development of the idea of developing Surabaya as an industrial city.** Surabaya was not only a place for heavy industries but also for small industrial business, as well as home-based industries. Detailed plans for the industrial zones should be immediately
• **Further development for Surabaya as a trading city.** This would be gained by centralising the regional trading functions on the CBD-Kembang jepun (Jembatan Merah area), accompanied by decentralising local trading businesses into each city development unit to eliminate pressure on the old city centre and settlement areas. In addition there would also be a stretching of city development to the east and the west, while in opposition to a preference from the business community to keep to the old central business district, the decision was to try to stretch it to the south of the city along the main road.

• To expand its function as a maritime city, Surabaya would not only be a city for naval activities but also for transportation and communication. For this purpose, Surabaya would develop its transport system and organise mass transportation.

• In addition to its function as a city of education, in its regional services it should also be a city for health services as well as for government services.

• The smaller units of the city should be adjusted to fit with the overall city development. Detailed plans should be immediately issued to smooth the implementation of the development process by all of the development actors. Along with this, the local government should strengthen its supervision of the implementation of the development plan.

• Finally, law enforcement would be strengthened.

A number of these notes will have implications for the present study: there is the reference to small business and home based industry in the first note; the preferred decentralisation of corporate activity in the second would bring major commercial activity south; the issue of a mass transit system in the third note, if implemented, would similarly affect the area
system in the third note, if implemented, would similarly affect the area chosen for the present study; and the reference to planning for the 'smaller units' of the city in the fifth is significant.

5.3 RECENT DEVELOPMENT OF SURABAYA

Nowadays, Surabaya is typical of many other fast-growing Indonesian cities, but without the peculiarities of Jakarta that flow from its being the capital city (and that in part account for the non-urban focus of Jakarta observed by Evers and Korff [2000:118] and discussed earlier). Like other cities, such as Bandung, Yogyakarta, Medan, and Makasar, Surabaya is a city that accommodates the 'urban bias' in the national policy on economic and social development that was referred to Chapter 2 (and is in some contrast to the Evers and Korff point). Thus these cities inevitably draw rural people towards their areas.

Urbanisation in Indonesia increased from 22.4% of the total population in 1980 to 35.9% in 1995, and correspondingly over the same period, the rural population decreased from 77.6% to 64.1% (Supas, 1995). In its development Surabaya has implemented community betterment programmes as well as enhanced business expansion. However, in some cases there is considerable argument and friction in accommodating the interests of various parties, especially their preference for the same parcels of land. The struggle between residents and business is especially marked, and this has been a factor in determining the focus of the present study.

The government has revised Master Plan Surabaya 2000 to form the basis for the next master plan, Master Plan Surabaya 2005 (Rencana Tata Ruang Wilayah Kota Surabaya 2005 / RTRW Surabaya 2005). In this latest master plan Surabaya is divided into three Development Areas: the Central Surabaya Development Area, East Surabaya Development Area
The Central Surabaya Development Area is designated as a centre for trading and warehousing, with the support of service activities, including government services. The East Surabaya Development Area is designated as a mixed area for trading, industry, education, tourism and housing.

Although a lot of work envisaged in Master Plan Surabaya 2000 has been implemented, development will be continued with the guidance of the more recent Master Plan Surabaya 2005. There will still be an emphasis on developing the industrial, trading and services sectors, to be followed by human resource development related to poverty alleviation, development of equity, improving local revenue, integrated urban infrastructure development and improved spatial planning. In relation to this last field of development, some examples could be listed, starting with the broader objectives of the city. The Surabaya statistical report for 1996 stated that in achieving the goal of increasing the community standard of living, job opportunities had been created along with improved housing.
stated that in achieving the goal of increasing the community standard of living, job opportunities had been created along with improved housing conditions, cultural life and education services, as well as social services. Further details of job opportunities that had already been created and made available in Surabaya in the previous ten years were noted.

Improvement in housing conditions and neighbourhood facilities over the previous ten years in Surabaya could be seen as part of the ‘booming’ property business in Indonesia, especially for the formal housing sector, which has mostly been carried out by private developers. The other agents participating in this process were the co-operative housing institutions and Perum PERUMNAS, the national housing agency. The ‘big’ housing estate developers preferred to explore the western part of the city for middle-low to high-class settlements. The other, smaller housing developers tended to concentrate in the eastern and southeastern parts of the city down to the Sidoarjo district and attached to the Sidoarjo housing estates, for middle-low to middle income settlements. The smallest housing estates supplied low to middle-low class settlements in the south-west part of the city, near Karang Pilang industrial zone together with Perum PERUMNAS on the north-west part of the city (in Driyorejo). Previously, in the early 1970s, Perum PERUMNAS, in its task of constructing low to middle-low housing settlements, had constructed many houses in the Tandes area, to support housing in this industrial zone. This housing was then connected with the real estate housing from the western part, to make the zone completely a settlement area. This supported the master plan, which stated that future housing would extend out from the inner city.

Meanwhile, informal housing was still being constructed by the people themselves in the existing kampungs, both in the inner city and the fringe areas. Housing improvement and small-scale housing construction
houses on the remaining land. These *kampungs* have tried to accommodate
the expansion of extended families as well as newcomers, and
consequently most of the existing settlements are becoming denser.

Supporting people's efforts to accommodate themselves, and
consistent with the objective of developing and improving environment
quality, local governments have supplied neighbourhood services through
*Kampung* Improvement Programmes (KIPs). Furthermore, this effort has
also helped to accommodate some of the population predicted for the year
2000 and beyond. Nowadays, as infrastructure installations have already
spread all over the city, connections for water taps, telephone and
electricity could be effected by every citizen on an individual basis,
although more expensively than through collective action as part of the
KIP projects.

Surabaya has advanced some way towards the long stated goal of
being an *INDAMARDI* city, but also a city of good government and
heritage. This can be illustrated as follows:

The three outer districts, Rungkut, Tandes and Karang Pilang, which
were promoted as industrial zones, have flourished to form a promising
industrial district. They have infrastructure and services support as well
as residential settlements. Further development of Surabaya as an
industrial city, as stated in the evaluated master plan, has enabled it to
accommodate all kinds of industrial businesses, not only heavy and light
industries, but also home industries. A lot of home industries are
mushrooming in all parts of the city, including in the *kampungs*.
(Unfortunately, this is not backed up by enforcement of safety laws, so that
many *kampung* home industries are out of control and seriously lack safety
awareness.) Conversely, along with the city's broad spatial planning,
detailed plans for the designated industrial zones have been formulated.
Conversely, along with the city’s broad spatial planning, detailed plans for the designated industrial zones have been formulated. Trade was another preferred activity for Surabaya. Retail shops and trading offices are flourishing, together with all kinds of service businesses such as accommodation, entertainment, travel agents, restaurants and so on. These tend to be centralised in the Kembang Jepun Centre Business District (Jembatan Merah area) and along the main line of Jalan Jakarta to Jalan Tunjungan as the master plan indicated, and as the businessmen have come to prefer. However, decentralised local trading business in each city development unit is also succeeding. Furthermore, in a lot of cases lines of business and trade in the form of strip development along roadways are now connecting the city development units of the various business districts (though the effects on traffic flow tend to range from serious to chaotic). In order to support urban economic life, Surabaya has improved the existing market places that serve both regional and local demand. Appropriate services and infrastructure have been installed in the two big regional wholesale markets, Pasar Turi and Pasar Atom. Moreover, to support the city’s daily needs, medium wholesale markets have been completed in each urban district, supported by traditional markets in each settlement unit. At the same time, reliable services as well as loading facilities for factory outlets have been provided.

Supported by the central government, Surabaya has improved its civil harbour not only for conventional trading and travelling but also for handling containers. Consequently, fisheries no longer exist in the harbour, but they still thrive on the coastline further out from the harbour. As part of this development, Surabaya is also endeavouring to improve its transportation and communication systems, although it has not succeeded yet. As with other medium-sized cities in developing countries, Surabaya is facing traffic problems in its transportation system, and new mass
various components are not well connected, those who possess private vehicles prefer to use them, which then make the roads over-burdened and congested, especially during peak hours. This occurs particularly on the main roads around the CBD area or public facilities, even though road widening and improvement has occurred and remains a priority. All kinds of vehicles are on these roads. Motorcycles dominate the private vehicles, followed by cars and bicycles, while the public transport consists of taxis, buses, bemo (mini buses), becak (pedi-cabs), and more recently ojek. Moreover, business transportation also affects the roads, from motorcycle couriers to trucks and lorries. While the road and highway improvements have assisted transport services for businesses, they have also enabled the population to become more aware of the relative advantages and disadvantages of the city, and to determine their behaviour accordingly. Aside from their purpose of serving traffic, they have also opened up the western part of Surabaya, which has enabled private developers to explore it for constructing their housing estates.

In the decade of the 1990s, Surabaya also proved itself as an educational city, especially for tertiary education. Private universities and other tertiary education institutions have filled up the Sukolilo district, the promoted educational area. They have built their campuses side by side with the new development campuses of two highly regarded national universities, Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember (ITS) and Universitas Airlangga (UNAIR), although neither the city forest nor the open space as a field of study (Tandes and the east coast line) have been created yet. In just a few years Surabaya has become a tertiary education centre for East Java Province. Many students, mostly from East Java Province, like to pursue their tertiary education in Surabaya, not only at the two national universities, but also at the private universities.
pursue their tertiary education in Surabaya, not only at the two national universities, but also at the private universities.

To serve its function as a city for health services, the local government, working with the Health Department and the Education and Culture Department, has been improving the big teaching hospital in Surabaya as a Regional Hospital, as well as operating community health centres in each of the community units. Along with this, there is a naval hospital and an army childbirth clinic, which also serve the general public. Surabaya is also encouraging the private sector to provide private hospitals, clinics and other health facilities. There are ten private hospitals and many private surgeries. Surabaya is also a city noted for government services. As well as being the capital city of East Java Province, it is also a location for all of the representative offices for ministerial departments and central government offices or bureaux. In its physical development, it has undertaken much construction and urban betterment over recent decades, although the upgrading and urban renewal programmes for the six old districts and the previous European enclave have not been implemented.

The local government, through Dinas Pengawasan Bangunan, the building-construction supervisory office, has set up a building regulation to conserve old government and public buildings on the grounds of architectural value. In this way it supported concerns for Surabaya as Kota Pahlawan. Meanwhile, through Bappeda, its local development bureau, there has been an arrangement to make detailed plans for Surabaya’s districts and special regions. Not all of the districts in Surabaya have detailed conservation plans, but most have special areas with specific detailed plans.

When the Indonesian developers were enjoying their decade of good times from the mid 1980s to the mid 1990s, together with other cities in Indonesia Surabaya was flooded with physical development projects. Silas
demand of the 21st century, although the economic collapse of 1997 has meant that many were uncompleted, unoccupied and now derelict, and are likely to remain so for years.

There are some aspects of the implementation of the master plan that need however to be reconsidered. For instance the restriction on developing the inner city area needs to be revisited: despite restrictions, construction has continued to accommodate the location preferences of the property investors. It seems that local government has not seriously executed a high level of control on this. Another example is the proposal to create more public open spaces: while there have been some efforts to do so, by opening the kali Mas riverbank, this goal has not been vigorously pursued. Many areas are favoured to be new business areas rather than city forest or open spaces, despite the clear evidence in collapsed earlier developments that business premises are already over supplied and that there is no demonstrated demand for those now imagined. Thus there is not only a need for effort to strengthen the supervision and law enforcement of the implementation of the development plans, but also for a clear perspective on the Surabaya 2005 Master Plan, in the light of the changed circumstances post-1997.

Referring to the Master Plan, Surabaya municipality prepared Rencana Detail Tata Ruang Kota /RDTRK, detailed plans for each of its districts. It promoted each district as a Unit Pengembangan (development unit), supported in each case by some Unit Lingkungan pengembangan (neighbourhood development units). The next section will describe one of these typical inner city development units in Surabaya.
Figure 5.12 Pictures of recent Surabaya

Source: Laboratorium Perumahan dan Permukiman
5.4 UNIT PENGEMBANGAN TEGALSARI (TEGALSARI DEVELOPMENT UNIT)

Unit Pengembangan Tegalsari is one of the Surabaya detailed plans. The area covered by it was planned as the city’s central development unit, and was meant to be the centre of trading and services development as well as public facilities. It has also developed as the centre for government offices, although the plan endeavours not to neglect its existing condition as a preferred housing area. Figure 5.13 shows the area of the Unit Pengembangan Tegalsari (Tegalsari Development Unit).

Tegalsari Development Unit covers the whole area of Kecamatan Tegalsari (Tegalsari district), consisting of 11 unit lingkungan (neighbourhood development units) within 11 sub-districts: Alun-alun Contong, Peneleh, Genteng, Kedungdoro, Embong Kaliasin, Tegalsari,

Figure 5.13 Map of Surabaya and the location of Tegalsari Development Unit
Wonorejo, Kartini, Keputran, Darmo and Darmo Kali), in a 765.7 ha area, and inhabited by 184,412 people (Pemerintah Daerah Tingkat II Kotamadya Surabaya, 1997), with the majority in the productive age groups (between 15 years and 45 years) and employed in various types of business activities. People work principally in the sectors of craft and industries, government services, health care, trading and services. The trading and services sector occupations include carpenters, construction labourers, beauticians, tailors, traders, self-employed drivers, rickshaw drivers and transportation services.

From 1990 to 1995 the population growth rate declined to 0.49% per annum. Its land uses are housing, taking up the largest area (55%), with the rest comprising public facilities (7%), commercial (16%), open space (3%), industries (0.2%), empty land (1.8%), and infrastructure (17%). The commercial activities are tending to displace the housing and public facilities. Along most of the main roads, houses have been replaced by trading and new public facilities, which sometimes extend back from the roads to engulf the kampung houses. With the inducement of money, kampung residents are pressured to release their houses for such development. The broader population, meanwhile, pays a price in roadside induced traffic chaos.

**Land use**

The Tegalsari Development Unit area is densely built up, where housing has a floor area ratio from 0.6 to 1.8 with one to three floors, while its building coverage is from 60% to 80%. The floor area ratio of the public space area is 0.7 to 25.6, for 1 to 32 floors, with a building coverage of 70% to 80%. The commercial area, in turn, has a floor area ratio from 0.7 to 17.5 for 1 to 25 floors, and a building coverage of 70%. The smallest area is the industrial
area, which occurs only in Keputran sub-district, with a 0.8 to 4.8 floor-area ratio for 1 to 6 floors of building, and with a building coverage of 80%

The extraordinarily high reported floor area ratios must raise some suspicion: clearly the projects to which they apply have 'slipped under the radar' of good planning and development control. There may have been special circumstances that justified the official leniency (perhaps a politically motivated aim to 'create an image' – the search for spectacle?), or it may be that the special circumstance was the transfer of money or other favours. The exploration of these issues, which relate to the relations between developer interests and government, are outside the scope of the present study. Suffice it to say that the suspect projects were indeed intrusions into kampung space, and that the role of development control is a question for further research.

The transportation system in this development unit is directed to reduce congestion, and to 'flatten' the distribution of transport accessibility to make it more evenly distributed, from north to south and west to east across the city, since the area lies at the centre of the city. As a result, the area is experiencing dense traffic not only because of the business and private activities but also simply due to the focussing effect of the mass transportation. Today, in supporting mass transportation, there are 13 minibus routes and, of course, taxis operated by the private sector, and another four routes of buses run by both public and private sectors. Accordingly, traffic jams sometimes occur in the peak hours, not only because of the volume of vehicles, but also the uncertain terminuses of the mass transportation and the chaos of street parking. Street parking is the primary option for private cars, since there are only four private parking facilities available in the area.

Housing in the area varies in size and density. Kampung houses are typically small, while the medium and large houses are from both the Dutch
and later eras, often constructed in the early 1950s to the 1960s. The high-density housing is in the *kampung* areas, which is generally informal housing, mainly in *kelurahan* (sub-districts) of Keputran, Tegalsari, Wonorejo and part of Genteng and Kedungdoro. The less dense housing, mainly in the previous Dutch areas, is formal housing, and mostly located in the sub-districts (*kelurahan*) of Darmo, Dr. Soetomo, part of Keputran, Embong Kaliasin and Genteng. In the Tegalsari area, housing has been planned as both formal and informal housing. Formal housing is largely on the existing street lines, and the informal housing was planned in a form of clustered housing or flats.

**Facilities and services**

There is no plan for increased school and worship facilities, since there is adequate provision for these in this development unit, although the quality needs to be improved. Schools already cover all education levels, from kindergartens, primary schools, and secondary schools to tertiary education. Worship facilities accommodate all of the five Indonesian official religions (Moslems, Catholics, other Christians, Hindus and Buddhists). There are also adequate health services for the area, from the neighbourhood primary health care (*posyandu*), community health centres (*puskesmas*), and health clinics (*poliklinik*), up to hospital services. However, more attention needs to be given to the development of the community health centres.

As mentioned above, the dominant economic activities in this area are trade and services. Those activities spread historically from the north to the south of the area along the main roads, from the Alun-alun Contong sub-district to Keputran sub-district. In order to grasp the goal as a centre for trade and services of Surabaya, four areas have been planned for trade buildings: the area of the Tunjungan trapezoid, the Kedungdoro rectangle,
Tegalsari rectangle, and Genteng rectangle. Then less intensive trading and service areas are to be developed in the centres of the development units and in the neighbourhood units. These trading businesses include markets, stalls, shops and warehouses, which could be expanded with services that include entertainment and recreation. Today, shops dominate these trading and service facilities (1,319), followed by stalls (781), warehouses (70) and markets (13) (Pemerintah Daerah Tingkat II Kotamadya Surabaya, 1997).

The least frequent activities are industrial. There are only three industrial activities on this area, in the Keputran sub-district, utilising remaining old factories which were originally established in the Dutch 'new industrial' area: Mataram paints, Daimaru sandals and two old bakeries. In the most recent plan, industries are no longer recommended for the area, and accordingly these existing industries should be relocated.

Cultural and recreation activities do not enjoy a reasonable share of the facilities of Surabaya. There are only a few amusement centres and a few small city parks. People spend their leisure time at home or going outside for window shopping in the shopping centres, eating at restaurants or seeing movies. Sometimes they go to temporary exhibitions. Until this recent development plan, culture and recreation centres as well as amusement centres were to be only part of the trading and services activities. The new plan can only be judged as pessimistic in relation to new open spaces for parks. All the plan does is to guarantee to maintain the existing open spaces such as small parks, boulevards, riverbanks and cemeteries. However, Tegalsari development unit does present some opportunities, since the city-wide cultural and recreation services are mainly located in this area. There are eight cinemas, six exhibition centres, nine sports halls, and fourteen sports fields, although not everyone has equal access to these services.
All residents in this area have access to electricity, water supply, telephone connections and gas installation if they seek them, as all of those systems are already set up in the area. There are also many public telephone and communication stalls (wartel). The area is also on the city cleansing system. There are two levels of cleaning systems, the first based on neighbourhood unit responsibilities and the second on the city cleansing department. The first level involves communities managing their own waste disposal from each of the houses to the city's waste disposal depots, while the second level involves the city cleansing department, which removes the waste from the depots to the city waste disposal centres.

5.5 **KAMPUNG KALIASIN: THE FIRST (OBSERVATIONAL) SURVEY**

*Kampung* Kaliasin is part of the Tegalsari district summarized above. As discussed in Chapter 4, this *kampung* was chosen as a specific study area for the purposes of the present research.

5.5.1 Planning for Kampung Kaliasin

Kampung Kaliasin is in Unit Lingkungan pengembangan Kedungdoro (neighbourhood development unit), one of the 11 units of the Tegalsari development unit (Unit Pengembangan Tegalsari), as indicated by Figure 5.14.
A base map of the area was collected from the city government on a scale of 1: 10,000. It describes the structure of the kampung, the roads, pathways, drainage and building locations. As well as the map, further information about the kampung was found in the city government detailed plan, and this information was further enriched by on-the-spot observation and informal chatting with people in the area.

Data in the Tegalsari detailed plan stated that this district is dominated by housing, covering some 67% of the land area. Most of the houses are informal, since it is one of the old kampungs of Surabaya. Commercial areas, in turn, accounted for some 18%, infrastructure 11%, empty land 3%, and public facilities 1%, with no open-spaces and no industrial area. In these
Tegalsari sub-districts, there are 29,423 inhabitants, with the population declining at an annual rate of about 1.07% over the period from 1991 to 1995.

In 1991, 481 people moved out, 84 people in 1992, 48 people in 1993, 556 in 1994, and 418 people in 1995. It seems that this is connected with the construction of new hotels and a shopping centre on the periphery of the area. The major occupations of the people are in the trading and services sectors (12,980), government services (6,505), industries and handcrafting (21) and health sectors (19). The area is planned as a mixed area for housing, trading and services, and public facilities, and an indication of its intended activities and facilities is displayed in Figure 5.15

![Figure 5.15 Land use planning as currently proposed for Kampung Kaliasin](source: Pemerintah Daerah Tingkat II Kotamadya Surabaya, 1997)

The types of houses would be shop-houses, office-houses, apartments or condominiums, detached houses, kampung houses and flats. The trading and services activities would consist of shopping centres, offices, shops and retail areas, stalls, markets, services and hawkers’ activities or informal trading. The public facilities would include facilities for education, health
care, government services, worship, culture and recreation as well as sport. Housing would cover 50% of the area, which means a reduction from the existing proportion of 67.3%, while the other 50% would be a mix of trading and services and public facilities.

The plan suggests that the housing area would be inside a ring of trading and services areas and public facilities. The plan envisages improvements and some specific renewals of housing in the area, since the houses are categorised as disorderly, and very dense, especially in the old kampung.

Transportation is proposed to be improved in order to reduce congestion and more evenly distribute the transportation and movement. There is a plan for widening some of the local streets, but these would cut through many of the houses, and this is especially the case with the kampung through-streets. Public facilities such as education, health, worship, and government services would not be further developed since they are claimed to be in good order (see Figure 5.16).

Figure 5. 16. Street plan for Kampung Kaliasin in Unit Lingkungan pengembangan (UL) Kedongdoro.
Source: Pemerintah Daerah Tingkat II Kotamadya Surabaya, 1997
Large building blocks (block system buildings) on the existing trading and services area along the streets that enclose the unit would be encouraged. Since it is a mixed area, both the building coverage and the floor area ratios would be varied. The plan states that the building coverage would be 0.4 to a maximum of 0.75 for the high density housing area (the *kampung*) (see Figure 5.17).

![Figure 5.17 Building coverage permission in Unit Lingkungan pengembangan Kedungdoro](image)

Source: Pemerintah Daerah Tingkat II Kotamadya Surabaya, 1997

The floor area ratio would not be the same for the street oriented buildings (SOB) and the block system buildings (BSB). For the SOB, it would be a maximum of five, while for the BSB it would be eleven to twenty-five (see Figure 5.18). As observed above, these exorbitantly high floor area rations are clearly anomalous, and suggest either error or lack of realism on the part of the planners, or else an opening for collusion between developer and development controller. But, to repeat from previously, these questions of the role of development control are beyond the scope and aims of the present study.
Accordingly, the number of levels in the buildings would also vary. Houses in the high-density *kampung* would have a maximum of four levels. The technical plans appear to indicate that the trading and services buildings would be high-rise buildings. Street-oriented buildings should have a maximum of ten levels, while the block system buildings would have around twenty-five to fifty levels – though again the realism of the projection is to be questioned. (Figure 5.19)
The plan thus indicates that the existing kampung Kaliasin would be pushed to the centre of the area and encircled by ten-storeyed street-oriented buildings and perhaps forty-storeyed block-system buildings. Moreover, the kampung itself was planned for a four-storeyed settlement, crossed by two local primary roads.

