

Jurnal Teknik Sipil & Perencanaan 19 (2) (2017) 97-105

JURNAL TEKNIK SIPIL & PERENCANAAN



http://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/index.php/jtsp/index

Socio-Economic Transformation of The Local Community as Gentrification's Implication in DKI Jakarta Province

[⊠] Santy Paulla Dewi

Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Faculty of Engineering, University of Diponegoro

Kata Kunci/ Keywords:

gentrification, kampong neighbourhood, Betawi people, newcomers

gentrifikasi, perubahan lingkungan, masyarakat Betawi, pendatang

Abstract/ Abstrak:

Jakarta has a rapid development which attracts newcomers to come and live in. Hereinafter, the newcomers look for the house which in accordance to their income and preferences. They chose inner city kampong for residing and their existence displacing the Betawi people as the local community. The newcomers' presence led displacement and transformed the neighbourhood. Likewise, they had also influenced in the socio-economic transformation related with education, women worker, community relationship, and lifestyle.

Jakarta melaksanakan pembangunan yang sangat signifikan sehingga menarik pendatang untuk bekerja dan tinggal di propinsi ini. Selanjutnya, para pendatang ini membeli rumah yang disesuaikan dengan kemampuan ekonomi dan preferensinya. Mereka memilih tinggal di kampung kota yang berlokasi di pusat kota di mana keberadaan mereka pada akhirnya menggantikan masyarakat lokal. Kehadiran mereka juga mengubah tata lingkungan sekitar. Selain itu, mereka juga memberikan pengaruh pada perubahan social ekonomi yang ditinjau dari sisi pendidikan, pekerja perempuan, hubungan social masyarakat, dan gaya hidup.

Sitasi:

Dewi, Santy Paulla (2017). Socio-economic transformation of the local community as gentrification's implication in DKI Jakarta Province. *Jurnal Teknik Sipil & Perencanaan*, 19(2), 97-105.

© 2017 Universitas Negeri Semarang

[⊠] Santy Paulla Dewi:

Department of Urban and Regional Planning University of Diponegoro, Kota Semarang

E-mail: santy_paulla@yahoo.com

p-ISSN 1411-1772 e-ISSN 2503-1899

INTRODUCTION

Sopiyah is one of the Betawi women who was born in Jakarta, 59 years ago. As a daughter of a landlord who occupied vast land and had many houses, she lived with her parents and her eight siblings in a big house at kampong Kramat Asem. Sopivah's family lived in this kampong since her were born (before Indonesian Independence Day - 1945). Before her parents passed away (in 1981), they had already given all of the properties for their children; one house or a parcel of land for each child. All of Sopiyah's siblings were married to a person from another tribe, including her. As time goes by, since 1980s one by one of her siblings sold the house or the land and moved out to another kampong in Jakarta peripheral region.

Likewise, one by one of her neighbours moved out. They needed money to feed the family; so they sold the house to the newcomers. These Betawi neighbours were mostly less educated, worked in the informal sector, and paid under minimum wage standard. Since 2000, every year she had a new neighbour who originally came from another city and different tribe. She saw her new neighbours demolished the previous house and built the more modern and luxurious house than before, new luxurious tenements, and new shops. Moreover, a new taxi office and a private institution office were built on the road side of the kampong main entrance. This kampong is located in the inner city in East Jakarta. It has a good accessibility which connected by a good public transportation. Therefore, many newcomers chose to stay in the kampong and the kampong is included as the populous district in the most populous administrative region in DKI Jakarta Province, the population density was reached 34,4 person/km2 in 2013 (jakartadata.go.id).

The physical appearance of the kampong transformed to be better, such as tenements house which impressed slum changed into a modern house and some infrastructure improvements. Land price surge significantly from 150 thousand rupiahs per m2 in 1989 to 12,5-16,8 million rupiahs per m2 in 2016