5.5.2 A First Description of Kampung Kaliasin

As shown in Figure 5.20, five streets circle Kampung Kaliasin: Jalan Basuki Rachmad, Jalan Embong Malang, Jalan Kedungdoro, Jalan Kedungsari and Jalan Tegalsari.
Kampung Kaliasin’s Boundary

Figure 5.2 Map of Kampung Kaliasin and its encircling roads

Observing the edge of the *kampung* from its encircling roads provides a useful insight into the way the *kampung* edge has been developing. Starting from the corner of Jalan Tegalsari with Jalan Basuki Rachmat, then going along the eastern side of Jalan Basuki Rachmat to the corner of Jalan Pemuda, there are: a three-storeyed glass building for the *Honda* showroom next to a small but old and famous bakery outlet, a restaurant that used to be a night club, offices, and a brand new bank branch office. At the corner is a large conserved Dutch building now used as a sport and art shop. On the western side there are blocks of shops and offices, starting with Surabaya Business Centre, the first rental offices in Surabaya built in 1978, which
includes Gelael Supermarket in its ground floor (the first supermarket in Surabaya), and which used to be the first bowling centre. The next block is a large glass fronted building, newly renovated and owned by a leading Indonesian car dealer, Indomobil, for its showroom up to the corner of Jalan Kaliasin Pompa, the main street that goes through Kampung Kaliasin. At the other corner of Jalan Kaliasin Pompa is the super block developed by PT. Pakuwon Jati, comprising Tunjungan Plaza Shopping Centre, a twelve-storey rental-office (the BBD Tower), the Sheraton Hotel, a condominium with an eight-story parking facility, which was one of the most successful property businesses in Surabaya in the 1990s. A small dead-end street called Margoyoso that leads to a branch of Surabaya's Telecommunication Office ends this block. The next block begins with a three-star hotel, Hotel Tunjungan, built in 1995, which replaced an old shopping arcade (pertokoan Apollo); then at the corner of Jalan Basuki Rachmad and Jalan Embong Malang is Toko Nam, an old department store that existed before Indonesia's Independence.
Figure 5.21 Street Picture of Jl. Basuki Rachmat
Source: Laboratorium Perumahan dan Permukiman FTSP-ITS
Jalan Embong Malang is mostly occupied by small service businesses on the northern side, such as tailors, banner and emblem makers, sport shops, and restaurants. However, there is a big two-storied renovated local-government-owned shopping arcade, Pasar Tunjungan. It was an unsuccessful relocation project. In its previous location it was a busy and popular traditional market but at present it is the quietest market in Surabaya, as the rents in the shopping arcade were too high for the former occupants of the market. The southern side of Jalan Embong Malang is occupied by high-rise buildings. Beyond Toko Nam is the Pakuwon Jati block, which includes the Sheraton hotel and its condominium, then the Surabaya Go Skate building that used to be the first and the only ice-skating rink in the early 1980s. However, only four years after it was constructed, the manager converted it into a convention hall and rental shops. Next to this building are more shopping arcades, a partly constructed and subsequently abandoned high-rise building, and the Westin Hotel (a new five-star hotel built in 1996), and some old shops.
Figure 5.32 Street Picture of Jl. Embong Malang
Source: Laboratorium Perumahan dan Permukiman
Turning south from Jalan Embong Malang into Jalan Kedungdoro, there are other types of businesses. This street is dominated by car spare-parts and accessory shops, although there are also some other kinds of small shops and offices. It is also quite a busy road at night, being occupied by food stalls, and it is one of Surabaya’s favourite places to eat in the city.

The next turn to the east is into Jalan Kedungsari, which used to be a street of Dutch era mansions, although since the early 1980s some of the houses have become shops, offices and other facilities. Only a few are still houses. The last street that encloses Kampung Kaliasin is Jalan Tegalsari. This is also a street of Dutch mansions, and a few of these have also been turned into business offices and shops, and local services such as a school, police station, and administration offices.

This area was increasingly an outlet for investment capital in the “long growth” of the Suharto era, but was then caught up in the 1990s boom and collapse because of over investment. At this time, the public realm was completely neglected.
Figure 5.4 Street Picture of Jl. Kedungdoro
Source: Laboratorium Perumahan dan Permukiman
Entering the *kampung* from these enclosing commercial roads gives quite another experience. Historically, as some of the residents recounted, Kampung Kaliasin was one of the older traditional *kampungs* in Surabaya. Soon after Independence in 1945 some vacant land on this *kampung* was granted to some of the Independence fighters. However, until the early 1960s the *kampung* was not very crowded. Most of the residents knew each other, and moreover some of them were relatives. The original *kampung* houses were permanent structures with brick or wooden walls and tiled roofs. Multi-function houses were common; some were used as local shops or for other services. Some houses had large courtyards, although in later years these were subdivided. Some parts of the un-built land were later given to the householders' children, and other parts were sold to other people for cash. All of these processes underlay the area's dramatically increasing densification.

In 1979 the Kampung Improvement Program (KIP) was implemented in Kampung Kaliasin by the city government. As well as physical development it also received some assisted social development projects. One of these that still operates is the community co-operative institution (*Koperasi Masyarakat*), an institution that accommodates business activities shared by people for their mutual benefit.

The KIP improved the internal roads, pathways, and drainage, as well as providing water and electricity supply, and it provided some public toilets, since not all dwellings had toilets. Recently there has also been provision of public telephones.
Figure 5.5 Picture of Kampung Kalasain

Source: Self Collection & Laboratorium Perumahan dan Permukiman
As the years went by, along with property business booming, more formal development occurred on the kampung edge (along the enclosing commercial roads described above). The arrival of these formal businesses caused the kampung to flourish. More people were coming, some working at those developing businesses, while others were utilising the new development environment in other ways, and the kampung's population increased accordingly. However, by the mid-1980s the area was experiencing declining population, as a result of land acquisition for further property development.

As recounted by various residents, there were many community activities and organisations in which the people actively participated, such as PKK (Women's Organisation) and Karang Taruna (Youth Organisation). The city government provided public schools, small-scale health services, administrative offices, and a post office. The community provided other facilities, such as community halls, guard houses, places of worship, and other services including public transport. Daily needs including food were easily found, such as in small traditional markets, shops, stalls, and especially street vendors selling vegetable or ready-made foods.

5.1 CONCLUSIONS

As this has been effectively a history of Surabaya, it is impossible to leave it without some reference to recent events, especially as these constitute part of the context for the present study. The most obvious of these has been the 1997 economic crisis in Indonesia, which has persisted, sadly, into the new century.

That circumstance caused the collapse of further investment, with the consequence that the city's planning has not been able to be implemented. Hardships have confronted a variously desperate, angry and resigned
population, but the *kampungs*, at least on superficial evidence, seem to have survived well.

Linked to the economic collapse, and arguably in part a consequence of it, has been a rapid political evolution (or is it turmoil?). In the course of the study we could witness the departure of three presidents: Suharto (1998), B.J. Habibi (1999), A. Wahid (2001). Subsequently another has left – Megawati Soekarnoputri in 2004. While there may have been little effect on the *kampungs* of Surabaya from these events of the political world, the decentralisation and autonomy marking the new era will be inescapable in its consequences, for are not the *kampungs* already part of a decentralised, autonomous, informal, uncontrolled sector?

The most salient conclusion to be drawn from this history is the quite amazing contrast between the grand plans for kampung Kaliasin linked to the Master Plan Surabaya 2005, and the reality of its present loose, informal, fine-grained pattern of activities. The grand plans come ever further into doubt in that context of post 1997 economic crisis and post 1998 political evolution.

The most pressing question is: how does such a *kampung* actually work – what are the processes of its transformation, first in the context of real and threatened intrusions from the corporate sector that spatially already occupies its edge (pre-1997), and secondly in the context of continuing economic crisis (post-1997) that in turn threatens the corporate sector itself and of a chaotic lurch towards democracy? To deal with this question – part of the research question guiding the present project – is a task for Chapter 6, and then its continuation in Chapter 7.
Chapter 6

Results of First Interview Survey

6.1. Introduction

In Chapter 4 a research program was devised that consisted of three parts: a preliminary observation, to get an overview of kampung Kaliasin, and two surveys to determine the views of the main actors in the kampung about their relationships with the kampung and each other. The first of these surveys was in part to test the interview schedule, but more significantly to test the validity of the research questions and their underlying assumptions; and then followed the second or main survey. The observation of the physical condition of the kampung and aspects of its planning were reported in Chapter 5. The aim of this chapter is to describe the conduct and the outcome of the first interview survey. The main survey will be reported subsequently in Chapter 7.

Section 6.2 outlines the procedure used in the first interview survey, and section 6.3 presents the findings from it. Section 6.4 discusses the changes made to the survey questionnaire as a result of these findings. Conclusions are then drawn in section 6.5.

6.2. First Interview Survey Procedure

The first interview survey, as mentioned in the research design chapter, had two aims. The first aim was to understand the historical development of kampung Kaliasin, in particular to understand how the community perceived the physical development of their kampung. The second aim was to acquire
data with which to reflect on the research questions, the assumptions that
might underlie them, and thereby the operation of the interview schedule.

To perform this first interview survey, it was considered that only a few
interviewees in each part of the area would be required. Therefore, the
interviewees were selected as representatives of the neighbourhood units
(Rukun Tetangga/ RT) in the kampung, to ensure a reasonable geographic
coverage of the area. The sampling method was described in chapter 4.

Following the key themes of the research questions, the interview
schedule was designed to observe the relationships among the three groups
most concerned with kampung Kaliasin: kampung dwellers, small business
persons, and larger (corporate) enterprises.

The questions also include the characteristics of the respondents, their
activities, their current situations, their feelings and perceptions about each
other, and also their expectations for the future of their kampung. A different
interview schedule was used for each of the groups.

6.3. RESULTS OF FIRST INTERVIEW SURVEY

There were only thirty-two kampung dwellers chosen from the neighbourhood
units, and forty-five small businesspersons interviewed. No businesspersons
from the large enterprises were interviewed because the researcher could not
at that stage obtain the necessary consent in the time available for the survey.
This section describes the responses, firstly from the kampung dwellers then the
businesspersons.

6.3.1 The Kampung Dwellers

Kampung dwellers are those who live in the kampung but, in order to get a
suitable response, only adults were chosen as respondents, and preferably the
nominated head of the household, who might be the husband, the housewife
or another family member. The answers will now be described under the headings of respondents' characteristics, activities, and neighbourhood environment.

For the *kampung* dwellers the questions followed four themes, as outlined below:

1. **Respondents' characteristics.** The questions explored the bio-data of the respondents and their residential history.
2. **Activities.** Questions were designed to get an idea of how the *kampung* dwellers utilised the potential of their houses and neighbourhood.
3. **Linkages and networks.** Questions explored the social and economic networks of the *kampung*, to gain a better understanding of the various issues discussed in earlier chapters.
4. **Concern for the neighbourhood.** There were also questions seeking the *kampung* dwellers' views on the development of their neighbourhood, how it affected them, and what they believed about their neighbourhood's future.

**Respondents' Characteristics**

Six questions were asked to explore aspects of the identity of the dwellers: gender, age, place of birth, education, length of residence in Surabaya, and their citizenship within Indonesia. None of the respondents refused to answer those questions.

The reason for choosing these six indicators of personality is:

1. **Gender.** It was preferred that only adults, and preferably the head of the household, should answer the questions. This selection is only a way to build an easy access to the respondents (since most of the women in this area would not be comfortable to talk to an unfamiliar person/stranger, which means that the researcher or surveyors, unless obtaining permission from the husband), although for those
women who could step forward to answer the questions this would be appreciated and accepted.

2. Age. This item is for testing the entitlement of the respondents, since questions would also try to get information about the history and the development of the kampung and also their involvement in the kampung's activities (politics, economics and social activities).

3. Place of birth. This item, together with the question of respondents' opinions about the kampung's condition and its future, would help to fill in the picture of the kampung as seen by its dwellers. Moreover, this question would also help to distinguish the difference perceptions (if any) between those born in the kampung and the migrants.

4. Citizenship. This item is selected for recognising the migrants and their attitude in the kampung.

5. Length of residency. Together with the previous questions this item could give an idea about the affection of the people towards the kampung and, in reverse, it could also illustrate the characteristics of the kampung based on peoples' livelihoods.

6. Education. As discussed in chapter 2, education is one of the gears to 'modernity', which then could influence the respondents' ways of life, ways of thinking, opportunities of work and other social and economic activities.

Figure 6.1 shows the place where the residents were born, and where they are now registered as a citizen.
In this and following figures, the vertical axis shows the percentages of the respondents, not the numbers of respondents. The figure shows that there were only a few migrants in this sample, since most of the respondents were born in Surabaya (origin), and only a few were from other regions in Java, and other islands of Indonesia. Moreover, this was confirmed by their citizenship: most of them were registered as residents of Surabaya (91%), and only a few were registered as temporary residents or were still holding their original citizenship (9%). Thus on this evidence the kampung is dominated by the Surabayans.

Moreover, as shown in Figure 6.2 below, most respondents had been in this kampung for over twenty years, with only a small percentage having stayed less than five years. Hence the suspicion at this point must be that Kampung Kaliasin has a relatively stable population.
Mostly the residents had been there for more than 30 years (before 1970s), with additional information that respondents who were in their thirties and forties had been born or had spent their childhood in this kampung. This might be a biased sample, since mostly the chosen respondents asked their parents or head of the household to be the respondent, because the elders could tell their experiences more completely.

This first interview survey may have included few of the new occupants, either permanent residents or renters, who had come after the development of the big enterprises at the periphery of the kampung – especially if those new occupants were residing with longer established families.

The last indicator that could give a picture of the respondents’ characteristics is their education. Together with other variables from the interview, this item would support to answer questions of community, which will become significant in chapter 8, as education is assumed to be one of the factors that could change the attitude of respondents towards their way of thinking and more over it becomes the basic requirement for participating in modern business activities. Therefore educational levels were reviewed for this study. The results from this question are shown in figure 6.3 below.
These respondents mostly had an intermediate level of formal education. Half had finished junior high school (Sekolah Lanjutan Pertama/SLTP), and almost twenty per cent had finished senior high school (Sekolah Lanjutan Atas/SLTA). However, some had tertiary education, mostly bachelor degrees, with their number greater than those who had only finished primary education (Sekolah Dasar/SD). It is worth noting that those who had middle education levels (SLTP and SLTA) were those who were in their thirties and forties, namely the younger generation of the settlers.

**Housing Conditions**

In order to explore the current housing condition of the kampung, several questions were used, relating to the size, the occupancy, the infrastructure and the construction of the house.

The size of the respondents’ houses would enable us to know the real size of the people's dwellings, which can then be compared with the national standard in order to know the 'actual' size of the kampung houses in a wider policy context. Moreover this question could be elaborated with other questions which could explore the history and the development of the house.
The sizes of the respondents' houses are shown in Figure 6.4.

![Size of houses](image)

**Figure 6.4 Sizes of residents' houses**

Most of these houses were smaller than those in formal-sector housing estates (< 35 sq.m), but still in the range of the public/national starter and simple housing plan (between 21 sq.m. and 36 sq.m).

The highest percentage group of the houses was smaller than 35 square metres, then those between 36 and 55 square metres, and then those between 57 and 90 square metres. The process of the development and redevelopment (including progressive expansion) of the small houses is a significant characteristic of this and other *kampungs* in Surabaya, but was missed in this survey; it will need to be observed in more detail in the main survey (to be reported in Chapter 7 following). Despite their limited size, these houses generally accommodated a considerable number of residents.

In order to get a picture of the 'density' of each house, and of course a sight of the *kampung*'s density, the housing occupancy question is raised. Furthermore, with the field notes and other added information and discussions, these facts could lead researcher to look at the use of the *kampung*'s space. The housing occupancy is shown in Figure 6.5 below.
Even though the houses were mostly small, more than half of them accommodated five or more people, suggesting that this kampung is quite densely occupied.

Description of the housing condition is then completed by the expose of the house’s amenities, covering description of the building structure, roof material, floor cover, road width, water supply and the bathroom and toilet. Figure 6.6 below shows the construction of the houses and the facilities they contained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Structure</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Roof sheet</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Floor cover</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Tile</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Ceramic/</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-perm</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Zinc</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Terrazzo</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood/bamboo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road width in front</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Water supply</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Bathroom - Toilet</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1.5m</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5-2m</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Vendors</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Communal</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 m</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Deep well</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.5 Housing occupancy

Figure 6.6 Amenities of Residents’ Houses
Almost all these houses are permanent in their structure, with brick walls, roof tiles and terrazzo floors. Less than twenty per cent had semi-permanent walls, meaning that their walls are half brick and half other materials, with zinc and asbestos-cement roofs, and plaster floors.

These houses are located on lanes ranging between one-and-a-half to four metres in width and more than eighty percent of them are provided with drainage, since most of this area had been improved under a Kampung Improvement Program (KIP). Most respondents recalled that most people had improved their housing when the KIP project was implemented.

This kampung has had a water supply connection for a long time. Over ninety percent used piped water, some with a direct supply, and some obtained from water vendors, with only a few still using deep well water. However, not all of these houses are equipped with a bathroom and toilet; twelve per cent were still using a public or shared toilet. This showed that although most of these houses were constructed permanently, some still needed communal services, especially for water supply and bathroom/toilet.

Activities

With the aim of learning something of the economic activities of the kampung, this section will describe the residents' employment, the locations of their workplaces, and their transportation. The respondents' occupations would indicate the type of employment in which they are actively involved. Moreover, the data could be expected to help to describe this inner city kampung's economic structure and character.

Figure 6.7 shows the respondents' occupations.
More than fifty percent of the respondents were engaged in various kinds of formal employment, such as working as permanent employees in private, corporate or government institutions and in the armed forces, or doing casual work. Only around a quarter were self-employed persons, running their own businesses. Sadly, on this evidence, nearly a quarter were unemployed.

To get a general idea of the economic status of the residents, a question was asked about their monthly income. These were varied, although most of them are low (see Table 6.1.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Rp. 100,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp. 100,000 to Rp. 200,000</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp. 200,000 to Rp. 300,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp. 300,000 to Rp. 400,000</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp. 400,000 to Rp. 500,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Rp. 500,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: AU $ 1 = Rp. 5,200 (2000)

Table 6.1 Income distribution of residents interviewed
The finding on employment was checked against job location, in order to examine the argument that the kampung was chosen as a place to stay because of its convenience to work. The information about the locations of the dwellers' workplaces could also be expected to help to explain the economic link between the dwellers with their place of work, and subsequently also help the researcher to determine the socio-economic link between the kampung and the city (if any).

Figure 6.8 shows the locations of respondents' occupations.

![Figure 6.8 Locations of respondents' occupations](image)

The majority of the respondents had jobs in the city, in the inner city area more widely defined, or other places within the city, or they were travelling business persons, and only nineteen per cent of them worked in their neighbourhood unit. There were also some commuters, who worked outside the city but still stayed in this kampung. This was confirmed by Figure 6.9 below, which shows the distance to their location of work.
The neighbourhood location of work is represented by those working less than 3 km from home and those working at home, while those who worked in the inner city area were those who were within 3 km to 10 km working distance. Those who stated that their working location was elsewhere within the city had working distances from 10 km to 25 km. The rest were those who were 'travelling', as they work as vendors, middlemen or salesmen, or who worked outside the city. According to these categories only 22 percent worked within the city, and 41 percent in the inner city.

The last supporting data on activities, relating to the respondent's modes of transport, will add information on their mobility. Moreover, the information would also help to explain the majority of vehicles in this settlement, the typical streets and lanes in the kampung, and might reflect their activities in relation to their surrounding or citywide. Means of transportation in this section are categorised in four modes, bicycle, motorcycle, public transport and car, but it could also accommodate the information that respondents do not need any kind of vehicle to go to their work.

The next figure shows the mode of their transport for the journey to work (Figure 6.10.)
Bicycles and motorcycles were the preferred means of transport, for carrying goods as well as people. Few walked or stayed at their homes to work, while only one respondent stated that he used his car to travel to work. Surprisingly, public transport was only used by nine per cent of the respondents even though this kampung is served by 13 routes of public transport.

**Linkages and Networks**

Social networks are exposed in order to observe the 'spirit' of the kampung. They were investigated by asking questions about the frequency of joining in with public functions held in the public facilities of the neighbourhood unit such as the community hall, community worship and community watch. Community hall is a place where the community talk about their kampung's socio-political activities/events, with the meeting regularly occurring at least once in a month. The community worship in this kampung occurs in the mushollas/small mosques or small Christians worship houses (likes small chapels) which have a regular meeting for their members to profess their faith or perform their religious duties. The community watch is a place where the
community in turn gets together with their neighbours in a small group doing patrol for guarding their kampung every night.

The regularity of the respondents joining the social events (according to their own understandings of the terms often/never) will give an idea about the harmony of the kampung, and could express the close relationship between the dwellers in the kampung. It is shown in figure 6.11 below.

![Figure 6.11 Residents' participation in community activities](image)

These kampung residents showed strong participation in community activities, especially in those of the community hall. The percentage joining community worship activities was slightly less, but this was because these activities could be performed in turn by the members of each household in their house. The lowest percentage is in joining the community watch/poskamling (neighbourhood self guarding), but this because each family could be represented by only one member of the family, usually represented by the young adult son or brother.

**Neighbourhood Environment**

The neighbourhood environment section will describe the kampung condition from the eyes of the dwellers. This begins with questions regarding the kampung's healthiness, nuisance, hazards, infrastructure and public facilities,
and their impression of the emergence of new businesses. The next question is regarding the effect of changes in this kampung to the family way of life (i.e. traditional lifestyles, social values, education, kind of past-time activities, business sensitivity). Then, the inquiry ended with question on their opinion about the future of their kampung.

Collecting people’s opinions about their neighbourhood environment, they were asked to compare their current situation with their first experience in this kampung, or their memory of their childhood in it. The responses were enlarged with the field notes where the respondents were asked to describe the kampung’s history and its development.

The results are shown in Figure 6.12.

![Figure 6.12 Respondents' opinions on the condition of the kampung](image)

Many respondents considered that their current neighbourhood should be improved, although a few said that it was still in good condition, and others suggested specifically that it should be turned into a free floods area. A significant proportion of the respondents felt that their environment had become noisy, crowded and overpopulated, especially those who lived around
the Tunjungan Plaza shopping centre, and most notably during shopping hours. A few of them were concerned about the lack of greenery, especially after the kampung had progressively become a denser settlement.

This kampung is not short of public facilities; there are public facilities that are usually used by the respondents; beside the community halls, community worship-houses and community watch, it also equipped with schools, community health centre and local market. However, this local market was only used by thirty-four percent of these respondents, and they were more likely to buy from vendors, flea markets, or stalls around their houses.

The arrival of new ‘big businesses’ in their environment drew some comments. The results are shown in Figure 6.13.

![Figure 6.13 Respondents' impressions on the emergence of large new businesses in the area](image)

Most were unconcerned by the arrival of these businesses, saying that they did not disturb them, or that they were even advantageous. However, one third claimed that the businesses did disturb them in some way. However in this case the responses may have a strong geographical bias, since the question was directed towards the arrival of big business in Jalan Basuki Rachmat (i.e. Gelael, Tunjungan Plaza, Banks, authorised car-dealers, etc) and Jalan Embong
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Malang (i.e. Sheraton Hotel and Westin Hotel). Those who lived some distance from these enterprises were those who made no comment.

Figure 6.14 shows the responses of people to questions about their future settlement or their preferences for their future housing. This is also an open-ended question, since respondents could give their elaborations about it, describing what they would really wish for in their future kampung.

![Figure 6.14 Respondents' preferences for their future]

Responses to this question can suggest something of the future of this type of kampung, and perhaps underpin some predictions concerning who will continue to live in it. More than half of the respondents said that they preferred to stay in the neighbourhood, and only 19% said that they would like to leave.

Mostly those who gave no response or who wished to move believed that an offer from the developers for their properties would give them an opportunity to improve their living conditions. Some of these people stated that this did not mean that they would have to get out of the kampung, since they could have another house in better condition within the kampung.
6.3.2 The Small Business Persons

The small-business persons were chosen from those people running businesses in the kampung, both formally and informally. In order to explore their characteristics, they were questioned on four themes describing their time-span of stay, business activities, concern for the neighbourhood, and its linkages and networks:

- **Business people's characteristics:** Questions were asked about their origin, education and duration of their stay in the kampung. They were also asked to identify their future intentions on running their businesses in the kampung.

- **Business activities:** Questions were designed to record the type of businesses that they were running, and why they chose that kind of business.

- **Concern for the neighbourhood:** The questions explored their vision for the kampung, how it affects them, and what they believe about their neighbourhood's future.

- **Linkages and networks:** These questions recorded their customers and their suppliers, in order to examine their networks within and outside the kampung.

Of forty-five business-people respondents, most were men (60%), but this did not necessarily reflect a bias towards male respondents over female respondents. Both males and females had the opportunity to be interviewed, although some women preferred their male partners to be interviewed. The results will be discussed under the above four headings.
Business people's characteristics

As stated above, the small business respondents were asked about their origin, education and duration of stay in kampung Kaliasin. This information could describe their intention to stay in this kampung.

Based on field notes and transcripts of interview, these entrepreneurs were not trained or brought up as business people. Half of them had a basic formal education background, but had only completed their regular junior or high school education. A few had studied at vocational schools, but this was mostly unrelated to their current business. What is more, most were born in Surabaya, but with twenty-six per cent born in other regions of East Java province, and only ten per cent in other Java and Indonesian regions.

Figure 6.15 below shows the respondents' length of stay in the kampung. The figure shows that some seventy per cent of these entrepreneurs had been in the kampung for more than twenty years, some for very long periods.

Figure 6.15 Respondents' period of residency in this kampung

Beside that information, respondents also stated the year when they established their business. Figure 6.16 shows the years in which their businesses were reported to have been first established.
There was a sharp increase in the numbers of businesses established in the 1960s and 1970s, and another sharp increase in the 1990s. Most of these businesses (78%) were privately owned; although one was a co-operative and the rest were share-based businesses. While this might give us a picture of the longevity of current businesses, what we do not know is the real rate of business formation, including those businesses of the past that have subsequently gone out of existence; nor, unfortunately, is there a direct way of ascertaining the real rate of business formation and ending.

**Business Activities**

In this *kampung* there are many small business activities. This survey found they were of three main kinds: production businesses, trading enterprises and services. The production activities included making shoes or sandals, billiards sticks, toys, and furniture. As the questioning was open-ended, there were various types and sizes of shops recorded, such as: groceries, daily needs stalls, stationery, garments, electrical appliances, car and motor spare-parts, and building materials.
In services business, there were many tailors, beauty salons, food-caterings, car and motor repairs, workshops, printers and some others. This distribution of business activity is reflected in the data of Figure 6.17 below.

![Figure 6.17 Type of respondents' businesses](image)

These activities could generally be categorised as small business enterprises, since over half of the respondents said that the monthly income from their operations was under one million rupiah (AU $ 1= Rp. 5,200 in late 2000), as shows in Figure 6.18 below.

![Figure 6.18 Small businesses monthly income](image)
Choosing this *kampung* as their business location seems to have been generally unplanned, as shown in Figure 6.19.

![Figure 6.19 Reason for choosing business location](image)

Reasons given included 'having a try' since they already had a suitable location (their house) that could be utilised as a place for opening business activities. Another reason was inheriting a business from their parents. Only two respondents claimed that they chose this *kampung* because of its proximity to the central business activities.

**Concern for the neighbourhood**

There seemed to be no specific origin for the customers of the businesses; they come from anywhere in the city. Only one third stated that their clients tend to be their neighbours, and nine per cent of them named some firms outside the *kampung* area as their occasional customers. Two respondents, the tailors, stated that they used to serve companies or corporations inside the *kampung* for their uniforms.

To understand more about their business activities, the interview also included questions on who they preferred to have as business partners and employees. Most respondents stated that they preferred to have relatives as their business partners, especially ones who lived in the same *kampung*. Their second choice was relatives who lived outside the *kampung*, then neighbours.
Half, however, said they believed that their business did not need business partners, and so to them the question seemed irrelevant.

In not choosing their neighbours as partners or employees, respondents did not give clear reasons such as their being unskilled or not needing a job. Furthermore, it also was not because of the availability of skilled relatives or friends. Their responses are showed in Figure 6.20 below.

![Figure 6.20 Reasons for not choosing neighbours as employees](image)

**Figure 6.20 Reasons for not choosing neighbours as employees**

Figure 6.21 displays some reasons given by respondents for why businesspersons might employ their neighbours.

![Figure 6.21 Reasons for employing neighbours](image)

**Figure 6.21 Reasons for employing neighbours**

Based on the above responses, and on the responses to the question of where their employees lived, almost half of them (47%) had employees who
resided outside the kampung, 38% in the kampung, 4% had employees living both inside and outside the kampung, while the rest stated that they did not have any employees (11%). It seems that this kampung is also a significant and apparently thriving workplace.

Since these are small business activities, they generally employed between one and five full-time employees (53%). Part-time employees were generally hired on the basis of seasonal orders. Twenty-two per cent preferred to run their businesses by themselves, while twenty per cent employed some six to ten people, and only two respondents employed more than ten people.

None of these businesspeople had hired their employees for formal positions such as managers, secretaries, treasurers or personnel officers or any other professional position. Most of the employees were sales or casual workers without any provisions for health, housing or life insurance. They are paid on a monthly basis, sometimes with a transport fare benefit or other additional rewards.

The respondents tended to have no objection if their employees lived outside the kampung. Comments were made to the effect that they did not have any concern about where their employees lived (51%), and 40% of them
commented that transport to this area was easy and satisfactory, while some commented that there was no appropriate accommodation at the work place.

**Linkage and Network (Relationship with Kampung Dwellers)**

It seems that the businessmen did not have any particular relationship with the kampung dwellers. They said that their services were not only used by kampung dwellers but also more widely. Less than forty per cent claimed that they were serving only kampung dwellers, with more than sixty per cent stating that they were serving everybody who needed their services.

![Figure 6.23 Customers of businesses in the kampung](image)

Figure 6.23 shows the reported relationships of the businesspeople to the kampung residents. The businesspeople generally did not have acquaintances in the kampung area, especially those who had shops or stalls on the edge of the kampung. Only a quarter of them were familiar with their neighbours, and few of them knew companies or other businesses surrounding them, although most had already been there for more than fifteen years. They did not have any intention to have better connections except with their customers.

Figure 6.24 shows the responses of these businesspersons to questions on complaints about their presence in the area. Almost half of them claimed that they never disturbed the environment, and only 10% admitted that sometimes
they did disturb the environment or the local community. On the contrary, almost 20% stated that *kampung* dwellers supported their presence.

![Bar chart showing businesspeople's responses about claims of disturbances](image)

**Figure 6.24 Businesspeople's responses about claims of disturbances**

More than seventy per cent of these businesspeople expressed the view that the *kampung* needed their business activities, while those who did not have any direct relationship with the residents tended to agree that this *kampung* would eventually be developed as a business area. Figure 6.25 shows responses to the question about how the businesspeople viewed the future of their businesses - more specifically about their future intentions.

![Bar chart showing intention for future business expansion](image)

**Figure 6.25 Intention for future business expansion**
Although almost sixty per cent said that they would like to expand their businesses, few had definite plans to do so. Of those who did intend to expand, most did not express any particular reason.

6.4. OUTCOME OF THE FIRST INTERVIEW SURVEY

The outcome of this first interview survey can be summarised under the following headings.

Symbiotic relationship:
Judging from the employment characteristics of the residents and the types of employees required by the businesspersons, there was little symbiotic relationship between these two groups, on the basis of this limited evidence. It was notable that the residents did not depend on these businesses for employment, and the businessmen also did not reserve their employment vacancies for the kampung dwellers.

The variety of occupations and the widely distributed locations of the respondents' jobs seemed to confirm that the relationship between the residents and the surrounding enterprises was quite loose.

It seems, therefore, that the hypothesis deduced in Chapter 4 about a symbiotic relationship of residents and businesses did not in general correspond with the characteristics of the study area as revealed at this point in the study, although there were a few cases where some inter-dependency did seem to occur.

Information from the big businesses could affect this conclusion, yet the fact that most residents appreciated the arrival of the 'big' enterprises could at least imply some feeling towards an indirect relationship.

Housing significance:
This can best be described by discussing the residential history of the respondents, their responses to the development of the area, and its value for the residents especially and for all inhabitants in general.

Because most of the respondents were from Surabaya and had been there for more than twenty years, this kampung can be considered, admittedly on very limited evidence, as a stable residential area. However, the small size of dwellings there is problematic and needs to be questioned. If it was the result of the kampung densification process, this might be confirmed by the respondents’ preference for staying in this kampung. Moreover, concerning their working places and their means of transport, the kampung was also a significant place of residence for those working in the wider city.

However, the selection of these respondents could have resulted in some misinformation, since the renters were excluded. Therefore, this observation cannot address the question of the use of the neighbourhood for transient residents. This issue was brought up by some of the respondents’ anecdotes concerning the recent condition of their kampung, in which they said they were pleased to accommodate many new residents in their kampung.

Prospective future:
This can be explored by comparing the opinions of the inhabitants, both the residents and the businesspeople. The residents and the businesspeople do not seem to have the same perspective, although they both cared about the kampung based on their own objectives.

The issue of letting the kampung receive newcomers, by renting out houses or rooms, indicated that this kampung did apparently have significance as a temporary dormitory. So, it might be predicted that it would become a more transient kampung with the increasing mobility of the population, though this observation remains mere surmise.
The option of letting the *kampung* become much more open to business activities as suggested by the businesspeople, and the objections of some residents who did not feel comfortable with this happening, are in some conflict and need to be explored further. This calls for a redefining of the questions on the arrangements for the future of the *kampung*. 
6.5. CONCLUSIONS

Because the working hypothesis concerning the symbiotic relationship between residents and businesspeople was not found to be clearly supported by the limited evidence here, it was necessary to reshape the interview schedules. The points in the schedules that should be re-visited are listed below according to the type of respondent.

6.5.1 The Kampung Dwellers

- In order to include new residents it is necessary that all residents have an equal opportunity to be respondents, i.e. both owners and renters.

- The new residents' points of view should give a picture of their attitude to the kampung as a transient residence or temporary dormitory area for people away from their permanent home, who might be working for the new business developments in this area.

- The residents need to be divided into those who do not have business activities in their house, and those who do. This classification is required in order to avoid confusion in summarising their opinions about the future of the kampung. This point emerged when it became clear that these two groups gave different responses to key questions, such as their intention to continue to live in the kampung, their responses on the current situation, and also their expectations about future residence.

- The residents with home-based business activities showed characteristics different from those with formal business activities. Therefore it will be necessary to examine their responses separately.
6.5.2 The Small Business Persons

- The small business-person respondents would then be only those who operate their business activities separately from their domestic activities.

- Several questions concerning their requirements of employees will need to be asked in order to gauge the chance of low-cost labour mobilisation in the kampung.

- Moreover, a question will also be needed to find the businessmen's attitudes to assisting the kampung, and being part of the kampung community. Although it would be difficult to gain this information, it could be crosschecked against their need of space for the expansions of their business.

The implementation of the main survey using a revised set of interview schedules will be reported in Chapter 7
Chapter 7

RESULTS OF SECOND (MAIN) SURVEY

7.1. INTRODUCTION

The first interview survey described in the last chapter indicated that the presumption of downtown areas dependent on the cheap labour of an adjoining kampung was not supported: the hypothesised symbiotic relationship was not clearly evident between those two parties. For that reason, more information on how the kampung operates was needed. To this end the second survey, to be reported in this chapter, was based on adjustment and modification of the interview schedule of the first interview survey.

The aim of this chapter is to describe the conduct and outcome of the second survey. Section 7.2 outlines the procedure of the second survey, including the modification of the interview schedule, followed by the results of the survey in section 7.3 and 7.4, and a discussion of the outcomes in section 7.5.

7.2. SECOND SURVEY PROCEDURE

The procedure for this second survey was similar to the procedure used for the first survey, except that it required a larger number of respondents, and these had to be more rigorously selected to be representative of the kampung as a whole. At least six residents and one small businessperson were selected as respondents to represent each neighbourhood unit (Rukun Tetangga / RT). The kampung dwellers group included both permanent owner-occupiers and renters. However, to get a richer understanding of kampung activities, this
group also included those who had home-based economic activities, while the small-businessperson respondents were those who had a special room or place to run their businesses, either within or outside their houses, but within the kampung. Meanwhile, for the large enterprises, the researcher went directly to the administrative office of the coordinating organization for the Tunjungan Plaza area.

The interviews took place in the respondents' houses or business locations using the modified interview schedule. It took about an hour to conduct the interview. In practice the interview schedule sometimes led to further elaborations and explanations. These narrative answers were taped (if the respondents had given their consent), or else written in the questionnaires or notes.

The new questions were not only focused on interrelationships (the resources for relationship, needs for relationships, access to relationships, and perception of the value of relationships) and on the perception of future development as previously explored in the first interview survey, but were also concerned with inhabitants' activities, living conditions, feelings and perceptions about each other, and also their expectations for the future of the kampung. These questions will still be organised under the four headings described in Chapter 6: namely, the respondents' characteristics; their activities; linkage/networks; and their concern for their neighbourhood. However there were also some additional questions that could widen the information on the system of the kampung, while some questions that were found to be of little value in the earlier survey were deleted.

7.2.1 Questions Addressed to the Dwellers

The questions addressed to the dwellers were as follows:

1. Respondents' characteristics. First, these questions explored the identity of the respondents, and included detailed information on their age,
education, occupation, origin and the length of their stay in the kampung. Second, questions also took a look at the respondents' residential history, which could reveal things about the development of Kampung Kaliasin, and give more detail on the respondents' intentions about staying in the kampung.

2. Respondents' activities. In the first interview survey this category was intended to explore the activities of the dwellers in relation to the small businesses or large enterprises surrounding this area in order to describe their relationship with these business activities. However, since these activities were not prominent in the answers to questions in the first interview survey, the questions were restructured in order to get an idea on how the kampung dwellers utilised their houses and their neighbourhood. (The essence of previous questions will be covered under the next heading, on the linkages and networks.) Therefore the questions will be supporting other questions on the respondents' economic activities or employment that could describe the position of the kampung in a citywide context. The revised questions include the location of their jobs, mode of transportation, etc.

3. Linkages and network. In the first survey, questions under this heading explored the pattern of interrelationships between respondents and the business people, and covered employment opportunities and the kind of services that might serve those business people and relationships with the business people together with their perceptions of the value of these relationships. In this survey, the questions were rather more specific on social networks, as the economic activities and networks had been revealed as relatively unproblematic in the previous survey. Therefore the questions addressed only the social networks among the respondents, which are the dwellers, the business people, and the large enterprises.
4. *Concern for their neighbourhood.* The questions will remain the same as in the first survey, questioning the respondents' opinions on the development of their neighbourhood and its impact on their future living conditions.

7.2.2. **Questions Addressed to the Small Business People**

The questions addressed to the small business people were as follows:

1. *Respondents' characteristics.* Most questions asked in the earlier survey were also included in this survey, as they covered information on the identity of respondents that will be used in the analysis process. The questions covered the respondents' age and education, origin and length of their stay in this *kampung*, and their citizenship.

2. *Respondents' activities.* As in the earlier survey, the questions under this heading not only explored the business people's activities and their business prospects, but also their willingness to employ *kampung* dwellers. The questions covered the types of business, year of establishment, ownership, employment, and their enthusiasm for running their businesses in this location.

3. *Linkages and network.* To improve information on their networks within and outside the *kampung*, this survey also challenged the respondents with questions on their familiarity with the *kampung* and their customers.

4. *Concern for their neighbourhood.* Some questions were added to the list of questions in the first survey asking about respondents' vision concerning the future of the neighbouring *kampung*. The additional questions not only explore their views on the development of the *kampung*, but also enable them to talk about their enthusiasm to expand their business.
7.2.3. Questions Addressed to the Large Enterprises

The questions were directly posed to the selected large enterprise, PT. Pakuwon Jati, which had a coordinating role in Tunjungan Plaza and was considered to be reasonably representative of other enterprises on the edge of the kampung, and were as follows:

1. Respondents' characteristics. Questions for revealing the identity of this particular enterprise would not be asked, as it would not be necessary for research analysis. Questions were therefore directed to exploring its business activities.

2. Respondents' activities. The questions asked of the management covered the types of activities run by the enterprise, and in what year each of them was set up. This was followed by direct information regarding Tunjungan Plaza shopping centre's services and facilities in more specific detail.

3. Linkages and network. Questions were used to explore the networks between the property management and the kampung dwellers as well as their customers.

4. Concern for their neighbourhood. Questions under this category were directed towards exploring the respondent's vision and expectations concerning the neighbouring kampung.

Example of questionnaires, notes and transcription are displayed in Appendix 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b and 3a.

7.3. Results of the Survey

In total there were 151 respondents categorised as dwellers, 74 as small businesspeople, and PT Pakuwon Jati as the developer of Tunjungan Plaza shopping centre, which was selected as the representative respondent for the larger corporate enterprises. In order to get an objective overview of the kampung, Section 7.3.1 illustrates the development of Kampung Kaliasin as
described by respondents. Sections 7.3.2 and 7.3.3 describe the responses of
the three types of dwellers and local business people, while 7.4 to follow will
look at the issue of the large corporate sector presence at the periphery of the
area.

7.3.1 Development of Kampung Kaliasin

Some residents believed that Kampung Kaliasin was named for its
environmental condition: it is a settlement that lies along a saline river⁴ and is
surrounded by salty deep-wells. The people who had been resettled by the
Dutch government from the neighbouring kampung (in the vicinity of Embong
Wungu)⁵ recalled this area as a woody land. Houses were sparse, surrounded
by mixed gardens (comprising perennials: fruit trees, bamboo, nipah
(arecaceae), and home gardens (kebun). Most of the houses were of wooden
construction, with walls of woven-bamboo and wooden boards or half brick
and half woven-bamboo. Many people bred goats and there were lots of big
catfish in the clear and clean local canal; it was similar to other ordinary
Indonesian villages.

Pathways were of macadamised stone or compacted soil, and were not
wide. As remembered by the respondents, the main roads were Jalan Kaliasin
(now Jalan Basuki Rachmat), Jalan Embong Malang and Jalan Kedung Doro,
which were wide, of compacted soil, and used by wooden-wheeled vehicles.

---

¹ Kali means river, and asin means saline.

² Embong Wungu area was the first housing estate determined by the Dutch Colonial
Government (Handinoto, 1990). One respondent said that the Dutch government had given
his grandfather 1,600 sq.m. of land in this area (Kampung Kaliasin) as a compensation for his
previous land in the Embong Wungu area. It was a woody land that should be developed by
himself for his new settlement. Unfortunately his grandfather lost parts of his land; some
was lost during the revolution era, another part was used by the government for local
infrastructure (such as local roads and drainage), and the rest is the 90 sq.m house that he
inherited, and another small part that is still being dealt with by the local district
administration office to determine whether he owned it.
The first population influx to this *kampung* was in the 1950s, after the Independence war, when people came out from refuge areas, looking for their fortune in the city. In groups they squatted in the area, chopped down the trees, cleared plots and built houses with no rules except for pathways to be maintained with at least one metre of width. As earlier settlers recalled, neighbours were no closer than a hundred metres, and houses were still rare. For example, as illustrated by the older respondents, *kampung* Genuk (Rukun Warga/R.W-IV) was previously occupied by about twelve households and along one of the alleys (Kedung Rukem Gang I) there were only three houses, all occupied by relatives.

![Figure 7.1 Map of Surabaya 1897. This map shows the Dutch buildings, marked in red, close to Kampung Kaliasin (KK).](image)

*Source: Pemerintah Daerah Tingkat II Kotamadya Surabaya, 1990*
Some parts of this kampung's area were swampland (kedung\(^3\)) and they had to fill the plots when they built their houses, yet in the rainy season they still flooded. Presumably, this condition made Kampung Kaliasin an unpopular kampung to live in, although it was near the Dutch activities area.\(^4\)

After Independence, all buildings that used to be Dutch properties were nationalised. Some of them were then authorised to be used by the national armed forces and other Indonesian government institutions, while others remained in private hands.

In the 1960s many more people came to stay in this area. As most of the area was already inhabited, some of them occupied the Chinese cemetery and transformed it into a new kampung, which they called Kampung Kedung Turi Baru, while others filled in the gardens, as they were descendents or relatives of the earlier occupants. The houses then became more attached to each other, but still with a small front yard or spacious back yard. As remembered by the older respondents, in the early 1970s the kampung was still considered to be a somewhat quiet neighbourhood, especially after sunset, when there was nobody on the streets and most of the dwellers were inside their houses. The need for improvement started when they needed wider and connected paths. Pathways were then widened to two to four metres and transformed into streets, although this meant that the front yards of many houses had to be narrowed. The shrunked yards then turned into porches or even were built

---

\(^3\) Kedung means swamp; since this area used to be a swampland, most of the areas in the kampung used Kedung as part of their name, i.e.: Kedung Rukem, Kedung Klinter, Kedung Turi, Kedung Sari, etc. It should be noted that Kampung Kaliasin comprises a number of more or less distinctive areas, each of which is also designated as a kampung with its own separate name.

\(^4\) In the 1800s the Dutch stretched the development of Surabaya to the south of the city (see Surabaya map 1866 in Figure 5.1). They built government buildings and facilities such as the Governor’s residence, municipal office, Dutch clubhouse (Simpang), hotels (Wijnveld Hotel and Orange Hotel), military hospital, post-office, telecommunications office, and modern stores such as toko Fiet than toko Metro and toko Nams in a new area around the Simpang area.
over to form a new extension room for expanding their house. As a result, nowadays almost all of the frontages of houses are directly on the pathways or streets.

The 1980s was the starting period for major changes to the borders of the kampung; it was the time when private investors implementing the city development plan started to develop this area as a modern business district. The thin strip of business buildings along the major streets that surround the kampung became more continuous and tied together, forming lines of large and impenetrable, contemporary, 'new-look' business premises.

The first business centre (Surabaya Business Centre) was built in Jalan Basuki Rachmat over an area that used to be an army depot, some kampung houses and a small local canal; then followed a single level shopping centre (Apollo), cinemas and other entertainment facilities.

---

The major physical change was the development of the first phase of Tunjungan Plaza, a multi-storey shopping centre at the corner of Jalan Embong Malang and Kaliasin gang Pompa. This shopping centre was built on
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a piece of land that had previously been occupied by the revolutionary army forces for their soldiers, especially for those who came from other islands. Then, the development of a five-star corporate sector hotel, the Westin, in Jalan Embong Malang, removed the relatively new kampung Kedung Turi (occupied by new settlers in the 1960s), as well as the local government Broadcasting Office (RRI stasíun Surabaya), a local primary school (SDN Kedung Turi), an old myth-laden Banyan tree, and some old Dutch houses. This development compensated the owners at various prices between Rp. 875,000 and Rp. 2,500,000 per sq.m. The primary school was replaced with a new one, built by the investor of the hotel, in a nearby kampung (Kampung Kedung Klinter). Some of the respondents said that most of these displaced settlers bought new houses and moved out toward the city boundaries, although some moved to nearby kampungs, and used the rest of their money for investment.

In the early 1990s, Tunjungan Plaza (TP) shopping centre phase-1 (TP-1) was expanded to becoming the Tunjungan City Project, with the expansion of the shopping centres (TP-II and TP-III), car-park building, office tower (Bank Bumi Daya tower), an apartment block, and the Sheraton Hotel, by demolishing kampung Margoyoso (Mergoyoso Gang-I to Gang-VII). And it is this expansion (presumably only halted by the 1997-98 economic crisis), and the possibility of its continuance, that forms part of the environment of threat and opportunity that was expected to be the context facing the various respondents and accordingly is to be referred to in the present survey.

7.3.2. The Kampung Dwellers

As defined in Chapter 4 and explained further in Chapter 6, the kampung dwellers, determined appropriate to be chosen as respondents, are adult

5 Gang means alley; Margoyoso Gang-I, means Margoyoso street, alley no1.
persons and preferably the nominated head of the household, who might be the husband, the housewife or another family member. The 154 respondents were chosen at random by mapping and proportional representation of the neighbourhood units; based on a rigorous sampling schedule, each of the 22 neighbourhood units was represented by seven respondents. Figure 7.3 show the location of the respondents.
Figure 7.3. Locations of respondents
The summary of responses will be presented under the headings of respondents' characteristics, activities, and neighbourhood awareness.

*a. Respondents' Characteristics*

The *kampung* dwellers' characteristics will be described in two sections: first in terms of their personal identity, and second relating to their housing condition. As in Chapter 6, in all of the figures showing the results of the second survey, the vertical axis shows the percentages of the respondents, not the numbers of the respondents. The exact percentage is indicated by the number above each bar.

*Personal Identity*

As displayed in Figure 7.4, Kampung Kaliasin is mainly inhabited by those who claimed to be people of Surabaya, since three-quarters of them were born in Surabaya and almost 90% percent were registered as citizens of Surabaya. This result is further supported by figure 7.5 that shows respondents' period of residency (The figures bear a strong correspondence with those of the first survey, as becomes clear from a comparison of Figure 7.4 with Figure 6.1 in Chapter 6.)
Figure 7.5 shows the length of respondents' residence in this *kampung* (and again there is a correspondence with the results from the first survey).

![Bar chart showing the length of residence](image)

**Figure 7.5 Respondents period of residency**

This figure indicates that most of the respondents had resided in this *kampung* for more than 20 years, and were dominated by those who had been there for at least 30 years. The interview revealed that most of the respondents who were in their thirties or forties had been born in the *kampung*. Also half of those who were more than 50 years old had resided in this *kampung* for more than 50 years, with the other half being ‘new’ settlers, most of whom arrived however as early as in the 1950s. From these respondents the researcher got the picture of Kampung Kaliasin in an earlier age, and their feeling about the changes at the present time. This lengthy period of stay leads to their vision about and affection towards their *kampung*. Under the section on neighbourhood environment this condition will be more closely discussed.

Some of the respondents stated that many people were coming and going in the 1980s. People from Mergoyoso and Kedungturi baru were some of those who left the *kampung*, since their *kampungs* were at that time subject to development for new business activities. However, most of them stated that after the 1980s development, there were more people coming than going. One of the older respondents said that: ‘... now, this *kampung* is becoming a
densely inhabited area, and Kampung Kaliasin dwellers are not the only Kaliasin-inherited (Kaliasinian) any more, … we live with new dwellers and the renters …‘

Because this kampung was gradually and over a long period experiencing development by addition of population, people seemed not aware that it will put their kampung environment at risk risk. Densification however could not only overload its infrastructure capacity, but also lead to social tension in the future.

The last indicator of personality characteristics is their education; Figure 7.6 shows the respondents’ education level.

This figure indicates that most of the respondents have already had an intermediate formal level of education: most had finished their junior high school (Sekolah Lanjutan Tingkat Pertama/SLTP) or senior high school (Sekolah Lanjutan Tingkat Atas/SLTA). Moreover, the number of those who had tertiary education was greater than those who had primary education (Sekolah Dasar/SD) or less. It is worth noting that those who had middle-high education (SLTA and Bachelor) were generally in their thirties and forties. This detail showed that many of Kampung Kaliasin’s dwellers are scholarly; this capacity is an asset for joining modernisation. The basic knowledge from
their high school and higher education widens their opportunity in joining both formal and informal economic and social activities.

**Housing Condition**

This section describes the housing conditions of the respondents. Questions used to explore the quality of the respondents’ houses were the same as those used in the first interview survey, covering size, tenure, occupancy and the amenities of the house.

Figure 7.7 shows the sizes of the respondents’ houses. Again, as with the previous questions, there is a clear correspondence of these results with those from the first survey, with just a small difference in the 36-55 sq.m category.

![Figure 7.7 Sizes of dwellers' houses](image)

The diversity in respondents’ houses, from those smaller than 35 m² to those more than 200 m², reflects the characteristic of its unstructured physical development. Mostly they were smaller than the government’s categorisation of simplest houses to standard houses.⁶

---

⁶ In the government and private housing estates, house sizes of 36 m² to 55 m² are categorised as the simplest house (*Rumah Sangat Sederhana/RSS*), those in size 56m² to 90m² are categorised as simple house (*Rumah Sederhana/RS*), and those 91m² to 120 m² are categorised as standard house (*Rumah Standar*). These are typical houses offered by housing loan credit schemes. It is envisaged that these small houses would be suitable for
There is a simple explanation as to why the kampung houses are so small. Respondents recalled that the original kampung houses were not as small as today’s houses. Previously there were many bigger houses and most of those houses had courtyards, but currently most of them have had to be shared with other members of the families; therefore those houses became smaller and smaller. Some houses and their courtyards were subdivided, sometimes several times, to accommodate the extension of the family. This subdivision forced people to use up all the space, sometimes to be shared by eight or more persons as shown in Figure 7.8.

To accommodate this sharing, sometimes residents had to sell their houses, in which case the cash could be shared among family members. Some respondents stated that in most cases they bought another house, but smaller, in this same kampung, as most of them still preferred to be close to their relatives or old friends, and a typical comment would be that: ‘... this area is central, and it’s a pity to leave it.’

For those who did not have a spacious house and did not want to sell the house, they would share with their kith and kin in the existing house.

future self-expansion, but in a kampung with limited land such expansion is scarcely an option.
Therefore nowadays there are some intensively occupied houses of extended families. However, there were also children and grandchildren who would rather sell their inheritance to buy the houses they preferred, not in this kampung but in other housing estates. As an example, some respondents stated that those whose houses had been bought by Pakuwon Jati (the developer of Tunjungan City Project) bought other houses in fringe areas or other places in the city, or even in a private housing estate or public housing estate such as in Perumnas Tandes, since the developer had given residents a reasonable amount of money for compensation. Sometimes however this developer also offered another house within the kampung and it paid the price difference, especially when they did not want to move outside the kampung. There seemed however to be an unwritten rule operating in their community that they would sell at a lower price to their neighbours or other people than to the developers. At this time the offers were around one to four million rupiah per square metre of land, with no value given to the building. Therefore if the occupants wished to reuse the building materials they could have all of them.

The trading mechanism was easy and the amount of money offered for compensation was tempting; the developers gave the residents easy access to other houses if they would like to sell their current properties, which was the preferred mechanism chosen by the dwellers since it left out the middleman. Interestingly, those who had a business instinct bought a house in a nearby area, waiting for the next opportunity to sell for a higher price to the developer.

The other aspect which gave value to this kampung is the house tenure. In this kampung, according to Basic Agrarian Law (Undang-Undang No 5 th. 1960 Pokok Agraria,) there are at least two types of legal tenure that most occupants have: Hak Milik (full tenure/freehold) and Hak Guna Bangunan (right to utilize) derived from eight legal tenures stated in that regulation (hak milik, hak guna
usaha, hak guna bangunan, hak pakai, hak sewa, hak membuka tanah, hak memungut hasil hutan, and other rights) that are under the control of other institutions. This legal status in fact secures those dwellers to be able to stay in this kampung, and most of all they have the right to choose whether they would like to stay or to sell their properties.

The tenure of the kampung houses is showed in the next figure.

Figure 7.9 The housing tenure of respondents' houses

Almost all of the respondents stated that they had full tenure (hak milik) of their houses, including those who inherited them from their parents or ancestors, but where title has not yet been transferred or confirmed legally to their name (some stated that they were currently applying for legal title). Only a few were leasing (sewa) or borrowing (pinjaman), using their employer's or an institution's house, or using a relative's house. Actually these terms of sewa and pinjam did not reveal the exact tenure of the house since renters did not know the status held by the owner.

The last aspect that could describe the housing condition in this kampung is the facilities and services of the houses. Figure 7.10 describes the physical condition, services and facilities of the respondents' houses. The data again correspond with those of the first survey (Figure 6.6) except for differences in
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the road width distribution, which may have reflected the more systematically spatial sampling of the second survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Structure</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Roof sheet</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Floor cover</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Tile</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-perm</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Zinc</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Terrazzo</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood/ bamboo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road width in front</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Water supply</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Bathroom m - Toilet</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5-1.5m</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5-2m</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Vendors</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Communal</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 m</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Deep well</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public bath</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;4m</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.10 Amenities of dwellers' houses

The figure shows that most of the houses are of good quality: permanent in structure, covered by a tile roof, and with terrazzo floors. This is quite a significant development, as it was remembered by the older respondents that those houses were in the past still semi permanent. Moreover, almost all had private bathrooms and toilets and accessible water supply. However, some of them stated that public bath-washing-toilet, or Mandi Cuci Kakus/MCK umum, are still needed for certain areas of this kampung, as some of their neighbours were still using the local canal as a public toilet.

In some parts, a water supply has been connected since the Dutch period as one elder respondent observed: ‘... at that time we got clean water from the pipe by inserted coin money then the water would flow for a certain time and automatically stop’. The clean water connection was then added by the Kampung Improvement Program-UNEP (KIP-UNEP) project in 1977. Some
had their own connection, but those who could not pay the connection fee could buy from the public water standpoints or from the vendors. This program had also improved other infrastructure facilities, such as pathways and drainage. As remembered by some of the respondents, before the improvement in some areas they had to walk their bicycles because of the poor condition of the *kampung*’s lane.

There were two other Kampung Improvement Programs (KIP) implemented in this area, the KIP-WR Supratman projects, and the KIP-IBRD. In the KIP-WR Supratman projects in 1983-1984 the pathways were improved with concrete slabs. The KIP-IBRD assisted the *kampung* with the further improvement of the pathways and provision of drainage. In some areas the community also improved some of the pathways by themselves or got assistance from the developers, such as the Westin Hotel management: when they complained that its construction caused flooding in the *kampung*, the hotel then provided drainage for this local area. The *kampung* dwellers were pleased: not only had the management listened to their concerns but they also let the youngsters work as construction hands.

In some areas these KIP infrastructure development projects created other problems. For example, in a certain area due to technical requirements, the construction of the drainage was higher than the floor levels of the residents’ houses, and accordingly the overflow from this drainage could easily flood the houses. Recently the overflow has occurred frequently because most of the wastewater from the houses discharged directly to the drainage, and the situation becomes worse when litter also fills up the drain.

Respondents who lived near the food stalls surrounding Tunjungan Plaza complained the most, since most of the food-stalls threw their food waste into the drains, which not only caused the drains to block up, but also caused odours. The flat surface of most of the Surabaya area, and especially the subsided and swampy surface of this *kampung*, worsens the condition. This
situation was not too bad when the Tegalsari swimming pool (in Jalan Tegalsari) was operating, as at least every week this waste was washed away by the swimming pool discharge.

In some neighbourhoods, occasionally, there were clean-up days which included cleaning the drains, but there were no further actions to remove from the kampung the dirt that had been cleaned from the drains. This activity also demonstrates the attention of the dwellers to their neighbourhood, and furthermore it also showed that ‘the spirit of brotherhood’ is still there. However some respondents stated that previously the cleaning days were more frequent, and the flow of the drainage to the Kedungdoro canal was good, and floods lasted no longer than an hour.

This kampung had already been supplied with electricity since the Dutch period, and now all the houses have been connected. The community organised the supply of pathway lighting from their home connections.

Figure 7.11 illustrates typical houses in Kampung Kaliasin

Figure 7.11 Typical houses in Kampung Kaliasin
b. Respondents' Activities

As intended, this part will present a picture of how the kampung dwellers utilised the potential of their house and neighbourhood, through looking into their social and economic activities.

Figure 7.12 describes the employment areas of the respondents, followed by another three figures that examine their working conditions.

This figure, which can be compared with Figure 6.7 previously, shows that most respondents are engaged in formal occupations such as employees, civil servants, soldiers, or other types of work. A quarter of them are running their own businesses, but nearly twenty percent were unemployed (pensioners, just fired as a consequence of the economic crisis, and those who do not have particular occupancy and at this time are between jobs). The recent circumstances pleased some of the older dwellers, for as one said: '... today's kampung dwellers are not only chauffeurs but also managers...'

Those who claimed to be running their own businesses articulated many activities such as being a middleman, a vendor, house-to-house electrical device technician, letting some of their rooms, and other informal businesses. These activities are distinguished from those of the second type of respondent,
the small businesses, since they do not need or have any specific room or place in or outside their houses to run their businesses.

Figure 7.13 Rented houses and daily needs stall

Figure 7.14 shows the distribution of respondents' workplaces. Comparison with the corresponding Table 6.8, from the first survey, reveals some differences in the locations of their work in the inner-city and within the city more widely. Previously the data showed that the percentage of those who work in the inner-city area were higher than those who worked within the broader city area (41% working in the inner-city area, and 22% working within the broader city)

Figure 7.14 Locations of respondents' occupations
This figure shows that only twenty percent of the respondents, who had occupations, worked in their neighbourhood, while the majority worked in the inner city and within the wider city area (65%), and some are commuters who work in another city (7%) or travelling (8%).

Clearly, this kampung was not only for those who depend on the neighbourhood for jobs, as two thirds of the dwellers worked elsewhere in the inner-city area or within the wider city boundaries. Linked with the respondents' education level and types of jobs they are engaged in, those dwellers had a better opportunity to choose employment offered throughout the city. For example there were dwellers who worked in Perak, the harbour area or in another Central Business District to the north of the city; some were working in industrial estates, to the south-east of the city, and others were working or studying in the far-eastern educational precinct of the city, yet they still treasured their parents' houses in this kampung. This is understandable, as many respondents in this kampung are second and third generation descendants of the original inhabitants, and new settlers from other kampungs within Surabaya or other cities.

In order to confirm the distribution of their locations of work, the next figure shows the distance of the working places of the respondents from their homes.

![Distance to work](image)

Figure 7.15 The distances of respondents' working places from their homes
Those who work in the neighbourhood are represented by the groups having a distance to work of less than 3km or working at home. The respondents who worked in the inner-city area stated that their working locations were from less than 3 km up to about 5 km in distance, while those who worked within the broader city claimed that their working distances were about 10 km to 25 km, and the rest were those who worked outside the city, and the wanderers (those who sell their product/merchandise house to house). It seems that there is a clear functional link between the kampung and the broader city.

In order to know something of the respondents’ mobility, the next figure indicates their modes of transport. A difference in the data from those of Figure 6.10 would seem to reflect the inclusion of the renters in this sample – they were omitted from the first survey, and many more frequently work close at hand.

![Figure 7.16 Respondents’ modes of transport](image)

The figure shows that the majority of the respondents used private transportation, which means using bicycles and motorcycles, since only 3 respondents were using a car to go to work. Public transport is also a reasonable choice, since there were 13 public transport routes serving this kampung, namely three bus routes and ten bemo (mini-bus) routes. The three
bus routes connected with the southern inter-city bus terminal (Bungur Asih terminus) and the western-end inter-city bus terminal (Tambak Langon), the harbour (Tanjung Perak), and the old central business district (Jembatan Merah), while the nine bemo-routes gave access to various destinations in the city. It seems that motorcycle is the favoured transportation mode in this kampung as with most people in Indonesia.

Motorcycle is the most preferred means of transportation for Indonesians, especially for those in the low to middle income group; it is reliable in cost, time and flexibility, especially when public transport is still unscheduled and is still not yet serving to the nearest lane. Ojek (private public transport served by motorcycle) is another preferred transportation form in Jakarta to avoid traffic jams and because of the cheaper price but not yet in Surabaya. This mode of transportation originally arose in desa (rural areas) where public transport is infrequent and carriageways are poor, but nowadays this service is also popular in Jakarta when people do not like to be trapped in traffic jams or to be jostled in crowded public buses or mikrolit. Although it was not mentioned by respondents, becak is also a common transportation means for the dwellers, since these becaks are found along some laneways and at some street junctions.

The next theme is to observe the spirit of kampung Kaliasin by looking at the linkages and networks of its dwellers.

c. Respondents' Linkages and Networks

An idea of social networks was established by asking questions on how often respondents joined community activities, especially those held in public facilities in their kampung. Community hall (Balai RT or Balai RW) is a place where people talk about their socio-political events and activities; community worship houses (musholla or rumah kebaktian) are places where people profess
their faith and widen their religious knowledge; and guard-houses\(^7\) (Pos Kamling) are where people get together in small groups to guard their environment. In this part the researcher also asked about respondents' social activities in kampung organisations.

The other public facilities regularly used by the dwellers are public schools, community health centres, and small reading centres (little private libraries run by the dwellers, although most of them are lending novels and easy reading material rather than educational material). Other social facilities are not provided at an acceptable level, but since there is no option, small community open spaces, such as lawns or lanes, are the children's places to play. More recent observation is that Tunjungan Plaza shopping centre is a favourite place for the dwellers to enjoy their pastime, recreation and amusement or just get together with the family. As one of the respondents observed, '... it was a regular place to visit to have fun with the children, although we just go window-shopping or have a cone of ice-cream...'.

Most of the respondents claimed that community relationships are still working well. The once-a-month meeting of the local women's organisation (PKK) is one of the mechanisms for communication among women in the kampung. Sometimes people also get together in a bigger group, such as an RW (neighbourhood community) to look after the kampung in every aspect, such as environment or safety. In some neighbourhood units where safety is the main issue, disturbance alarms have been installed to let people know when there is trouble, such as burglars, drunks, fire, etc.

Giving a hand or visiting neighbours for a chat, passing on good wishes to a wedding ceremony, welcoming new babies, conveying sympathy, or just getting together for neighbourhood convenience is still common.

---

\(^7\) Pos Kamling/ a guard house is a small booth that is usually placed in a strategic place in the kampung, as a post for community-watch groups patrolling the kampung to ensure its safety.
Figure 7.18 shows the claimed frequency of respondents in attending the meetings in the three most public meeting places, namely the community halls, community worship centres, and community guardhouses.

![Bar chart showing frequencies of respondents attending meetings](chart.png)

**Figure 7.17 Respondents' reported participation in community activities**

Respondents usually come to these three important public places for socialising in formal and informal meetings. As remembered by older respondents there used to be an annual festival that drew people together, called *bersih deso/ruwatan*. This activity used to get all *kampung* dwellers together for blessing the *kampung*. As they recalled, there was a respected couple, named *Buyut Mojo*, who became the *kampung*’s legendary leaders. This couple used to be peacemakers in the fights between Kampung Kaliasin people and those of neighbouring *kampungs* (Kampung Surabayan and Kedungdoro). Their graves used to be a shrine for the local people, solemnized once a year, in the *bersih deso/ruwatan* day. At that time the entire *kampung* got together for a festive day, cleaned the neighbourhood both ‘physically and spiritually’, and ended the day with a *wayang* (shadow-puppet) performance at night.

Later, people, who are mostly Moslem now, would rather celebrate the birthday of the prophet Muhammad (*Maulid Nabi*) or Independence Day,
although some of the respondents still longed for that traditional festival. They said that it would be better if they could have all of those celebrations side by side. For example, a respondent said that '... we cannot disregard our ancestors, especially those who did well for us, moreover, that celebration is part of our culture...' Theirs are two of the few graves remaining in the kampung graveyard, since most of them have been incrementally transformed into houses and open space.

The figures below shows some of the public facilities in Kampung Kaliasin

![One of Balai RTs](Image)

(Neighbourhood unit Community Hall)

![One of the Balai RWs](Image)

(neighbourhood Community Hall)

![One of the Mushollas](Image)

One of the Community guardhouses

Figure 7. 18 Some of the public facilities
The next issue in examining the dwellers' characteristics is their attitude to the existence of large business activities.

**Attitude to Large Business Activities**

Figure 7.19 shows the responses on the question on how the emergences of those larger, corporate business activities have affected them.

![Figure 7.19 Respondents' impressions on the emergence of larger new businesses](image)

The *kampung* dwellers had both positive and negative views of the effects of the new modern businesses, especially for the new modern 'entertainment' complex (*Tunjungan Plaza*). They were aware that it brought an opportunity to experience the modern world; however, a quarter of the respondents were disturbed by its negative impacts. As one respondent noted, ‘...those who are unaware of the side effects of modernisation and are trapped with consumerism will be drawn into over-excitement, which could persuade them to become thieves or robbers to fulfil their needs...’

The awful condition that especially concerned the respondents was the rumours that some people linked to the concession renters, namely some of the shopkeepers or the sales promotion girls, have been indicted for being prostitutes at night. They worried that this condition could lead to social disorder, drug abuse and gangsters in their neighbourhood, although these
businesses were also seen to have had positive impacts. The emergence of the two global business activities (Pakuwon Jati and Sheraton Hotel) has absorbed available labour from the kampung. Vacancies are usually offered to kampung dwellers via the head of the neighbourhood unit or neighbourhood community (RT or RW), although the dwellers are still disappointed as the offers were always only as blue-collar workers.

Many respondents stated that the emergence of the Tunjungan Plaza was not disturbing, but rather was useful. The Plaza activities have been seen as an opportunity to operate new businesses, especially food stalls, rented rooms, or business suppliers. Many non-working mothers try their luck by selling food based on home menus or selling some other daily needs in front of their houses. Houses in areas near to the business activities open some of their rooms to be rented for both clerks and shopkeepers from other cities.

Motorcycle parking is also a promising business for those who live close to the shopping mall, although this business is already controlled by a pensioner of the navy. Some of the respondents however stated that it would be better if it was managed by the community, so that the benefit could be shared.

d. Respondents' Concerns on the Environment of Their Kampung

This section will describe the kampung condition based on residents' points of view. The question is still regarding the kampung's physical conditions, nuisance, hazards, healthiness, and also its need of development.

Figure 7.20 summaries the views expressed by respondents' concerning their current environment.
The figure shows that most of the *kampung* dwellers were concerned about the physical and social condition of the *kampung*. Respondents stated that it is not a bad area to live in, since it is in a pleasant location. Some respondents would like to stay in this *kampung* forever, since moving to other places would require them to adapt to a new environment and that would distress them. Some dwellers stated that nowadays this area is bustling, especially during shopping times (from 10.00 a.m. to 10.00 p.m.), and that this condition was much more disturbing for those who lived near the discotheque; the noise and traffic, especially on weekend nights, usually do not stop until 3.30 a.m. in the morning.

The disturbing impact that was of concern for some respondents is that the shopping centre would become a place for looting and the *kampung* could be a hiding place for the criminals. They indicated that certain alleys have become popular places for badly behaved youngsters.

Those who lived near Jalan Kedungdoro recalled that there used to be many houses in this street, but now most of these have been replaced by shops and other business activities. In the afternoon in front of these shops, along Jalan Kedungdoro, stand food-stalls (this is one of the local government's
promoted food-stall areas in Surabaya). However, some of the respondents who lived near this area noted that these street food stalls should be organised in such a way that they did not disturb the traffic.

$Losing the Kampung$

In order to know something of the dwellers' attachment to the kampung there were several questions prepared. There were several answers to the question on the possibility of the kampung disappearing. Figure 7.21 shows their preference for staying in this kampung with all its present conditions and reality.

![Figure 7.21 Preference for staying in kampung](image)

This figure verifies the option of most respondents; about sixty per cent of them would choose to stay in this kampung, with some of them likely to renovate their house to make it more comfortable. Almost twenty per cent however preferred to leave the kampung, while the other twenty percent would like to have their right to negotiate. These last included most of the respondents who lived near the border of the kampung and close to the business areas, and who stated variously that they would not have any hesitation about giving up their properties/land to the developers if '... it is on the agreement of the majority of the dwellers;' or '... if the kampung would
be developed for public necessities, or ‘... if they have a good bargain, and of course ... if it is for a better future for them...’.

Economic Crisis

When the national economic crisis struck in 1997-1998, many kampung dwellers were left jobless, but they said that they could manage, since they were used to adjusting to various and charging conditions. They said that they could work extra time or find another occupation. One respondent stated that ‘... there would always be another day and another way to find fortune...', although they did not deny that some of the kampung children then became buskers or bullyboys to earn money.

They were used to spending their money based on their daily earnings. They stated that ‘... they would eat less when they got less and eat more if they earned more ...’ Only a few of them formally deposited their extra earnings in the bank; they would prefer to save it by themselves. They said that there was not a great difference living in the kampung from anywhere else. They added that it always depended on individual dynamism to overcome problems; some dwellers were even still improving their houses during the crisis. Nevertheless, some of the jobless were in trouble, as they become offenders and easily get drunk.

Expectations

As the question on respondents' expectations for the future of their kampung was an open-ended question, the answers are not displayed graphically.

In summary these residents would generally love to see their future kampung as a well-organised place, since they do not want to lose their heritage. But they would rather like to have the kampung without people wandering around with nothing to do, especially around the shopping centre. They preferred to stay in its locality. It is close to public facilities, easy to get a job, and convenient for family gatherings. They would like to treasure their
memories, since their family has always found it convenient there and feels affection for the kampung. For example, a respondent stated that he would like to reserve his house because it is his investment, and he had built it in stages just whenever he had money to spend on it.

7.3.3. The Businesspeople

This section will describe the results of the second survey of small-business people. As mentioned before, the respondents were chosen at random from those businesspeople who had a special room or place to run their businesses within or outside their houses, but within the kampung. There were 74 respondents to this part of the survey.

a. Respondents’ Characteristics

Respondents’ characteristics were still explored by six indicators, through questions regarding their gender, age, place of birth or origin, education, length of stay, and citizenship.

There was no bias towards either male or female respondents. As reported in Chapter 6, both genders had an equal opportunity to be interviewed.

Figure 7.22 Ages of businesspeople
Figure 7.22 shows the age distribution of people running businesses in the *kampung*, which also however reflects the valid age for being a respondent, and indeed for running a business.

As additional information, Figure 7.23 shows the length of their residency in this *kampung* since most of these businesspeople also resided in the *kampung*.

![Length of residence in the kampung](image)

**Figure 7.23** Length of residence in the kampung

This figure shows that although most of these business activities were operated by people who had already been there for a long time, nevertheless some were operated by recent arrivals. For additional information, Figure 7.27 to be given later will show the exact year of the establishment of their businesses, and Figure 7.29 will summarise their reasons for operating their businesses.

Figure 7.24 describes the educational level of the small businesspeople interviewed.
Figure 7.24 Respondents’ education categories

The education level of most of these businesspeople was middle-high (SLTP to SLTA) to high (bachelor and graduate), although the interviews with them revealed that their education did not generally relate to their types of business.

b. Respondents’ Business Activities

The types of business activities are shown in Figure 7.25.

Figure 7.25 The type of business operated by the respondents
Respondents' business activities were extremely varied, and can be broadly categorised into production businesses, trading enterprises and services businesses.

Those categorised as production/workshops included making shoes or sandals, billiards sticks, toys, furniture, etc. The trading enterprises included daily needs stalls, shops for any merchandise including motorcycle and car spare-part shops, electronic appliances, building materials, printing, etc. The services businesses included canteens and tailors, while the other services category included beauty salons, motor repairs, and some other activities.

**Figure 7.26 Some of business activities**

Figure 7.27 shows the reported years that the respondents' businesses were started.
Figure 7.27 Number of respondents' businesses established in this kampung from the 1950s to 1990s

The continuous line shows the number of respondents' businesses that were reported as being established in the years shown, and the square points show the total number of those businesses at ten yearly intervals.

Many respondents established their businesses in the 1970s. Numbers decreased in the 1980s (although this may reflect the number that had been established in that decade but subsequently closed and hence would not be reported), but gradually increased again during the 1990s.

Based on their monthly incomes, reported in Figure 7.28 below, these businesses can be categorised as small business enterprises.

Figure 7.28 Average monthly income of the business activities
More than half of them were earning less than one million rupiahs per month from their business operation, followed by another quarter who earned between one and three million rupiahs (AU$ 1 = Rp.5, 200 in late 2000). The rest, who operated slightly larger businesses, such as those who had shops and workshops, earned more than three million rupiahs. One of the respondents, who owned a car and motor repair station, did not want to reveal his monthly income although he stated that he had a turnover of eight hundred million rupiahs monthly.

Figure 7.29 shows the reasons respondents gave for choosing this kampung for their business activities.

Figure 7.29 Reasons for choosing the kampung as a business location

There were five common reasons for choosing the kampung as a base for their business. Mostly they stated that their place is in a good location, close to public services, to other business activities, and to potential customers. Good location was also the basic reason given by those who set up businesses in their houses; they said that their houses were in a good location and the right place to start a private business. However, some of those who had a home-based business stated that they just want to 'have a try'; especially after they realised that they were in an area full of activity.
c. Respondents’ Relationship with Kampung Dwellers

This section will describe the relationship of business people with the Kampung dwellers through their intention to take Kampung dwellers into their business activities, and especially from their responses on how they find their business partners, employees, and customers. In addition, it examines how business people view possible disturbances that might be inflicted by their business on neighbours.

Figure 7.30 describes the preferences of business people in choosing their business partners.

More than half stated that their businesses were too small to need a partner. The most preferred partner was their relatives, whether from outside the Kampung or within it. Only a small percentage (10%) of these businesspeople had their neighbours as their business partners. The employees of these businesspeople were anybody who was suitable for the job. There were three groups: those who did not employ anyone (32 persons), those who employed neighbours (15 persons), and those who employed other than neighbours (27 persons). Figure 7.31 shows the reported reasons why the business people who employed their neighbours did so.
Although almost half did not have any particular reason for not having their neighbours as employees (because, as revealed in figure 7.30, realistically their business is too small to need a partner), there were four main reasons reported by the remainder for employing their neighbours: because they were friends or relatives, because they were cheap labour, because of their skills, and because these businessmen would like to give their neighbours the opportunity to work.

However, for those who did not want their neighbours to be their employees reasons were given as in the next figure (Figure 7.32)
There were four common reasons given for businesspeople not employing their neighbours: the most frequent was that they were unskilled or had limited skills (since they only have a basic education certificate and not a vocational certificate that would be needed for their employment). The business people also assumed that neighbours did not need the jobs, since they rarely have application from their neighbours. But also, since they only need small numbers of employees – less than 5 persons – this question appeared very difficult for them to answer. The last reason is that this small opportunity has already reserved for their friends.

To describe more clearly the scale of these business activities, figure 7.33 shows the number of their employees and their working status.

![Figure 7.33 Numbers and the status of the respondents' employees](image)

These employees were almost equally divided between part-time and full-time. One of the businesspeople who runs a garment business stated that when needed he could employ more than 11 part-time workers.

In order to explore the spread of their services, the question of the origin of the buyers or consumer was asked. Most businesspeople could not specify where their customers came from since they never tried to be acquainted and approachable with their customers; they just stated that anybody could use their service and provisions including their neighbours, as shown in Figure 7.34 below.
The other characteristic to measure the business people’s links to and care for their environment is their response to neighbour’s claims of disturbance. Figure 7.35 shows the responses of the businesspeople to questions on complaints about their presence in the kampung.

Most respondents stated that they never had complaints from their neighbours since they never disturbed their neighbourhood, although some of them admitted that sometimes their neighbours claimed their activities as disturbance, especially the noises they created (and especially for those who have a motorcycle stand/garage). However, some of them declared that their
neighbours, far from being disturbed, were backing their presence in the *kampung*.

d. Respondents' Thoughts about Business Expansion

Figure 7.36 displays the responses of these business people on the question of their business development plans.

![Bar Chart](image)

**Figure 7.36** Future development of business activities

The figure reports that half the respondents were enthusiastic about expanding their businesses in the future. Types of development that they would like to have are shown in Figure 7.37

![Bar Chart](image)

**Figure 7.37** Future development of their business activities
Half of the businesspeople did not have any idea as to how they would like to develop their business. At least some thoughts were put forward by the other half, such as rent or buy another stall within or outside the kampung or even anywhere else. This condition could indicate how small and secure the businesses they are running at this moment are; simply, there is no specific plan for the future of their business. The response supported the notion of the essential ephemerality of business in a kampung. Some however thought that they would like to buy a new house within or outside the kampung.

Figure 7.38 summarises these business people’s attitudes to their neighbourhood.

![Figure 7.38 Business people’s attitudes to their neighbourhood](image)

Twenty percent of them did not have any idea about their neighbouring kampung, but there were other respondents who expressed a variety of viewpoints. Some believed that their neighbours need them, as their neighbours need their business/services and the employment that they provided. Meanwhile some of them have quite different opinions, believing that the kampung has to be changed, or it has to be developed as a commercial area, although others stated that the kampung should be conserved and is unsuitable to be developed as commercial area.
7.3.4. The Large Enterprises

PT. Pakuwon Jati, the developer of Tunjungan Plaza shopping centre (Figure-7.39) was chosen as representative of the large business corporations or enterprises in the area, and reflecting modern activities and life styles. Moreover, as hinted at by the information in the first interview survey, and clearly confirmed in comments from respondents in the second survey (and reported above), this enterprise has a significant social affect on the *kampung* dwellers.

![Plaza Tunjungan I](image1)

![Plaza Tunjungan II](image2)

![Interior Plaza Tunjungan I](image3)

![Plaza Tunjungan IV(Sogo) and the Apartment](image4)

Figure 7.39 Tunjungan Plaza Shopping Centre
Survey Procedure

The enterprise was asked to participate in the first interview survey stage, but its consent did not come until the end of that survey work. The researcher was not able to directly interview the manager of the business for the second survey, but instead was invited to leave the questionnaire with its leasing department to be completed in the researcher's absence.

Responses on Questionnaire

Based on the four headings on the questionnaire, the following provides a summary of the answers given by the leasing department.

1. Business Activities.

   The enterprise stated that in this location it only operated the shopping centres and rental offices, with some additional information that Tunjungan Plaza (TP) shopping centre first phase was established in 1986, TP-second phase in 1991, and TP-third phase in 1996.

2. Tunjungan Plaza Shopping Centre.

   The shopping centre offered three types of locations that could be hired: units/shops; plots/stalls in alleys; and exhibition halls. Businesses that were in units/shops were supermarket, department stores, book stores, sport stores, banks and money changers, jewellery outlets, boutiques, electrical appliances, internet-cafes, restaurants and cafes, chemists, art-shops, beauty salons, etc. Some were shops for famous global-brand products such as Levis, Benetton, Country Road, Louis Vuitton, Cartier, Royal Selangor, Adidas, etc.

   Retailers could also choose plots or stalls in alleys. These were small plots about two metres square preferably for light goods such as candy or snacks stalls, mobile phone counters, flower stalls, cosmetics or girls' accessories such as bandanas, earrings, hair-clips, etc. Sometimes these places were leased for a short term by some shops as extension areas for their
promotion days/weeks. The idea for letting these spots started in 1996 in order to make the shopping centre livelier and to pick up additional products.

There were also halls that could be hired for trade events/fairs, such as furniture-fairs, fashion-fairs, cosmetics-fairs, automotive/car expo or fruit and flower shows, book sales, education exhibitions, seminars, and even music and dance performances. Moreover there were also special places for entertainment such as cinemas, children’s playground and amusement centre, and ice-skating rink.

In response to the question on what criteria they would use in choosing the type of businesses that could be operated in the shopping centre, they did not express explicit criteria except to say that they would choose products or activities that could make Tunjungan Plaza a complete shopping centre.

They did not specify how they wished to develop their business except that they stated that the prospect of further developing it was good. In addition they stated that its ideal/strategic location would support its business development. In their response they stated that it was a successful business and they felt confident that they would overcome the influence of the national monetary crisis by welcoming a greater variety of businesses into their shopping centre.


In responding to the question on whether this enterprise had a social relationship with the kampung dwellers, Pakuwon Jati claimed that it did have such a relationship. They recognized that many of the shopkeepers came from the kampung, and kampung dwellers provided services for most of them, such as renting houses, selling food and other essential needs. Moreover this enterprise affirmed that the above activities supported their business.

To the question of what was their impact on the neighbouring kampung, the response was that no difficulties were experienced. They believed that with this kind of social relationship, they were able to ask kampung people to improve the orderliness, safety, tidiness and attractiveness of their kampung.

Conversely in replying to how the neighbouring kampung influenced their business, they stated that they would fulfil the kampung people's various demands on them.

7.4. MAIN FINDINGS

The outcome of the second survey for each group of respondents – and in part drawing on lessons derived from the first (in Chapter 6) – can be portrayed as follows:

7.4.1 The Kampung Dwellers

The residents of Kampung Kaliasin were ordinary Surabayan citizens, who had in the main resided in this kampung for more than twenty years, and were mostly born in the kampung or elsewhere in Surabaya. Most of them had a good educational background and had occupations in the citywide region, apparently reflecting their status as second (or perhaps even third) generation settlers in the area. Their houses were mostly small, but they were of permanent structure and materials, and had sufficient amenities. Their limitation was in terms of land for expansion, in contrast to dwellings in newer estates in Surabaya.

The people of Kampung Kaliasin still exhibit a close practice of traditional mutual-help (gotong-royong), with communal meetings being held at least once each month to get together and talk about their neighbourhood. Both positive and negative views were articulated in response to the
establishment of modern business activities surrounding their neighbourhood. The tension of encroachment was however felt only by those who lived near the new business developments, although it seemed from the responses that any problems were readily resolved. Staying in this kampung was still the most preferred choice, although tentative arrangements to move had been considered by some of them. Keeping the kampung as a liveable settlement was a high expectation of the residents.

7.4.2. The Businesspeople

The businesspeople who run their businesses in this kampung were also Surabayan citizens who lived in or outside the kampung. Their businesses were varied, comprising production, trading and service businesses, and founded through the years, some as early as the 1950s, but others were more recently, in the 1990s. Most of them were small enterprises, with few employees.

The management of their businesses usually did not directly reflect a commitment to the neighbourhood, although some of them did take the opportunity of employing their neighbours. These business people had two opposing ideas for the development of their kampung: one group preferred to see the kampung developed as a business area, while the other group would like to preserve it as it was or even improve its condition, as a residential area (or perhaps as a mixed residential and business area).

Possibly the most significant information to emerge from this group – and from more direct observation of its activities over the years of the present study – relates to the adaptability and flexibility of the population, and to its ability to adjust to drastically changing economic circumstances. These very small enterprises can quickly come into existence, and equally quickly change their focus if someone sees a new opportunity. Further, this locally focussed ingenuity stands alongside the apparent participation in the much broader
economic life of the whole city. It is an interesting combination of the narrowly local and the broadly urban and an issue to which we will need to return in the next chapter.

7.4.3. The Large Enterprise

Unfortunately it proved difficult to make contact with the various corporate-sector enterprises on the periphery of the area – the Westin Hotel, the Sheraton Hotel, Tunjungan Plaza, the developers of the unfinished office towers (stalled, no doubt, by the 1997-1998 economic crises). Although respondents to the resident survey provided a range of stories concerning the development stages of these various enterprises and community relations at those times (and most notably relating to the Westin Hotel), neither corroboration or contradiction of these stories was forthcoming from the enterprises themselves. Only one such organisation was eventually accessed, and it is clear that the information supplied by it was carefully worded for 'political correctness'.

This large enterprise, Pt. Pakuwon Jati, has developed Tunjungan Plaza as a one-stop shopping centre. It provides a variety of spaces in its buildings to be leased or hired in order to accommodate various activities and possibilities of business activities. This institution did not express directly the effects that they have had on the people in the kampung, although it did claim that its activities had a positive impact in terms of supplying services and facilities to the dwellers; and reciprocally it claimed that the dwellers and small local businesses provided benefit to the shopkeepers who were the plaza's tenants. It did not articulate a clear vision of its own or of the kampung's development plans, other than to suggest that kampung dwellers needed to be responsible towards their environment.

There was however an expression that further development would be 'good', and it is safe to assume that in coming years there will be renewed
interest in investing in retail developments, offices, entertainment facilities and the like in Surabaya, and that pressure to expand into the *kampung* could be renewed.

To speculate on the ways in which these three spheres interact — dwellers, local enterprise and large business — and on their significance and their apparent directions of change, is the task of chapter 8 following.
Chapter 8

DISCUSSION

8.1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter in principally reflection – in the light of the insights emerging from the analyses of Chapters 6 and 7, what can we now say about the various ideas and arguments that have emerged from the discussions of theory in Chapter 2? And what can we say now about the very different – indeed almost radically opposed – policy approaches encountered in Chapters 3 and 5 respectively? Stated otherwise, it is to ask 'what has been learnt?'

It needs to be emphasised that what follows is a discussion, as its title declares. Hence matters of speculation, deferred from previous chapters, will now be addressed as he endeavour is to bring together the diversity of issues encountered earlier.

While the chapter will begin with a comparison of Jakarta and Surabaya (in 8.2), the prime focus will be on the latter as context for considering the real significance of Kampung Kalaisin. It will specifically discuss issues of urban function and urban structure and their transformations in recent times, to be followed by a reflection on the structure of the modern kampung more widely (in 8.3, the diverse forms of interdependence between city and kampung highlighted in the present study (8.4), and it will also reflect on the apparent 'genius of innovation' in housing and settlement form that seems so well demonstrated in Kampung Kalaisin (8.5).
8.2. MODERNISATION: THE EMERGENCE OF DIFFERENT VIEWS IN INDONESIAN URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Surabaya is in many ways little different from other cities of the modern world. It is a fragmented city of differentiated and distinctive communities, and of internal movement and constant readjustment. Two factors radically affect the recent evolution of the city, namely modernisation in various of its forms, and active community development. What makes it distinctively different from other cities is its local culture and conditions (but of course these similarly make every city different). The absolutely distinguishing characteristics of Surabaya however would seem in large measure to be related to the structure of its local communities, with their strong cultural traditions despite the high level of mobility.

In this research the evolutionary process in Surabaya seems inevitably to call for some comparison with Jakarta as a reference. It is a critical consideration since most of the literature resources on modern Indonesian urbanism are based primarily on Jakarta, and to a much lesser extent on Surabayan experience. Somewhat surprisingly, there is a dilemma in the inconsistency of the development stories that one can deduce for the two cities and which can set a context for seeing urban development in Jakarta and Surabaya differently. Simply stated, the two cities emerge as distinctively different in their development.

Urban function and urban structure

Many scholars have tried to give an explanation for the original structure of the Indonesian city, fairly consistently arguing that there was traditionally no urban-like structure in Indonesia as usually exhibited in the Western city or, for that matter, in other Southeast Asian societies, and we can turn again to the observations of Evers and Korff (2000:118):
Thai cities show a high degree of "urbanism", ritually established and spatially expressed through city walls, gates and monks. The (ancient) large Indonesian settlements exhibit as ... not a city but a kraton or istana is ritually defined and forms the centre of a centrifocal spatial system.

It is hard to find the core of the present Indonesian city (if the kraton survives, it has certainly lost its ancient significance!), or to describe clear boundaries or neatly zoned land uses that typically characterise the developed Western city (and on the absence of boundaries, albeit in the Thai context, see Thongchai, 1994). In Indonesia for example a settlement might grow from a trade entrepôt or raw material import/export village that experienced some gradual evolution and development, and then it might expand into something that one might label a city under the social and economic pressures of colonisation, with or without the intrusions of physical planning (Wertheim, 1980; Evers and Korff, 2000:28, 34-37).

The European industrial revolution in various ways affected Indonesia through the impact of the European traders. The subsequent progress of new modern technology resulted in an increasing demand for raw materials, and traders were intent on searching it out around the globe – including notably in Indonesia. This might be labelled the era of mercantile modernisation. Later industrial modernisation also offered opportunities for European ventures to bring their factories out to 'the East', for the great benefit of keeping operating costs as low as possible by exploiting low-cost labour; but that deepened the basis for economic colonialism and imperialism, which in turn set off Western forms of urbanisation to be overlain on the colonised settlements. The implementation of those factories, plantations, and colonial settlements, which were usually furnished with demanded infrastructure and public facilities, led in turn to major impacts on local and traditional land use and settlement structure as has been observed, in Chapter 5, in the case of Surabaya. It is also clear that this insertion coincided with evolving notions of
modernist urban planning in the West that would seek to impose a transforming order on economic, social, and political life. So in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, essentially Western ideas of the city and of urban order began to be imported into the colonial empires, and as a consequence modern structure plans began to be drawn up by the Dutch for some cities in Java.

Jakarta and Surabaya apparently grew initially by the clustering of simple, self-supporting original/traditional settlements (the kampungs) scattered over their regions; then later these traditional settlements would tend to agglomerate and perform as larger clustered settlements functioning as a form of city. Both cities, geographically, could be categorised as coastal cities and trans-shipment ports; and while Surabaya was somewhat different from Jakarta (Jayakarta in its previous name with Sunda Kelapa as its local trading port), this East Java entrepôt was nevertheless one of the preferred European mercantile places of interest in the East Indies as early as the 1600s.

In both Jakarta and Surabaya the Dutch inserted their own ‘modern’ institutions and urban infrastructure into the apparently unstructured agglomerations of traditional settlements (the kampungs). Jakarta in particular in the 19th century was experiencing the effects of the European ‘parks movement’, with a linear plan which stretched the city out to the south of the existing Sunda Kelapa port to a quite spacious central park and beyond to a new ‘garden suburb’ real estate development (the present Menteng). Jakarta was designed as a modern city of administration, equipped with its governor-general’s palace and other supporting facilities. However unlike Jakarta which was planned on an area that was relatively vacant, Surabaya was still experiencing a more spontaneous development up to the period when the political economy changed from what could be termed the Dutch
'industrial colonialism' to 'authority colonialism'\(^1\). The consequence seems to be that Surabaya, even more so than Jakarta, developed "... a dualism between modern, westernized institutions and seemingly rural life-styles" (Evers and Korff, 2000:27). It is the 'urban involution' referred to in Chapter 2, leading to the coexistence of a firm-type economy with a bazaar-type economy (Armstrong and McGee, 1980), and seemingly in evidence from the results of Chapters 6 and 7.

It is not coincidental that similar dual economies underlie the spatially muddled (mutually intrusive but symbiotically linked) 'urban' phenomenon of desakota (desa, an agrarian village, kota, of a city), theorised by Terry McGee, as a spontaneous, emerging, de-centred urban form characteristic of wet-rice growing but modernising Southeast Asian regions (McGee, 1991; 1995). The parallel between desakota and the 'urbanising' kampung is suggestive, and a field for future research.

The distinctiveness of Surabaya

It might have been more difficult for the Dutch to (re)plan Surabaya, since this trading city was shared with other considerable groups of long-residing foreign traders - the Chinese, Arabs, and some Indians - as well as other important inter-islands merchant communities such as Madurese, Bugis, Ambonese, Balinese, and various others. However the shift of power consequent on the changing economy got effective planning work underway. A new (colonial) town in the form of a fort town was initiated, all as discussed in Chapter 5. A citadel (never finished) would not only be built to defend the city from overseas enemies, but also to effect a segregation of the existing local ethnic groups from those foreign trading communities who had

\(^1\) This condition happened as a result of the bankruptcy of the Dutch East India Company (Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie /VOC), and the Dutch Government take-over of all its assets and debts.
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resided there and ‘tied the knot’ with local people over the centuries. Accordingly, Surabaya never had a specific plan; overlaying the existing clustered settlements, the city was provided with amenities of a European town: the civic buildings, cathedral, monasteries, convents and their schools, markets, hospital, post-offices, individual houses, infrastructure services and wider streets. The effect of this approach would be to enclose or even abolish some of the original settlements.

It seems that in this planning the Dutch not only made an obvious distinction between places of work (including the plantations) and places of residence (settlements), but also between their own quarters and the local kampungs and the settlements of the other ethnic groups. An example of this fragmentation and segregation can be seen in the existence of the (Dutch) Art Deco remnants along Jalan Tunjungan but the decidedly different (Chinese) shop-houses on the other side of the road from them, which indicate a significant commercial activity in the area in the 1920s and 30s, close to but separate from the Dutch institutions and housing estates, while the Javanese kampungs remained hidden behind those blocks. The present functional and visual diversity of the Kampung Kaliasin perimeters, and their present economic contestations, are in large measure to be traced to these processes. And it is noteworthy that the same screening of the kampungs that occurred in the 1920s and 30s prevails in the present; the significant different is that the screen is now provided by the malls and towers on the corporate sector.

The revolutionary phase that occurred throughout Indonesia during the 1940s can be seen as the climax of indigenous responses to the unjust and exploitative conditions that accompanied colonialism. As could have been predicted, most cities in Indonesia were in chaos. In this era, the city governments of both Jakarta and Surabaya did not direct any attention to developing the urban area, let alone the kampungs. Such issues were also passed over during the era of Japanese occupation. The post-1945 upheaval
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seemed to put even further pressure on the urban areas. In this transitional era some rules and regulations of urban development still referred to or were based on previous Dutch regulations (for example the Surabaya Stad plan of 1949). This transitory and chaotic circumstance could be denoted as part of the next urban modernisation process in which the Indonesians would seek a new environment promising a new experience of the city and of life more broadly.

The early independence situation gave the impression that the city was in fact a place of liberalisation and of economic promise and benefit. The influx of migrants not only occupied abandoned and nationalised properties and expanded the kampungs, but also grabbed and squatted on un-attended urban lands. Consequently the city started to transform from clusters of ethnically-specific sectors to more 'muddled up' quarters, which however also fitted an emerging belief in the idea of a new, unified culture - the Indonesian rather than the Javanese, Madurese, Chinese, etc. This set a new and considerable question in the context of the 1950s 'Indonesianisation' policy, namely whether this new form of 'muddled' urban space would mark the loss of one's ethnic identity, and whether it could indeed assist to generate the new Indonesian ethno-nationalism. In order to become modern cities that could facilitate modern economic activities and social development, both Jakarta and Surabaya were later guided by master plans. As a key strategy in achieving desired changes, these master plans played a significant role in influencing physical, economic and social aspects of urban development - including the hoped-for 'Indonesianisation'.

The process of Indonesian modernisation (in both urban and rural areas) has blurred the previously prominent and distinctive social characteristics of urban and rural communities, while also influencing in new ways the structure of the habitats. For example, where urbanisation was initially perceived as an expression of freedom, it has instead become an
expression of the escape from the countryside, lured by the false prospect of jobs in the well-paid administrative and commercial sectors from which, however, many had been and remain excluded. Yet to repeat a point from Chapter 2, and borne out in the interview results, the kampungs manifest a phenomenon of ‘multiple modernities’ - multiple interrelated knowledges and practices, all of which are simultaneously global and local (Moore, 1996:9; Vickers, 2004:30; Bunnell, 2004:20).

In the New-Order regime era the urban development processes of Jakarta and Surabaya were considerably different from each other. Jakarta especially speeded up its urban development in the ten year period of Governor Ali Sadikin (1966-1977), following the ideas of Soekarno, the first president, on the building of Jakarta as the first modern city of Indonesia. Sadikin administered Jakarta in a military style (he was a navy admiral), and operated a strong in-line organisation; as the governor he was seen as the author of ideas and directions as well as the responsible commander for their implementation. His urban management was oriented towards advancing urban assets through raising the real regional income (Pendapatan Asli Daerah/PAD), especially from the real sectors of the economy as well as from the entertainment sectors (nightclubs, gambling, and others); he ensured proper legal services, constructed an art centre (Taman Ismail Marzuki), and was especially instrumental in constructing the ‘Indonesia Miniature Park’ (Taman Mini Indonesia Indah) as a symbol of a capital city that embraces the diversity of Indonesian cultures. Later however some groups claimed that Jakarta’s urban modernisation (as represented in building elements such as housing estates, shopping centres, civic buildings, and streets for cars - while largely ignoring public transport!) actually paid no attention to the needs of low-income people. More specifically it was argued that modernisation in Jakarta implied submerging, disappearing, or even eliminating the kampungs.
Jakarta, where the alumni of Jakarta’s and Bandung’s prominent universities tend to live, was strongly influenced by Western ideas; indeed this influence can be observed from as early as the establishment in 1920 of the first institution of higher education for technical study in Indonesia (the Technische Hooge School Bandung, renamed in 1959 Institut Teknologi Bandung/ITB). The institute’s Building Engineering Department (Bouwkunde Technische Hooge School – later the Architecture Department) was established in 1950, while the Department of Planning was established in 1959. Those are the two institutions that had the most prominent roles in the introduction of architectural modernism and Western modernist urban planning into Indonesia (or perhaps more accurately into Jakarta), via their Dutch and other European lecturers and some of the local lecturers who graduated from Germany and the United States. Later there were those who graduated from Universitas Indonesia, Universitas Parahyangan and a number of other institutions who also participated in the development of Jakarta – and again influenced by largely Western ideas. Moreover there are also expatriates who were hired or otherwise worked under international programs or project assistance schemes for Indonesia, and who also contributed to leading Jakarta down the same modernist path as Singapore, Melbourne or an American city.

Surabaya however is somewhat different, as it was only influenced in the main by a small cohort of planners and related professionals from local universities, which were established only in the second half of the twentieth century, such as Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember Surabaya (ITS), Universitas Airlangga, Universitas Kristen Petra, and a few others; but especially the discourse on urban matters tends to have been set in Surabaya of recent times by Johan Silas and small numbers of other academics and practitioners who have for a long time emphasized practical improvement and community-based development. Their focus on grassroots action has
underlain the long sequence of the Kampung Improvement Programs; and these programs and the successive lessons learnt from them have in turn led to both refinements and improvements in the evolution of ideas for and approaches to such development. Moreover this prominent group has also had the opportunity to assist local government, especially in the period of Mayor Poernomo Kasidi (1984 to 1989 and 1989 to 1994). He was an army doctor who became the fourth mayor of Surabaya during the New Order regime; however he did not govern Surabaya in a military style, but rather pursued development of the city in close collaboration with the people. Many international and national awards were bestowed on his leadership, such as the World Habitat Award, The Aga Khan Award (for Architecture), UNEP award for the quality of the urban environment, UNCED award for urban environmental management, and also some national awards such as Adi Pura Kencana (for environmental management), Wahana Tata Nugraha (for traffic management), etc. His keen friendship with local citizens guided Surabaya to a more 'comfortable' form of development, rather than to rapid growth confined in the commercial sectors. Modernisation in Surabaya, in this perspective, might imply transforming the kampungs, or perhaps transforming the broader city itself to take on characteristics that are more typical of the kampungs. There is little doubt that Jakarta has more frequently been inflamed by conflict, compared with Surabaya; the latter has been more likely to go for convergence of ideas and reconciliation of conflicting viewpoints and material interests.2

The key role played by ITS academics, working with a relatively responsive city government, brings a somewhat different dimension to a finding by Somantri (1995), to the effect that kampung residents threatened

2 While this is clearly a generalisation, it would be supported by both academic texts (e.g. Jellinek, 1996 on Jakarta, Dick 2002 on Surabaya) and media accounts (in Kompas, Tempo, Jakarta Post, Surabaya Post, Jawa Pos, etc.)
with eviction have achieved a better outcome not through their own actions so much as through NGOs and student groups championing their cause. "Thus," add Evers and Korff (2000:237), "it seems that the urban poor do not organize themselves, but that they are organized by outsiders."

In the Surabaya case, the activist function seems more often exercised through academics working with official and semi-official agencies, with the obvious risks to academic reputations that such appearance of compromise entail. (Although this would be a sensitive issues, it is nevertheless a legitimate field for future research.)

The global wind is also blowing stronger in Jakarta and therefore it is not surprising that Jakarta would like to perform like other cities in the developed economies, or at least to look like them. Moreover, centralised economic development has caused the differences between rich and poor to seem greater, and they are certainly more blatantly displayed in Jakarta. Jakarta is also more of a political hothouse, where political agendas are both more diverse and more actively fought over, and these can spill across into the urban development scene, while Surabaya has an opportunity to somewhat have its own agenda in tackling its urban development, without the pressure of national image and ambitions and the complications of capital city politics.

Modernisation in Jakarta implies submerging, disappearing or even eliminating the kampungs. Modernisation in Surabaya, on the other hand, might imply transforming the city itself to take on characteristics that are more typical of the kampungs. The results from the present study seem to reveal a level of harmony and 'relaxation' that stands in some contrast with results reported variously for Jakarta in the studies of Jellinek (1991), Sihombing (2005) and Winayanti (2005).


Boom, collapse, and reconsideration
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However in the late 1990s with its new mayor Soenarto Soemoprawiro (1994-1999 and 1999-2001), Surabaya experienced a new pace and rhythm of development. The new mayor attempted to speed up development in the ‘real’ economic sectors, as if Surabaya should compete with Jakarta in its development; and in view of that altered outlook, Surabaya then experienced a turning point in its urban development. Coincidentally this was also the era of the frenetic, unrestrained, generally misguided and ultimately destructive Asian economic boom; private sector interests seized the opportunity to accelerate the development of Surabaya regardless of any evidence of demand for the facilities being developed. (And, it should be noted, this was the environment in which the decidedly unrealistic Master Plan Surabaya was formulated with its highly suspect floor area ratio prescriptions and dreams of effectively clearing and rebuilding kampung Kaliasin, discussed in Chapter 5.)

The city was effectively swarming with new business amenities such as offices, supermarkets, hotels, apartments, and other properties, in what presented as an uncoordinated jumble – and nowhere was this frenetic rush more clearly manifested than on the north and east perimeters of Kampung Kaliasin. It seemed for a time that new business would indeed swamp the city.

The quite destructive economic boom that swept up both Jakarta and Surabaya eventually ended, albeit badly, in an extremely painful economic downturn in September-October 1997. The crisis caused Surabaya to slow down and even stop much of its construction activity, and to become preoccupied with the problems of unemployment and the consequent rapid growth of the informal sector. For many people in Surabaya the effect was to turn them back to looking at more sustainable economic activities. The downturn also had the benefit of giving Surabaya, and Indonesia more generally, a ‘breathing space’ – though it might only prove a delay before the
next bout of misguided investment - in which to reconsider the direction that the cities should be taking. In the long run we will probably see the downturn as beneficial, because it will have compelled a restructuring of the Indonesian economy and indeed of society, and a re-examination of its sustaining values more generally. It might also provide an interval in which to re-examine the kampungs and their potential contribution - to see them more as a model than as an impediment.

The reformation era post-1998 has been another phase of Indonesian modernisation, or it might yet be termed 'post-modernisation' in the sense implied by Jean-Francois Lyotard (in the debate with David Harvey reported earlier), referring to the collapse of the modernist preoccupation with a universalist progress and, in its place, the idea of a diversity of pathways (Lyotard, 1984). Such diversity would seem to characterise civil society in the post-Suharto era, as well as to fragment the formal political arena.

The present era of democratization in urban development may break the old (frequently corrupt) links between particular investors and municipal government. At the present time, the city of Surabaya is still in a state of physical non-development, as city government prepares for a new era of local autonomy geared to self-direction - and perhaps for even further internal (post-modernist?) diversification, as well as divergence from the Jakarta model and towards a truly unique form of city.

Comparing Surabaya with Jakarta in its urban function and urban structure would lead to the observation that Jakarta presents different research questions, different schools of thought in dealing with the problem of difference and conflict in society, and it tends to exhibit a different political culture. So the inconsistencies reported in this section come down to this: in Jakarta a perspective focused on the ideas of Western modernist planning and the power of the corporate sector holds greater explanatory power; in Surabaya it is more to be found in a perspective founded in local community
action and 'the grassroots' (if we are to give credence to the stories of local self-determination represented in the vigour of the KIPs). Therefore the 'development stories' reported from the two cities implies opposed understanding of what is the city, and by implication what is implied by 'modernisation'. Furthermore, revisiting the history of a city in its urban development brings about the insight that the city's development has always been tied up with the history of its local authority. It is this distinctive context of Surabaya that underlies in turn the distinctiveness of Kampung Kaliasin - and *vice versa*, as the special quality of Surabaya *kampungs* and the city's Kampung Improvement Programs determine the 'specialness' of Surabaya.

These observations address in part the issue of how the Indonesian city of the present is to be theorised - the theme of the third research question from Chapter 1. Simply, it would appear that different logics underlie the two major metropolises of Indonesia: while a Western body of ideas of urbanisation might help to throw light on the processes of Jakarta, a logic more of 'the grassroots' is necessary through which to approach Surabaya - stated otherwise, the key to understanding urban processes in Surabaya seems more to be found in the *kampungs* and in the multiple modernities and multiple economic sectors as theorised in Chapter 2.

8.3. **A REFLECTION ON THE STRUCTURE OF THE MODERN KAMPUNG**

It has been learned in earlier chapters that the previous structure of Kampung Kaliasin was that of a traditional settlement harking back to the traditional pattern of ordinary Indonesian villages, mixing uses at human scale, domesticated and nourishing. Initially, this *kampung* was marked by the existence of an open space with banyan trees where people used to perform their traditional ceremonies and festivities, and they would use the same
space for a periodic temporary market; there was also a cemetery of a previous eminent leader here – they used to call this kind of place a *punden*. This *kampung* was thus considered a complete settlement since it also came to provide a graveyard for its dwellers. Secondly, *kampung* Kaliasin was also remembered as a place where people could breed cattle and undertake gardening on what was then their spacious tracts of land; but also in those days this was an ‘undeveloped’ place in modern terms; services were poor, and people had to walk their bikes on muddy pathways especially in the rainy season. Finally, a convenient and congenial living environment developed in the *kampung*, as was indicated by the emergence of clustered and well organised settlements in which people knew each other and could feel as if everyone was their relatives.

A relatively simple social structure and arrangements had been established in previous times in the *kampung*; this could be recognised in diverse stories of institutions, practices and significant leaders of the past – an example being that of an eminent leader there who could unravel social problems and resolve environmental inconveniences. Structurally and socially there were few apparent differences between this as an urban *kampung* and other, more essentially rural villages. Thus it was when modern infrastructure and other urban amenities began to be constructed by the Dutch adjoining this area. Eventually the *kampung* came to be encircled by four of the city’s main roads (embong Kaliasin, embong Malang, jalan Kedungdoro and jalan Tegalsari). The existence of these roads altered the accessibility of the *kampung* to other clustered settlements in Surabaya, hence establishing a system of spatial linkages within the city. The ‘hardening’ or firming process of *kampung* boundaries by permanent buildings began with the new forms of economic activity that grew along those roads, and with the building development that they brought, effectively surrounding the *kampung* and determining boundaries for it. At this time, there was very little
external pressure for change within the *kampung* structure itself, since political and economic views on development scarcely touched the native population and its settlements. However in a variety of ways the *kampung* was also experiencing its own forms of advancement.

The first pressure for change in the structure of the *kampung* occurred with the process of densification in the era of Independence. A new expression of modernity was exposed in the ways that the newcomers began to behave towards the *kampung*. Newly arriving residents were carving out small dwelling plots and constructing their houses in the *kampung*, with the consequence of new, denser, more chaotic patterns of settlement. The old civic institutions as symbols of public life were turning out to be insignificant to new residents who did not have any affection for or attachment to these or other landmarks since they did not feel involved in the *kampung*’s traditional activities. From that time, traditional ceremonies and other inherent festivities that were deep-rooted in animism and old customs began to be abandoned. Although some people have missed the routine ceremonial events of the past, it is interesting that they never claim that the new residents were the cause of the changes. What is more, the more recent religious overlays in Indonesian culture (mostly Moslem) did not allow for those old kinds of ritual – their demise can be viewed as one manifestation of modernisation, albeit *religious* and *cultural* modernisation.

It seems that the new dwellers did not disturb the former, although their arrival was in immense numbers, and intensive; the minimal disturbance was possibly because most of the newcomers were Surabayan and were used to living in *kampungs*, so they seemed to have similar behaviour and ways of thinking (except for that lack of interest in local customs and rituals). More ‘modern’ social arrangements developed in the *kampung*; new social networks were shaped by joining community activities within the formal neighbourhood units (RT or RW), wider than simple
neighbourhood relationships; also there developed professional or religious organisations (*pengajian*), which implied more impersonal and indirect relationships. The diversity of needs from an increasingly complex local community – in large measure consequent on its increasing density and declining self-sufficiency – called for new ways to become familiar with and to address specific issues arising in the settlement; in other words it called for new forms of local self-management. Therefore community organisations for assessing and accommodating problems and initiating necessary communication with related institutions beyond the level of the *kampung* would become increasingly necessary. The emotional or face-to-face relationships of traditional society still exist but shrunken from *kampung*-wide down to the neighbourhood unit. While *Kampung* Kaliasin might have been seen as a place of relatively fluid population movement in the past, and perhaps as recently as twenty years ago, nowadays those who might once have been viewed as new or even transient dwellers have settled to become permanent residents of the *kampung*. Indeed this stability is one of the more unexpected findings from the surveys reported in Chapters 6 and 7, and would seem to stand in some contrast to the experiences of Jakarta.

Amalgamation of clustered settlement in *kampung* Kaliasin set up a new structure of gridded though irregular passageways. This spontaneous development occurred during an era when local government was quite unprepared for any specific planning role for such areas. Today, except for the existence of the 'modern' high-rise buildings surrounding the area and the higher density, the physical character of the *kampungs* in urban and rural settings remains relatively similar – and still unplanned. It is noteworthy that the only planning measures recently proposed by the city for the *Kampung* Kaliasin area – for road widening and consequent redevelopment – had paid very little attention to the life and functioning of the *kampung*. On the other
hand however, it is likely that broader city planning has much to learn from the experience of Kampung Kaliasin.

Understanding the essence of the kampung as a place not only for accommodation but also for family rearing, and a vibrant component of the urban area, could help us to speculate on the development of new ‘traditional’ settlement forms and the redefinition of old ones. The kampung in the present era reveals processes or phenomena that might be generalised to other elements of the city. There is always however a danger in this enterprise: that nostalgia for the past, and for having a green and spacious kampung versus the reality of the present compact and dense (but clearly successfully functioning) kampung of the present, could inspire in some measure the goal to have this and other kampungs ‘improved’ to replicate something from the past but which is now impractical and irrelevant to a present economy and lifestyle. It could be a case of attempting to re-invent the past (perhaps even romanticizing the power and authority relationships that underpinned that past society, and to which few would wish to return).

In the context of current spatial planning, the kampungs and other housing estates are considered mainly as residential accommodation for supporting modern economic activities. The housing location (based on the distance of work), the housing condition, and its viability (based on infrastructure and public services) were in turn major issues for housing development that emerged from many respondents to the surveys of the present project. So both the planning approach and these views from the surveys would seem to conform with a modern paradigm of housing amenity in some contrast with that earlier premise, whereby the urban kampung was considered as a self-contained settlement. Kampung Kaliasin, again simply stated, is now a commuter area, a settlement where people live, and children play, but where the ‘breadwinners’ are more than likely to ride their motorbikes or the public bus to workplaces distributed widely across the city.
- as, indeed, in any typical modern city. There is a shift away from conventionally understood roles of the *kampung*, and it seems that we need actually to understand *kampung* Kaliasin as located ambiguously (and richly) between economies, between cultures and between worlds.

The main point of this history is that the evolution of Surabaya can be viewed from two opposed but equally valid perspectives. In the first perspective it is a city of the old kingdoms, of the colonial centre, subsequently of mercantile and industrial capital, and then of the shift from manufacturing to services ('deindustrialisation'), to which the *kampungs* have accreted - attached themselves. The *kampungs* attach to 'the real city'. In the opposed sense, the *kampungs* indeed *are* the real settlement, a modern transformation of an older type of settlement (as argued by McGee, 1991, in relation to the *desakota* hypothesis), and the Dutch, the shipping and the factories, the hotels and office towers and shopping malls are merely intrusions. In the first perspective, the *kampungs* are like parasites on 'the real city', which may legitimately request that they move. In the second, it is the *kampungs* that are real. And it is the second that compels a re-theorising of the city, to see it as a process of agglomeration of traditional communities to which modernisation and modernity come as sequences of intrusions, both physical and conceptual, but where local culture and practices persist (albeit constantly transforming), and where the local and the global thence manifest differently from the patterns found in Western cities (and, it might be added, differently in part from those of Jakarta).

Certainly there are different lessons from different cities. The *kampungs* of Jakarta, for example, have more frequently been battlegrounds between their residents and the proponents of development than has been the case in Surabaya. In Jakarta the divisions in civil society and in widely expressed attitudes come closer to this first way of seeing the city - that is, the *kampungs* as parasites or places that have passed their 'use by' date. The case of
Discussion

Surabaya is closer to a situation of constant and constructive negotiation between the two understandings. (The stories reported previously from Kampung Kaliasin of the Westin Hotel 'intrusion' and of the consequent processes of manoeuvre and negotiation are instructive.) Surabaya has been a city of active, rich and inventive experimentation to understand the interdependences that link these complementary worlds, and sensitively to negotiate the differences between them.

8.4. FORMS OF INTERDEPENDENCES

In a study of contemporary kampungs and their dispersal in Jakarta, Jellinek (1991) wrote of their 'reality' as parasites on the formal economy, both dependent on and nurturing that economic sector. The present project has reported a distinctively different reality. In the event, the local form of 'symbiosis' of formal and informal economies identified by Jellinek as characterising Jakarta was very little in evidence in the present Surabaya case, except possibly at the margin between the kampung and the corporate realm. While some local self-reliance and local interdependence might apply, from the evidence of interviewees the interdependence seems far more metropolitan in scale in the case Surabaya. (The greater ease of movement in Surabaya might also have been a factor: there is the possibility that the more localised interdependences between economies - formal and informal - in Jakarta is in part a function of that city's constraints on mobility.)

Instead we find three distinctively different forms of interaction from the surveys:

- Within-kampung linkages are strong and demonstrate flexibility; practices of gotong royong survive, though there is little evidence of participation from the within-kampung non-resident business community.
• Kampung-to-Tunjungan interactions are opportunistic; they are limited to the margins between kampung and corporate sector space, and responses would suggest that a social distance prevails.

• Kampung-to-city relations are "formal" in the sense of functioning markets in both labour, commodities and services; on all evidence they are also growing in significance.

The following paragraphs will reflect on the decidedly different characteristics of these forms of interaction.

Extremely varied businesses in Kampung Kaliasin show that this kampung is a favoured place to create and operate a new job or form of economic activity, especially in the informal sectors that include services and small industries. These 'subsistence business' activities of the residents constitute a powerful substitution for the services provided by the formal sector, and have the potential to undermine some fractions of the formal economic sector, though it should be noted that, above all, small-scale modern services are preferred by these new entrepreneurs. Other most prominent activities include leasing all or part of a house, and providing services for domestic needs. The consequence is that Kampung Kaliasin is jumbled with formal and informal activities, but they work in a high degree of accord with each other. Although very few formal sector organisations bring in informal services as direct inputs to their formal activities, there is however a seemingly mutual accommodation, and minimal disturbance from one to the other.

Much of the symbiosis between kampung and corporate sector arises from the role of Tunjungan Plaza shopping centre as a recreation area and indeed as a 'learning' centre toward 'modern consumerism', that is in the sphere of consumption rather then production. Families go to the shopping centre for window shopping, to taste a cone of McDonald's ice cream or a piece of chicken from the Kentucky Fried Chicken outlet, or to buy modern
imitated Louis Vuitton's handbags and other wares, or for those 'special' purchases for special occasions. This might simply be seen as part of a broader cultural transformation. There is some mutual interdependence of kampung Kaliasin with the Tunjungan Plaza and the street businesses, but it may not be strong. While a strong and local symbiotic relationship between kampung and corporate world may be a Jakarta myth, there is certainly however a strong internal mutual interdependence within the kampung itself – the sort of 'subsistence urbanism' akin to the 'subsistence agriculture' of traditional rural kampung (desa) life that was discussed in Chapters 1 and 2. But, simply stated, the urban interaction at a much broader, even metropolitan scale is more dominant.

It is useful at this point to return to arguments reviewed by Evers and Korff (2000) and alluded to in Chapter 1 and explored in Chapter 2. Quoting Castells (1989; 1997) and Sassen (1994; 1998), the point is made that the 'informal sector' and casual economy is not simply a (temporary) feature of Third World cities, but a characteristic of highly developed cities as well, including quite specifically New York (2000:132). Indeed as early as 1944 Karl Polanyi argued against any such simplistic notion: while the development of the self-regulating market might have been a 'turning point' in world history, he saw it as a 'rare' and degenerated form of socio-economic organization, and gave it little long-term chance of survival – an economy that is completed dis-embedded from social ties in doomed to (self)destruction (Polanyi, 1978). Subsistence production is seen by Polanyi as fundamental to human society.

In response to criticisms of Polanyi's arguments, Fernand Braudel developed the hypothesis further by distinguishing three economic sectors. Two of these sectors are 'the market economy' and capitalism, which would broadly conform with 'informal' and 'formal' sectors as used in the present text, and which Braudel asserts have characterised European society since well
before the industrial revolution and at least since the Middle Ages. However he adds a third sector, namely the 'non-economy'; it is the base in which the market economy is rooted but without however ever being able to penetrate it completely. So, to summarise, there is an immense base of the non-economy (to be identified with the subsistence production sector described earlier); on top of this base is the zone of the market economy where a multitude of small producers offer their goods; then over this zone is that of the 'contra-market', where the smart and powerful are in command (Braudel, 1986:245-246). This last zone is the realm of capitalism.

It is the points of intersection of these zones that have been the pursuit of the present study. In one sense the pursuit has failed, and for reasons predicted by Evers and Korff (2000:137): the subsistence production of the 'non-economy' – that is, the base itself – defies both rigorous classification, identification and measurement.

New technology (the motorbike, public transport) enables people to commute all over a vast city. The distances and the distribution of the respondents' working places indicated just how widely these Kaliasinians conduct their daily hies; despite their home-based economic activities, more than half of them are travelling within 5km to 25km for formal occupations. Surabaya may therefore be more 'modern' than Jakarta (a 'commuter land', rather than a village), or it might simply be that the right questions have not yet been asked about Jakarta. Or is local interdependence ('symbiosis') only ever functional at close range – at the margins between different worlds? And because Kampung Kaliasin is in its physical extent much larger that the more fragmented kampungs studied in Jakarta (by Jellinek, and by a number of recent PhD scholars, as referenced earlier), it has a large hinterland that is beyond that margin. So it is possible that the Jakarta studies have

---

3 I would especially refer here to PhD studies at the university of Melbourne by Antony Sihombing (2005) and Lana Winayanti (2005).
concentrated on only a special case of the interface between kampung and 'modern' urban activity – namely on the immediate margin between them.

Education development in the past brought the idea of modernisation to Indonesia, which then encouraged young educated Indonesians, included those in Surabaya, to fight for liberation from colonialism. What is more, the Surabayan movement in the revolutionary period was mostly played out from the kampungs (Frederick, 1978). That revolutionary force, based on education and new ideas and on the conditions of the kampung, continues today. The other reason why so many residents no longer attach to the existing jobs in their kampung is because of their opportunities with new knowledge to compete in broader and more varied occupations. In an important sense, the kampungs may still be revolutionary.

The question of community

From these considerations of forms of interdependence, as well as from the discussion of kampung form in 8.3 previously, there arises the question of whether the modern kampung is to be considered 'a community'. Evers and Korff (2000:229-230), in this regard, report a debate on the extent to which a kampung can be regarded as a 'community'. Murray, for one, argues that community continues regardless of size:

Kampung community is about neighbourship and there are strong pressures on Kampung people to be good neighbours. Good neighbourship or 'neighbourliness' is quite precisely defined in the Kampung and powerful sanctions function to make community members behave in conformity with the conventions (Sullivan, 1992:71, based on study of a Yogyakarta kampung).

If for no other reason, this 'neighbourship' will be sustained by the simple pressures of internal security and communal harmony. So,

... amidst its more frequently stated objectives the Kampung acknowledges a paramount goal: communal harmony, a situation in which people live together peacefully and compatibly, commonly designated by the word rukun (Sullivan, 1992:106).
Yet against that, the kampung is scarcely able to speak with a single voice or come to a consensual course of action (and such certainly seems the case in the present study):

The Kampung is not an entity capable of devising a ‘strategy’ but a community of individuals adapting to their urban situation and the arrival of more and more people with a balance of co-operation and competition (Murray, 1991:61).

Jellinek seems to have come to a similar conclusion, and for a clearly related reason to that suggested by Murray; where Murray saw the fragmenting factor being new arrivals, for Jellinek it was sheer size. Both would seem to apply to kampung Kaliasin.

The whole Kampung was too large for any formal organization or sense of unity. The inhabitants identified less with the Kampung than with clusters of houses along the several paths (Jellinek, 1991:26).

It is interesting however to observe that the findings from the present survey, whereby sense of community tended to be more linked to kin than to proximity, is questioned by those from Jellinek’s work in Jakarta: “In the Kampung ties of residential proximity seemed to be of greater importance than ties of kin (Jellinek, 1991:35). (There were similar findings by Bremm, 1988:52, in a kampung in Yogyakarta.)

The inescapable conclusion is that the nature of community, always in part ‘in the mind’ more than in any objective reality (the point emphasised by Benedict Anderson, 1991), is yet to be both researched and theorised in the case of the Indonesian kampung. It is an issue that might well be addressed in a future project.
8.5. A GENIUS FOR INNOVATION

Frequent contact with Dutch society certainly caused the Surabayans to come across new learning, and to become acquainted with new ideas and technologies, and to absorb bits and pieces of foreign ideology; therefore as early as this colonial era, Surabaya was being 'modernised'. It has evolved from a simple indigenous settlement to its present status - as the second largest city of Indonesia - but it has always faced complex local political roles (in the Dutch, revolutionary, New-Order, and the present reform eras), and the shifting nature of local political agendas and authority. It has been a place of fluidity and change.

One of the strongest indicators of kampung Kaliasin residents' ability to adapt - to exhibit an ability of 'self-reinvention' or what has been called previously a 'genius for innovation' - is in a depressingly negative result from the survey: that a quarter of respondents were jobless, when there are no unemployment benefits distributed by the state. Yet the non-participant observations that constituted part of the project revealed productive activity virtually ubiquitously throughout the kampung. Simply stated, people were occupying their time productively.

Kampung Kaliasin has revealed in great detail a population that can adapt rapidly to changed circumstances, or to suddenly perceived opportunity - people who will 'have a go'. Running businesses - such as vendors, canteens, daily needs stalls, or even small scale modern services such as beauty-parlours, public-telephone and internet access kiosks (wartel), video and electronic-games rental, electronic appliances repairs, photo-copy stalls, book-rental, etc - is simply because they suddenly saw the opportunities that being in this kampung presented. While many of these seized opportunities might be somewhat routine and the behaviours accordingly judged reactive, there are also abounding cases of real inventiveness and innovation. Kampung Kaliasin seems to exhibit 'no fear' of
the corporate encroachment of the hotels, plaza and offices – or it might be a combination of apprehension moderated by hope. The gradual process of development, the ‘mutual’ work opportunities traded between the dwellers and the corporate world bring about a ‘different’ sort of person – the interdependences work their way through and through. In this kampung therefore there is not a strong tension or fear between the developer and the kampung dwellers; it looks more like a somewhat distanced partnership relationship. Furthermore, it creates a great optimism among the dwellers (less anger than opportunity), unlike the situation commonly prevailing and reported in Jakarta, where there is hostility between kampung and formal economy. The value of looking at kampung Kaliasin has been to observe these great changes at the most local of levels.

Neighbourhood development programs and projects (the Kampung Improvement Programs) may have been one of the major interventions in the processes of the Surabaya kampungs, in that they have focused reinvestment to particular areas, and they may be ‘stabilizing’ the population. It is important to identify the effect of the neighbourhood development program, and to question (through interview) if the population of such areas is different, or if attitudes and experiences are different, from those elsewhere. This however must remain a task for future research.

Different approaches to housing development constitute examples of the difference in political culture between Surabaya and Jakarta: evictions, slum clearances or resettlements have been common activities to deal with low-income housing problems in Jakarta, especially when there has been almost bitter competition between developers for their business development projects, while Surabaya has especially focused on its kampung improvement projects. As response to its rapid population growth, housing development in Jakarta is more advanced than that of other cities in Indonesia, with variations in style, methods to pay, and so on, and with the construction of
many apartments, gated communities, themed developments and the like. In Surabaya, by contrast, the real advances seem to have been in the mobilisation of both city and kampung in community development.

Low-income people have their own ways of developing and conducting their settlements; to take full advantage or exploit the opportunities of their settlement is one of their attainments. Such has certainly been the case with Kampung Kaliasin, revealed in the present study.
Chapter 9

CONCLUSIONS

In Chapter 1 three interlinked questions were posed, to serve as the focus of the present research; they can usefully be re-stated here as a framework within which to structure the conclusions that will be drawn from the work.

1. How are we to identify the processes of change in a low-income inner city neighbourhood’s community system, in an area that is being encroached upon by modern business activities? What are the processes of change?

2. More specifically, and in the Indonesian context, what shifts are occurring between the conventionally understood roles of the kampungs that enable a form of low-income ‘subsistence urbanism’, and their apparently emerging roles linked to an ever-widening urban, metropolitan and even global economy and community? Is there a new form of community emerging and, if so, what might be its characteristics?

3. How might present understandings and supporting theory need to be re-thought to throw light on these processes of change observable in Indonesian cities? Does the Indonesian kampung present a significant model or ‘archetype’ that is relevant to the present and likely future of cities?

Accordingly these questions will be used to provide a framework for the concluding comments on the project.

---

1 As observed in Chapter 1, ‘archetype’ is to be defined as original model or prototype (Oxford English Dictionary).
Processes of Change – the first question

Modernisation might well be conceptualised as extending the idea of change broadly to the realm of the individual who might thereby be able to express their own idea of a preferred style of life or even a preferable identity. In its development towards being a modern city, Surabaya shows evidence of an increasing range of possibilities (and, at least potentially, of choices that it progressively extends to its occupants): it becomes a modern industrial port city, effectively inserted into its old city structure with its modernist Dutch city planning, equipped with improving infrastructure and services, albeit via development that has been decidedly sporadic. Along with government development planning with its emphasis on economic development, assisted by conventional (and essentially Western) planning theory with its emphasis on master plans with their systems of monitoring, feedback and re-planning, recent Surabaya urban development has focused on ideas of Surabaya as part of a global economic business community. However the increasing diversity of the city’s spaces, services and opportunities have seemingly failed to be extended to the point of allowing people to have the benefit of exploring their own ability, and to exercise their own real preferences. Both media and public policy extol the virtues of new estates, new lifestyles and conspicuous consumption, over the long established and clearly preferred choice of many, to whom the kampung remains an ideal. This has been a study of these processes of change, from the ‘grass-roots’ view of Surabaya’s large and strategically central Kampung Kaliasin – a traditional settlement form at the very eye of major urban change.

Neighbourhood development and changes are to be accepted as long as they deliver advantages to the dwellers. Processes of encroachment in the present era might be tolerated because encroachment is seen to be lucrative. The immediate gain of capital to some of the displaced might be pleasing, as it enables them to freely choose their new quarters, and as they might well like to move to a ‘higher level’ neighbourhood. However, the present study has
clearly revealed that this is far from the case for everyone. The *kampung* presents a community and physical environment that for many is of the greatest value.

In this context, the current city planning for *Kampung* Kaliasin - with new cross-roads and substantial housing redevelopment - must be seen as extraordinarily oblivious of the real processes of the city's evolution and of its persisting culture and spatial practices. While the intentions behind such planning might seem honourable, the approach must be judged as seriously flawed.

**New Urban Community - the second question**

One reason why the *kampung* remains a completely viable community form, even in the present frenetic age of continuing modernisation, is because its 'boundaries' have ceased to exist: perhaps the major conclusion from the present study has been that the *kampung* dweller, at least in the case of *Kampung* Kaliasin, is now an active, participating citizen of the wider city and its full economic, social and cultural life. An implication of this 'breaking the boundaries' is that there will certainly be adjustments (though perhaps not radical disruptions) in people lives and expectations, with inevitable consequences for the space of the *kampung* itself. There will be internal changes, and new opportunities.

The *kampung*'s subsistence urbanism has changed to a broader form of city subsistence urbanism, in which *kampungs* are part of the wider urban system. *Kampung* dwellers are servicing the broader city and the reverse is similarly the case, as the present study has clearly revealed.

**Challenging the Future Inner-city Settlement**

While the majority of Surabaya's population live in the *kampungs*, and while on the evidence of the present study there may be a high level of acceptance of *kampung* living and even strong preference for it, the *kampungs* nevertheless
Conclusions

present the challenge of being necessary communities that are seriously inadequate in many of their aspects, and that challenge will inevitably increase as incomes and expectations rise. Governments at all levels – national, provincial, city and more local – face the challenge of guiding and assisting the necessary improvement and transformations. To critique public policy, and to suggest 'better policy', has not been one of the aims of this research; nevertheless clues to directions that the policy debate might take have inevitably emerged from the study. Some brief reference to them is inescapable.

A significant range of methods and approaches will need to be pursued, sensitively and indeed experimentally:

- Standards of fitness and design need to be debated and agreed, and this will inevitably include the role of the planning system in guiding and if necessary controlling design. The aim is not so much to control the individual as to limit the deleterious spill-over effects of individual actions, and possibly including the action of continually subdividing already small dwellings into ever smaller ones. While the highly inventive and flexible approaches to housing provision will hopefully persist as an invaluable resource of the kampungs, there is clearly a need for agreed and if necessary enforced standards for housing and neighbourhood spatial behaviour:

- Area-based and other policies are necessary for both the renewal of privately-owned housing and of local authority estates. Such measures will include the improvement of security and the role of intensive, but always sensitive, housing management.

- At a broader scale, the management of urban growth might need reform, to achieve a more reflexive approach to the connection between house building at the most local of scales (as observed in Kampung Kaliasin) and the broader urban form. This amounts to extending the insights and experiences from the Kampung Improvement Programs to the wider area
of the relationship between urban planning and the provision of affordable housing.

- Scenarios for the future of the inner-city settlements of Indonesian towns and cities need to be explored. Stated otherwise, there needs to be a rich diversity of different approaches that can be observed over time; we then need to trust local communities to make their own decisions on the directions they wish to take. Surabaya can become a demonstration city of settlement planning and improvement approaches.

**Challenging the kampung as an archetype – the third question**

The last point above, implying the need to find scenarios for future city settlements in Indonesia, brings the attention back to the very positive insights that have emerged from the study of Kampung Kaliasin. This is a successful, functioning community, progressively opening up to the broader city and through it to the global community itself.

*Kampung* Kaliasin is not a slum, nor an aberration on the ideal of the city; rather it needs to be seen as an ideal in itself. It offers a form of space and of local community organization that might well be considered as an archetype for new settlements, that is more appropriate (perhaps even more 'Indonesian') than the proliferating housing estates of the recent past. Our need is to learn from the *kampungs*; and the real challenge is to take the processes of *kampung* growth, the persisting character of *kampung* culture and spatial practices, and the invaluable experience of decades of the Kampung Improvement Programmes, into the broader planning of the city itself.

**Future Directions for Research**

This has been a case study. As explained in Chapter 4, the value of a case study is in its reflecting upon a generalised theory or set of theoretical propositions and thereby subjecting that theory to test under the particular conditions that apply to that case. In the present instance *Kampung* Kaliasin
has enable a diversity of reflections on issues of modernity and modernisation, kampung and broader economies (forms of interdependence), the transformation processes in Indonesian urban settlements under conditions of modernisation and economic change, ideas of community and subsistence urbanism. However it should be fairly clear that another, different case study, of a kampung whose conditions are different from those of Kaliasin, would yield different insights and bring these and other theoretical issues under question from an altogether different perspective. Theory thereby becomes enriched. An additional conclusion from the present project therefore relates to the value of further case studies, of further Indonesian kampungs.

Kampung Kaliasin is a very large, extensive kampung. It does not appear to imagine itself as a single community, as observed above, and it may have been an error for the project to have treated it as a single entity rather than to observe its fragmentation/differentiation. Future work is needed to explore both (1) the effects of size on ideas of community (and thereby of agency) in Indonesian kampungs, and (2) processes of fragmentation which the Harvey-Lyotard debates, discussed earlier, would suggest are a common characteristic of present (post-) modernisation.

Since 1998 Indonesia has been passing through a period of profound social and political change. The surveys for the present project were conducted relatively early in that reformasi era. Anecdotal evidence would have it that political change is having significant effects on people's ideas of human agency - if this is an era of otonomi and self-determination, the argument goes, then surely I should have the right to determine the conditions of my own habitation. So future research needs to address (3) shifting ideas on equity, political (community) participation, and tensions between 'authorities' and 'the grassroots' in kampung society. In other words, how are ideas of local self-management and local self-help, reportedly
common to kampung society, transforming under the new rhetoric and practice of liberal democracy?

As something of a sub-set of this third area for future study, there is also the need (4) to re-evaluate the Kampung Improvement Programmes in this context of shifting ideas of political agency.

This comes back to the disclaimer, stated at various places in the present text, to the effect that the aim has been to understand processes of change – it has not been to rigorously critique planning policy (though comment on its inadequacy has been inevitable here), nor to propose better policy. However a legitimate criticism of the present project would be that it exposed a serious gap between the reality of the kampung and the unreality of the Surabaya Master Plan, and raised the question of why the planning was so focused on the apparent interests of corporate sector investment. A useful future project would be (5) to explore the links between various fractions of capital (developer capital, finance capital, etc) and various strands of government (political, bureaucratic, national vis-à-vis city vis-à-vis local, etc) over the periods of the 1990s boom, the 1997 collapse, and the various phases of the post-1998 reformasi.

This last might well be the most important, if the intention turns to actively improving the lot of the kampung dwellers. But it would also be the most politically sensitive and the most problematic.
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Appendix – 1a

QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE PILOT SURVEY

THE PURPOSE OF THE INTERVIEW

In general the purpose of this interview is observing the relationship among the three inhabitants in Kampung Kaliasin. They are the kampung dwellers, the street business and the big enterprises. The questions are whereabouts the inhabitant activities, their current situations, their feelings and perceptions to each other and also their expectation of their future kampung.

IT IS A FUNCTION OF:

1. Resources for interrelationship,
2. Need for interrelationship,
3. Access to the interrelationship,
4. Perception of value of the relationship, and
5. Perception of future development
Residents

Location/address : No.Quest:
RT/RW : Kel/Kec:

I. Residential history

1. Were you born in this kampung?
   a. Yes, in................. (year)
      1. Did you stay in the same house?
         a. Yes
            Could you tell me how does the kampung look like
            when you are young?
            (in sequence)
         b. No
      1. Where did you live previously? (RT/RW)
      2. When did you move to this house?
      3. How did you find this current house?
      4. Why did you move to this house? Did you have any
         optional areas?
            (Did your move consider to or result in changing
            economic activity - why?)
   b. No
      1. Where did you live previously? (Kampung,Kel,Kec,Kab)
      2. When did you move in?
      3. How did you find the current dwelling?
      4. Why did you move to this kampung? Did you have any
         optional areas?
            (Did your move consider to or result in changing economic
            activity - why?)
      5. How did you describe this kampung when you just moved
         in?
2. **Housing improvement**
   a. Do you have any plans to improve or change your house?
      1. Yes
         a. What changes considered?
         b. Do you have any constraint on your improvement plans?
            (size and location of space availability, infrastructure support, environment, etc)
      2. No
         a. Why? Do you have any constraint?
         b. How long do you intend to remain on this house?
            (return to village in old age, aspirations for the childrens)

II. **Choice of business activities**

1. What is your occupation? Where is your post? How do you get there?
2. Did you learn about new opportunities when you are here? (especially in relation with the “new” development in this area?)
   a. Yes or No. (give detailed: what, where, when, why and how)
   b. How much collaboration and support do you get from kin, friends, neighbours in setting up the activities?

III. **Linkages and Networks**

1. **Social Networks**
   a. Relationship: kinship / friendship / membership network
      1. Do you have any relatives / groups in this kampung?
      2. How do you usually get together/meet?
      3. How is your neighbourhood? (Do you have regular meeting?)
         b. How important are these social networks for you and your families?

2. **Economic Networks**
   a. Where do you usually shop for your daily need?
   b. Where do you usually get services? (health, education, recreation)
   c. Why do you choose them?
IV. Neighbourhood's concern

1. What do you think about the existing neighbourhood? (regarding health, nuisance, dangers, satisfaction)

2. How do large-scale changes in society affect the family?
   a. Loss of traditional lifestyle and values
   b. Education
   c. More past-times
   d. Loss of extended family
   e. More democracy
   f. Economic down turn, increased jobless family
   g. Expansion of business into the area
   h.

3. Future Intentions
   a. What would you like to see changed in this neighbourhood?
   b. What
      (what do they believe about their neighbourhood's future)
Appendix – 1b

**PERTANYAAN SURVEY AWAL**

**TUJUAN DARI WAWANCARA**


**AKAN MERUPAKAN FUNGSI DARI:**

1. Sumberdaya untuk keterkaitan hubungan,
2. Kebutuhan untuk keterkaitan hubungan,
3. Jalan untuk keterkaitan hubungan,
4. Persepsi dari nilai keterkaitan, dan
5. Persepsi untuk pembangunan yang akan datang
PENGHUNI

Alamat : No.Quest: 
RT/RW : Kel/Kec: 

Sejarah Rumah

1. Apakah saudara lahir di kampung ini?
   a. Ya, pada tahun.................
      1. Apakah saudara tinggal di rumah yang sama?
         a. Ya
            Dapatkah saudara ceritakan kondisi kampung ini waktu saudara masih kecil? (Dalam kurun waktu)
   b. Tidak
      1. Dimana saudara tinggal sebelum ini? (RT/RW)
      2. Kapan saudara mulai menempati rumah ini?
      3. Bagaimana saudara mendapatkan rumah ini?
      4. Mengapa saudara pindah kemari? Apakah saudara punya alternative tempat lain?
         (Apakah saudara pindah karena alasan ekonomi?)

   b. Tidak
      1. Dimana saudara tinggal sebelum ini?
         (Kampung,Kel,Kec,Kab)
      2. Kapan saudara pindah kemari?
      3. Bagaimana saudara mendapatkan rumah di kampung ini?
      4. Mengapa saudara pindah kemari? Apakah saudara punya alternative tempat lain?
         (Apakah saudara pindah karena alasan ekonomi?)
      5. Bagaimana saudara menggambarkan kampung ini sewaktu pertama kali saudara pindah ke kampung ini?
2. Perbaikan rumah
   a. Apakah saudara punya rencana untuk memperbaiki atau pindah rumah?
      1. Ya
         a. Apa yang saudara pertimbangkan?
         b. Apakah saudara punya keterbatasan untuk rencana pengembangan rumah saudara?
            (luasan dan lokasi yang tersedia, prasarana lingkungan yang mendukung, lingkungan, dsb)
   2. Tidak
      a. Mengapa? Apakah anda mempunyai hambatan?
      b. Berapa lama saudara berharap untuk dapat menempati rumah ini?
         (pulang kampung waktu usia lanjut, dan meninggalkan rumah ini untuk anak-anak mereka)

Pilihan untuk Kegiatan/aktivitas kerja

1. Apakah pekerjaan saudara? Dimana tempat saudara bekerja? Bagaimana saudara menuju ke tempat kerja?
2. Apakah saudara mempelajari tentang kemungkinan usaha baru ketika saudara dating? (terutama berkaitan dengan pembangunan 'baru' disekitar daerah ini?)
   a. Ya atau Tidak. (berikan detail apa, dimana, kapan, kenapa, dan bagaimana)
   b. Seberapa jauh hubungan kerja dan dukungan yang saudara dapat dari keluarga, teman, tetangga dalam rangka mebangun usaha saudara?

Keterkaitan dan Hubungan Kerja

1. Jaringan sosial
   a. Keterkaitan: saudara / pertemanan / keanggotaan jaringan
      1. Apakah saudara mempunyai saudara/ kelompok di kampung ini?
      2. Bagaimana biasanya saudara berkumpul/ bertemu?
      3. Bagaimana lingkungan tetangga saudara? (Apakah saudara mempunyai pertemuan rutin?)
b. Seberapa penting jalinan social ini untuk saudara dan keluarga saudara?

2. Jaringan kerja
   a. Dimana saudara biasa belanja untuk keperluan sehari-hari?
   b. Dimana saudara biasanya mendapatkan pelayanan? (kesehatan, pendidikan, rekreasi, dsb)
   c. Mengapa saudara memilih itu?

Ketanggapan Lingkungan

1. Apakah yang saudara pikirkan tentang kondisi lingkungan saat ini?
   (berdasar kesehatan, gangguan, bahaya, dan kenyamanan)
2. Bagaimana perubahan social yang besar akibat kondisi saat ini terhadap keluarga?
   a. Kehilangan nilai dan perilaku tradisi
   b. Pendidikan
   c. Lebih banyak kesempatan bersantai
   d. Kehilangan keluarga majemuk
   e. Lebih demokratis
   f. Merosotnya perekonomian, peningkatan pengangguran, pada keluarga
   g. Perluasan usaha di wilayah ini

3. Keinginan masa depan
   a. Apakah saudara saudara ingin melihat perubahan dilingkungan ini?
   b. Apa yang anda yakini akan perubahan yang akan terjadi dilingkungan ini.
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE FIRST SURVEY

1.1 THE PURPOSE OF THE INTERVIEW

In general, the purpose of this interview is to understand the process of urbanisation that plays in Surabaya, especially in an area that was highly transient, very diverse, and apparently of significance as a temporary dormitory for people moving to Surabaya, or within the city.

They are the kampung dwellers, the street business and the large enterprises. The questions are whereabouts the inhabitant activities, their current situations, their feelings and perceptions to each other and also their expectation of their future kampung.

Hence, some questions come out. First, could kampung be developed complementary with other city system? As a case: could inner city kampung developed as modern as it's surrounding formal Center Business District area? If it is possible, What kind of development should be done in this area? In addition, What, if anything, should the city government do to assist the kampung dwellers? Therefore, the principal survey then derived to an effort of Actuality and Identity

IT IS LIKELY TO BE A FUNCTION OF:

1. Resources for interrelationship,
2. Need for interrelationship,
3. Access to the interrelationship,
4. Perception of value of the relationship, and
5. Perception of future development
The interview schedule:

1. THE KAMPUNG DWELLERS

A. 'Resources' relevant to the interrelationship

a. The recent activities:

1. Do you have any relation/activities related with the street business/large enterprise surrounding this area?
2. What kind of activities did you have?
3. Do you have a full-time or part-time job of any kind?
4. In the main job, what was your occupation?
5. How many hours did you work in all jobs?
6. What are the main tasks that you usually perform in that occupation?
7. What was the employer's workplace address?
8. How many hours do you work in all jobs?
9. How did you get to work?

b. Skill:

1. What are your qualification or special skills?
2. Have you completed a vocational training or any other educational qualification?

c. Education:

1. What was your highest education that you have ever had?

d. House/accomodation:

1. What is the main reason you stay in this kampung / What was the most important to be here?
2. In what year did you move to this kampung?
3. How many bedrooms are there in this dwelling?
4. How much does your household pay for this dwelling?
5. What is the tenure of this house?
6. If this dwelling is being rented, whom is it rented from?

B. NEED FOR THE INTERRELATIONSHIP

a. Employment opportunity
1. Did you actively look for work at any time in the street business/large enterprise?

b. Services
1. Do you use the street business services?
2. Why did you go to the street business/large enterprise last time?
3. Where do you get most of your daily need?
4. Where do you usually go for your pastime?
5. Do you serve or provide something to the street business/large enterprises?
6. What kind of services do you do? In what year did you start to do it?

C. ACCESS TO THE INTERRELATIONSHIP

a. Relationship/connection
1. Do you know some people who work in the street business/large enterprise? Do you have any special shops/retail stores to go? Where are they (their address)?
D. PERCEPTION OF VALUE OF THE INTERRELATIONSHIP

1. How do you fell about the development surround you?
2. How do you think about the present of the street business and large enterprise?
3. Are there any condition that affect you?

E. FUTURE KAMPUNG PREFERENCE

1. How do you feel about your existing kampung?
2. What do you think about the existing public services?
3. What do you think about the existing public facilities?
4. How do you describe your future kampung based on this existing condition?
5. How do you describe your preference future kampung?
6. To what extent could the kampung dweller realised your ideals?
7. What do you expect local government to do in realising your ideals? What do you expect your neighbour businessmen to do in realising your ideals?
2. THE STREET BUSINESS

A. 'RESOURCES' RELEVANT TO THE INTERRELATIONSHIP

a. Recent activities

1. Do you have any relation/activities related with the kampung dweller/large enterprise surrounding this area?
2. What kind of activities did you have?
3. Do you have a full-time or part-time or any kind staff/employee who live in kampung Tunjungan?
4. In the main job, what was his/her occupation?
5. How many hours did he/she work in all jobs?
6. What are the main tasks that he/she usually performs in that occupation?
7. What was the employee home address?
8. Why do you prefer him/her?

b. Business specification

1. What is your business specification?

c. Location

1. What is the main reason you open your business in this location? / What was the most important to be here?
2. In what year did you operate the activities?
3. How much does your company pay for this plot?
4. What is the tenure of this plot?
5. If this shop is being rented, whom is it rented from?
6. Do you give any additional living's support for your employee?
7. What kind of support do you give? (Accommodation, health, transport, etc.)

B. NEED FOR THE INTERRELATIONSHIP

a. Labour
1. Did you get appropriate employees from the kampung dweller?
2. To what extent, if any, do you have confidence in working the kampung dweller to your company?

b. Services
1. Do you have kampung dweller/large enterprise customers?
2. Where do you get most of your business supply?
3. Do you serve or provide something to the kampung dweller/large enterprises?
4. What kind of services do you do?
5. In what year did you start to do it?
6.

C. ACCES TO THE INTERRELATIONSHIP

a. Relationship/connection
1. Do you know some people in the kampung/large enterprise?
2. Do you have any special service from the kampung dwellers/large enterprises?
3. Where are they (their address)?
D. PERCEPTION OF VALUE OF THE INTERRELATIONSHIP

1. How do you feel about the kampung dweller kampung?
2. How do you think about the present of the kampung and large enterprise?
3. Are there any condition that affect you?

E. FUTURE KAMPUNG PREFERENCE

1. How do you feel about existing kampung?
2. What do you think about the existing public services in this area?
3. What do you think about the existing public facilities in this area?
4. Based on this existing condition, what is your vision about the future kampung Kaliasin?
5. What is your preference for kampung Kaliasin?
6. What should it be?
7. To what extent could the kampung dweller realised your ideals?
8. What do you expect local government to do in realising your ideals?
9. What could you do in realising your ideals?
3. THE LARGE ENTERPRISES

A. 'RESOURCES' RELEVANT TO THE INTERRELATIONSHIP

a. Recent activities

1. Do you have any relation/activities related with the kampung dweller/street business surrounding this area?
2. What kind of activities did you have?
3. Do you have a full-time or part-time or any kind staff/employee who live in kampung Tunjungan?
4. In the main job, what was his/her occupation?
5. How many hours did he/she work in all jobs?
6. What are the main tasks that he/she usually performs in that occupation?
7. What was the employee home address?
8. Why do you prefer him/her?

b. Business specification

1. What is your business specification?

c. Location

1. What is the main reason you open your business in this location? / What was the most important to be here?
2. Where is your original place/ Where do you come-from?
3. Did you ever try to open this business in your original place?
4. In what year did you operate the activities?
5. How much does your company pay for this plot?
6. What is the tenure of this plot?
7. If this shop is being rented, whom is it rented from?
8. Do you give any additional living's support for your employee?
9. What kind of support do you give? (accommodation, health, transport, etc.)
B. NEED FOR THE INTERRELATIONSHIP

a. Labour
1. Did you get appropriate employees from the kampung dweller?
2. To what extent, if any, do you have confidence in working the kampung dweller to your company?

b. Services
1. Do you have kampung dweller/street business customers?
2. Where do you get most of your business supply?
3. Do you serve or provide something to the kampung dweller/street business?
4. What kind of services do you do?
5. In what year did you start to do it?

C. ACCES TO THE INTERRELATIONSHIP

a. Relationship/connection
1. Do you know some people in the kampung/street business?
2. Do you have any special service from the kampung dwellers/street enterprise?
3. Where are they (their address)?

D. PERCEPTION OF VALUE OF THE INTERRELATIONSHIP
1. How do you fell about the kampung dweller kampung?
2. What do you think about the present of the kampung and street business surround you?
3. Are there any condition that affect you?
4. Should your business expand?
5. To what extend?
6. Do you think that the development should expand to the kampung?
E. FUTURE KAMPUNG PREFERENCE

1. How do you feel about existing kampung?
2. What do you think about the existing public services in this area?
3. What do you think about the existing public facilities in this area?
4. Based on this existing condition, what is your vision about the future kampung Kaliasin?
5. What is your preference for kampung Kaliasin? What should it be?
6. To what extend could the kampung dweller realised your ideals?
7. What do you expect local government to do in realising your ideals?
8. What could you do in realising your ideals?
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PERTANYAAN SURVEY PERTAMA

TUJUAN DARI WAWANCARA

Secara umum tujuan dari wawancara ini adalah untuk dapat mengerti proses urbanisasi yang ada di Surabaya, terutama di daerah permukiman yang sangat transient, sangat beragam, dan tampak sangat penting sebagai hunian sementara bagi masyarakat yang baru memasuki kota Surabaya, atau bahkan yang berpindah dari satu daerah ke daerah bagian lain dari kota. Mereka adalah penduduk/warga (penghuni), pedagang jalanan dan pengusaha besar. Pertanyaaannya adalah sekitar kebiasaan penghuni, kondisi saat ini, perasaan mereka dan persepsi mereka satu kepada yang lain serta harapan mereka untuk kampungnya dimasa yang akan datang.


1. Sumberdaya untuk keterkaitan hubungan,
2. Kebutuhan untuk keterkaitan hubungan,
3. Jalan untuk keterkaitan hubungan,
4. Persepsi dari nilai keterkaitan, dan
5. Persepsi untuk pembangunan yang akan datang
Rancangan Wawancara:

1. **PENGHUNI**

   Alamat: 
   No. Quest: 
   RT/RW: 
   Kel/Kec: 

---

A. 'SUMBERDAYA' YANG MENDUKUNG KETERKAITAN KEMITRAAN

a. Aktifitas saat ini:

6. Apakah saudara memiliki hubungan/aktivitas yang berkaitan dengan usaha jalan/ pengusaha besar yang ada di sekitar lingkungan ini?
7. Kegiatan apa yang saudara punyai?
8. Apakah saudara mempunyai pekerjaan tetap atau pekerjaan paruh waktu?
9. Untuk pekerjaan tetap, apakah tugas/jabatan saudara?
10. Berapa jam anda bekerja pada pekerjaan utama saudara?
11. Kewajiban apa yang harus saudara lakukan pada pekerjaan saudara?
12. Dimana letak tempat kerja saudara?
13. Berapa jam saudara bekerja untuk seluruh pekerjaan yang saudara punyai (Penuh dan paruh waktu)?
14. Bagaimana saudara mencapai tempat?

b. Ketrampilan:

1. Apakah ketrampilan/ keahlian saudara?
2. Apakah saudara pernah mengikuti kursus/ training/ pendidikan khusus?

c. Pendidikan:

1. Apakah pendidikan tertinggi yang pernah saudara tempuh?
d. Rumah/ peristirahatan:

1. Apakah alas an utama saudara tinggal di kampung ini? Apa yang menyebabkan sedemikian penting tinggal di kampung ini?
2. Pada tahun berapa saudara pindah ke kampung ini?
3. Berapa banyak kamar tidur yang ada pada hunian ini?
4. Berapa banyak saudara bayar untuk keperluan rumah ini?
5. Apa status kepemilikan rumah ini?
6. Kalau ini adalah rumah sewa/kontrak an, dari siapa saudara memperolehnya?

B. KEBUTUHAN KEMITRAAN

a. Kesempatan Kerja

1. Apakah saudara aktif dalam mencari kesempatan kerja di usaha jalan/ perusahaan besar disekeliling saudara?

b. Pelayanan/ jasa

1. Apakah saudara memakai jasa pedagang/pengusaha jalanan yang ada di dalam kampung?
2. Mengapa saudara berbelanja/ memakai jasa pengusaha jalanan/ pengusaha besar di sekeliling saudara yang terakhir kali?
3. Dimana saudara mendapatkan kebutuhan sehari-hari?
4. Kemana biasanya saudara pergi pada waktu luang/ istirahat?
5. Apakah saudara melayani atau menawarkan jasa untuk pengusaha jalanan/ pengusaha besar sekitar?
6. Pelayanan apa yang saudara lakukan? Mulai tahun berapa?
C. JALAN UNTUK HUBUNGAN KEMITRAAN

a. Kemitraan
1. Apakah saudara kenal dengan pengusaha yang ada di sekitar saudara?
2. Apakah saudara mempunyai toko atau perusahaan langganan untuk usaha/jasa saudara?
3. Dimana keberadaan/ alamat mereka?

D. PERSEPSI NILAI KEMITRAAN
1. Bagaimana perasaan saudara atas pembangunan yang ada selama ini disekeliling perumahan saudara?
2. Bagaimana tanggapan saudara atas usaha yang ada disekitar saudara?
3. Apakah ada kondisi khusus yang mempengaruhi saudara?

E. KEINGINAN KAMPUNG DI MASA DATANG
1. Bagaimana perasaan saudara atas kampung saudara saat ini?
2. Apa pendapat saudara atas pelayanan jasa yang ada di kampung saudara?
3. Apa pendapat saudara tentang pelayanan umum yang ada saat ini di kampung saudara?
4. Bagaimana anda membayangkan kampung saudara dimasa yang akan dating?
5. Bagaimana gambaran saudara atas kampung ini dimasa datang?
6. Sampai seberapa jauh kampung ini akan menjadi kenyataan yang saudara inginkan?
7. Apa yang saudara harapkan dari pemerintah daerah untuk dapat mewujudkan ide saudara untuk kampung masa depan?
8. Apa yang saudara harapkan dari pengusaha sekeliling saudara untuk mewujudkan impian kampung masa depan saudara?
2. PEDAGANG JALANAN

Alamat : No. Quest:
RT/RW : Kel/Kec:

A. 'SUMBERDAYA' YANG COCOK UNTUK MEMBANGUN KEMITRAAN

a. Aktifitas saat ini:
1. Apakah saudara memiliki hubungan/aktivitas yang berkaitan dengan usaha jalanan/ pengusaha besar yang ada di sekitar lingkungan ini?
2. Kegiatan apa yang saudara punyai?
3. Apakah saudara mempunyai pekerja tetap atau pekerjaan paruh waktu dari penduduk kampung Tunjungan?
4. Untuk pekerjaan tetap, apakah tugas/jabatan nya?
5. Berapa jam mereka bekerja pada pekerjaan utama nya?
6. Kewajiban apa yang harus di lakukan pada usaha saudara?
7. Dimana tempat tinggal pekerja saudara?
8. Mengapa saudara memilih dia?

b. Ke khasan usaha
1. Apakah ke khasan usaha saudara?

c. Lokasi
1. Apa alas an utama saudara untuk membuka usaha di lokasi ini? / Apa yang membuat saudara merasa penting untuk membuka usa ditempat ini?
2. Mulai kapan saudara membuka usaha?
3. Berapa banyak perusahaan saudara membeli lokasi ini?
4. Apa status kepemilikan usaha ini?
5. Kalau tempat ini menyewa/kontrak dari siapa saudara mendapatkannya?
6. Apakah saudara memberi tambahan kebutuhan hidup untuk pegawai saudara?
7. Tambahan apa yang saudara berikan (perumahan/pemondokan, kesehatan, transportasi, dsb)

B. KEBUTUHAN KEMITRAAN

a. Tenaga Kerja
8. Apakah saudara mendapatkan pegawai yang cocok dari penduduk kampung?
9. Sampai seberapa jauh, kalau ada, saudara percaya dapat bekerjasama dengan penduduk kampung (sebagai rekanan kerja)?

b. Pelayanan
10. Apakah saudara mempunyai pelanggan dari penduduk kampung atau perusahaan besar sekeliling saudara?
11. Darimana saudara mendapatkan pasokan untuk usaha saudara?
12. Apakah saudara memberikan jasa atau apapun kepada penduduk kampung atau perusahaan besar sekeliling saudara?
13. Pelayanan jasa apa yang saudara berikan?
14. Pada tahun berapa usaha saudara dibuka?
C. JALAN KEMITRAAN

a. Koneksi Kemitraan

15. Apakah saudara kenal dengan penduduk kampung atau perusahaan besar sekeliling saudara?
16. Apakah saudara menawarkan jasa khusus untuk penduduk kampung atau perusahaan besar sekeliling saudara?
17. Dimana pelanggan saudara?

D. PERSEPSI NILAI KEMITRAAN

18. Bagaimana tanggapan saudara terhadap penduduk kampung?
19. Apa pendapat saudara tentang penduduk kampung atau perusahaan besar sekeliling saudara?
20. Adakah pengaruh khusus yang berdampak terhadap saudara?

E. HARAPAN KAMPUNG MASA DEPAN

21. Bagaimana perasaan saudara terhadap keberadaan kampung saat ini?
22. Bagaimana perasaan saudara atas kampung saudara saat ini?
23. Apa pendapat saudara atas pelayanan jasa yang ada di kampung saudara?
24. Berdasar kondisi saat ini, apa harapan saudara untuk kampung di masa yang akan datang?
25. Apa pendapat saudara tentang pelayanan umum yang ada saat ini di kampung saudara?
26. Bagaimana gambaran saudara atas kampung ini dimasa datang? Harus bagaimana?
27. Sampai seberapa jauh kampung ini akan menjadi kenyataan yang saudara inginkan?
28. Apa yang saudara harapkan dari pemerintah daerah untuk dapat mewujutkan ide saudara untuk kampung masa depan?

29. Apa yang saudara sumbangkan untuk mewujutkan impian kampung masa depan saudara?
3. PENGUSAHA BESAR

Alamat : No. Quest:
RT/RW : Kel/Kec:

A. 'SUMBERDAYA' YANG COCOK UNTUK MEMBANGUN KEMITRAAN

a. Aktifitas saat ini:
1. Apakah saudara memiliki hubungan/aktivitas yang berkaitan dengan usaha jalan/ penduduk kampung yang ada di sekitar lingkungan ini?
2. Kegiatan apa yang saudara punyai?
3. Apakah saudara mempunyai pekerja tetap atau pekerjaan paruh waktu dari penduduk kampung Tunjungan?
4. Untuk pekerjaan tetap, apakah tugas/jabatan nya?
5. Berapa jam mereka bekerja pada pekerjaan utama nya?
6. Kewajiban apa yang harus di lakukan pada usaha saudara?
7. Dimana tempat tinggal pekerja saudara?
8. Mengapa saudara memilih dia?

b. Ke khasan usaha
1. Apakah ke khasan usaha saudara?

c. Lokasi
1. Apa alas an utama saudara untuk membuka usaha di lokasi ini? / Apa yang membuat saudara merasa penting untuk membuka usa ditempat ini?
2. Darimana asal usaha saudara? (Dimana induk perusahaan?)
3. Apakah saudara pernah mempunyai usaha seperti ini di tempat asal saudara?
4. Mulai kapan saudara membuka usaha?
5. Berapa banyak perusahaan saudara membeli lokasi ini?
6. Apa status kepemilikan usaha ini?
7. Kalau tempat ini menyewa/kontrak dari siapa saudara mendapatkannya?
8. Apakah saudara memberi tambahan kebutuhan hidup untuk pegawai saudara?
9. Tambahan apa yang saudara berikan (perumahan/pemondokan, kesehatan, transportasi, dsb)

B. KEBUTUHAN KEMITRAAN

a. Tenaga Kerja
1. Apakah saudara mendapatkan pegawai yang cocok dari penduduk kampung?
2. Sampai seberapa jauh, kalau ada, saudara percaya dapat bekerjasama dengan penduduk kampung (sebagai rekanan kerja)?

b. Pelayanan
1. Apakah saudara mempunyai pelanggan dari penduduk kampung atau perusahaan besar sekeliling saudara?
2. Darimana saudara mendapatkan pasokan untuk usaha saudara?
3. Apakah saudara memberikan jasa atau apapun kepada penduduk kampung atau usaha jalanan sekeliling saudara?
4. Pelayanan jasa apa yang saudara berikan?
5. Pada tahun berapa usaha saudara dibuka?
C. JALAN KEMITRAAN

a. Koneksi Kemitraan
1. Apakah saudara kenal dengan penduduk kampung atau perusahaan jalanan sekeliling saudara?
2. Apakah saudara menawarkan jasa khusus untuk penduduk kampung atau perusahaan jalanan sekeliling saudara?
3. Dimana pelanggan saudara?

D. PERSEPSI NILAI KEMITRAAN
1. Bagaimana tanggapan saudara terhadap penduduk kampung?
2. Apa pendapat saudara tentang penduduk kampung atau perusahaan jalanan sekeliling saudara?
3. Adakah pengaruh khusus yang berdampak terhadap saudara?
4. Apakah perusahaan saudara ingin dikembangkan lebih jauh?
5. Dalam hal apa?
6. Apakah saudara berkeinginan untuk mengembangkan usaha saudara ke dalam kampung?

E. HARAPAN KAMPUNG MASA DEPAN
1. Bagaimana perasaan saudara terhadap keberadaan kampung saat ini?
2. Apa pendapat saudara atas pelayanan jasa yang ada di kampung saudara?
3. Apa pendapat saudara tentang pelayanan umum yang ada saat ini di kampung saudara?
4. Berdasar kondisi saat ini, apa harapan saudara untuk kampung di masa yang akan datang?
5. Bagaimana keinginan saudara atas kampung ini dimasa datang? Harus bagaimana?
6. Sampai seberapa jauh penduduk kampung ini dapat merealisasikan kenyataan yang saudara inginkan?

7. Apa yang saudara harapkan dari pemerintah daerah untuk mewujutkan impian saudara akan kampung tersebut?

8. Apa yang saudara dapat lakukan untuk mewujutkan impian tersebut?
These tables outline the main issues for exploring questions in detailed interviews, in order to understand the present patterns of activities and economic relations, and to explore the current work patterns in the area. The interlinkages among the inhabitants: the residents (with and without economic activities in their house/HBE activities), street businesses and larger enterprises.

Since this research is interested in facilitating a “modernisation” of the kampung that does not necessitate a destruction of the sustainable, self-help aspects of its economy, the interviewers should encourage people to discuss the above issues in an integrated way (eg how does their work history interweave with their housing and kampung history?) It is structured in a roughly chronological sequence: it is often useful to start by encouraging people to relate their stories of the past: where and how they lived and worked, moving towards the present situation (which is the main focus) and finally discussing future aspirations and plans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Small businesses</th>
<th>Big enterprise</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Housing and work histories</td>
<td>Residential history:</td>
<td>Residential history:</td>
<td>Residential history:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic/work history:</td>
<td>Economic/work history:</td>
<td>Economic/work history:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Location of work/s</td>
<td>a. Previous work/employment(s)</td>
<td>a. Previous work/employment(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Former HBEs: how successful?, why started and stopped?</td>
<td>c. Opportunities for HBE activities in the former location(s)?</td>
<td>d. Former business activities: how successful?, why started and stopped?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix – 3a**

### 2) Relocation and/or Moving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement to present dwelling, settlement or city</th>
<th>Movement for economic reasons?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. How did they find current dwelling? Family contacts; same religion / origin, etc.</td>
<td>a. Choice of new location? (Influenced by work?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Reasons for choice of new dwelling living?</td>
<td>c. Impact of relocation on buss' activity. (Did move result in changed buss' activity - why? If not discuss the differences between the way the buss' operates now and in the previous loc. New opportunities? New constraints? New work and workpatterns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Movement for economic reasons?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement for economic reasons?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. How did they find current location?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Reasons for choice of new location?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Impact of relocation on HBE. (Did move result in changed HBE activity - why? If not discuss the differences between the way the HBE operates now and in the previous dwelling. New opportunities? New constraints? New work and workpatterns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Movement for economic reasons?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement for economic reasons?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Choice of new location?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Impact of relocation on HBE. (Did move result in changed HBE activity - why? If not discuss the differences between the way the HBE operates now and in the previous dwelling. New opportunities? New constraints? New work and workpatterns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Motivation(s) for moving and its impact on economic activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation(s) for moving and its impact on economic activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. What motivates people to relocate place of residence/business activities and to stop and start again?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Linkage between changing place and economic activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. How does relocation (to new house, neighbourhood or city) influence the management of business/economic activities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Check questionnaire for information about relevant moves. Not all respondents are migrants, so edit accordingly].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3). Choice of business activities (related to the area)</th>
<th>Housing options / alternatives consid.</th>
<th>HBE options or alternatives?</th>
<th>Business options or alternatives?</th>
<th>Choosing to start particular types of business activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. How important was the opportunity to establish/continue HBE in selection of dwelling?</td>
<td>a. Are specific activities restricted to certain groups? Religion, gender, ethnic, etc?</td>
<td>a. How important was the opportunity to establish/continue business activities in selection area?</td>
<td>b. Necessary to make changes to the building accommodate activities?</td>
<td>c. Best and worst type of activities in your neighbourhood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantages and problems of having HBE within the home:</td>
<td>Advantages of HBE</td>
<td>Advantages of buss activity compared to:</td>
<td>Comparing business activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are some HBE activities more compatible with domestic activities than others?</td>
<td>What are the advantages to you of having your business linked to your home? What advantages compare to:</td>
<td>- HBE</td>
<td>- Asking about specific examples, i.e., their HBE in comparison to previous non-HBE work they or a relative has (or had).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- formal sector work outside home (e.g., street vendor)</td>
<td>- informal sector work outside home (e.g., street vendor)</td>
<td>- Formal/informal sector work</td>
<td>- Questioning about disadvantages or advantages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- same business in formal sector outside home.</td>
<td>- formal sector work (e.g., factory)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Discussing about status/rule (Legal issues - tax, local authority officials)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5) Linkages and Networks

#### Social Networks
- **a.** Relationship: kinship networks, religion/origin, friendships, membership: voluntary groups
- **b.** How important are social networks for their families?

#### Economic Networks:
- **a.** Where do they shop or get services?
- **b.** Did you learn about new opportunities when you came to this area?
- **c.** How are new skills acquired?
- **d.** How much collaboration and support do people get from kin, friends, neighbours in setting up economic activities?

#### Social Networks
- **a.** Relationship: kinship networks, religion/origin, friendships, membership: voluntary groups
- **b.** How important are social networks for the establishment and success of HBEs?

#### Economic Networks:
- **a.** Networks of suppliers, purchasers, sellers, distributors
- **b.** Identity of customers and suppliers (gender, ethnicity)
- **c.** Contacts: Labour (linked to kinship?) Information (opportunities)
- **d.** How do they learn about new opportunities?
- **e.** How are new skills acquired?
- **f.** How much collaboration and support do people get from kin, friends, neighbours in setting up new HBE activities?

#### Economic Networks:
- **a.** Networks of suppliers, purchasers, sellers, distributors
- **b.** Identity of customers and suppliers (gender, ethnicity)
- **c.** Contacts: Labour (linked to kinship?) Information (opportunities)
- **d.** How do they learn about new opportunities?
- **e.** How are new skills acquired?
- **f.** How much collaboration and support do people get from kin, friends, neighbours in setting up the chosen economic activities?

#### Interrelation between social networks and economic networks
- Nature of relationship with customers and suppliers: how are they found? Why use some suppliers and not others? Why do customers choose one certain type of economic activities and not another? [eg HBE, small shops: why some more successful than others?]
- Any attempts made to attract customers?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6) Success of HBE or other economic activities strategy?</th>
<th>a. How would you describe the success of your business?</th>
<th>a. How would you describe the success of your business?</th>
<th>a. How would you describe the success of your business?</th>
<th>How is success measured? Why are some HBEs perceived to succeed or fail?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. What has been the effect on you of the economic downturn?</td>
<td>b. What has been the effect on you of the economic downturn?</td>
<td>b. What has been the effect on you of the economic downturn?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Has it been possible to improve living conditions with the income from the HBE?</td>
<td>c. HBE central for survival or secondary income? Possible to save?</td>
<td>c. Is this economic activities central for survival or secondary income? Possible to save?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Constraints and Opportunities</td>
<td>Improving housing conditions</td>
<td>Improving housing conditions</td>
<td>Interested in making changes and improvements to HBE</td>
<td>Interested in making changes and improvements to the existing business activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Plans to improve or change the dwelling</td>
<td>a. Plans to improve or change the dwelling</td>
<td>a. What changes considered?</td>
<td>a. What changes considered?</td>
<td>a. What changes considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Constraints on improvement? - size and location of space available? - availability of infrastructure?</td>
<td>c. Does the size/condition/location of the dwelling limit the potential for HBE activity? (increased productivity?)</td>
<td>c. Constraints on improvement;</td>
<td>c. Constraints on improvement;</td>
<td>c. Preference for enlarging the existing plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Preference for separation of HBE activity from dwelling?</td>
<td>d. Preference for multiple smaller HBEs or one larger one?</td>
<td>d. Preference for multiple smaller HBEs or one larger one?</td>
<td>d. Preference for multiple smaller HBEs or one larger one?</td>
<td>d. Advantages/disadvantages of moving into separate business premises?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Advantages/disadvantages of moving into separate business premises?</td>
<td>e. Advantages/disadvantages of moving into separate business premises?</td>
<td>e. Preference for multiple smaller or one larger?</td>
<td>e. Preference for multiple smaller or one larger?</td>
<td>e. Conflicts between other business activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflicts between different HBEs within same household, or neighbouring households?</td>
<td>f. Conflicts between different HBEs within same household, or neighbouring households?</td>
<td>f. Conflicts between different HBEs within same household, or neighbouring households?</td>
<td>f. Conflicts between different HBEs within same household, or neighbouring households?</td>
<td>f. Conflicts between different HBEs within same household, or neighbouring households?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interested in making changes and improvements to the existing business activities

a. What changes considered?
b. Constraints on improvement;
- size and location of space available?
- availability of infrastructure?
- availability of credit?
c. Preference for enlarging the existing plan?
d. Advantages/disadvantages of moving into separate business premises?
e. Conflicts between other business activities?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8) Future Intentions</th>
<th>Intend to remain in the same location? Return to village (in old age)? Aspirations for children</th>
<th>Intend to remain in same location? Return to village (old age)? Aspirations for children</th>
<th>Continue same HBE or any intention to change? Alternatives considered: seek employment?</th>
<th>Continue same business activities or any intention to change?</th>
<th>Continue same business activities or any intention to change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9) Socio-economic conditions and HBEs</td>
<td>How do large scale changes in society affect the family? - increased joblessness family - loss of traditional life style and values - education - more past time - loss of extended family - economic downturn - more democracy - expansion of business into the area</td>
<td>Return of relatives (migrant workers) changing household size and changing income.</td>
<td>How do large scale changes in society affect HBEs? ( increased competition from new HBEs created by those who lost formal sector jobs; competition from formal sector, e.g. plaza)</td>
<td>How do large scale changes in society affect your activity? ( increased competition from new informal/HBEs created by those who lost formal sector jobs, or from the plaza, etc)</td>
<td>How do large scale changes in society affect your business?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental and future concerns

Regarding health, nuisance, dangers, satisfaction, etc.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a.</strong> What do they think about the existing neighbourhood?</td>
<td><strong>a.</strong> Does the domestic location of the HBE inhibit the working of the HBE?</td>
<td><strong>a.</strong> What do they think about the existing neighbourhood?</td>
<td><strong>a.</strong> What do they think about the existing neighbourhood?</td>
<td><strong>a.</strong> Does the domestic location of the HBE inhibit the working of the HBE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b.</strong> What do they believe about their neighbourhood's future?</td>
<td><strong>b.</strong> What do they believe about their neighbourhood's future?</td>
<td><strong>b.</strong> What do they believe about their neighbourhood's future?</td>
<td><strong>b.</strong> What do they believe about their neighbourhood's future?</td>
<td><strong>b.</strong> What do they believe about their neighbourhood's future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c.</strong> What would they do for the future of their neighbourhood</td>
<td><strong>c.</strong> What would they do for the future of their neighbourhood</td>
<td><strong>c.</strong> What would they do for the future of their neighbourhood</td>
<td><strong>c.</strong> What would they do for the future of their neighbourhood</td>
<td><strong>c.</strong> What would they do for the future of their neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d.</strong> What would they like to see changed?</td>
<td><strong>d.</strong> What would they like to see changed?</td>
<td><strong>d.</strong> What would they like to see changed?</td>
<td><strong>d.</strong> What would they like to see changed?</td>
<td><strong>d.</strong> What would they like to see changed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e.</strong> What would they think about expansion of 'larger business' in the area (e.g. more hotels, plaza expansion, etc)</td>
<td><strong>e.</strong> What would they think about expansion of 'larger business' in the area (e.g. more hotels, plaza expansion, etc)</td>
<td><strong>e.</strong> What would they think about expansion of 'larger business' in the area (e.g. more hotels, plaza expansion, etc)</td>
<td><strong>e.</strong> What would they think about expansion of 'larger business' in the area (e.g. more hotels, plaza expansion, etc)</td>
<td><strong>e.</strong> What would they think about expansion of 'larger business' in the area (e.g. more hotels, plaza expansion, etc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Awareness of the neighbourhood environment**

Are there any mechanisms within the community to control negative impacts? Noise, dust, fumes, water pollution, rubbish created by HBE or other economic activities. Dangers to children? (machinery, tools, vehicles, chemicals etc)
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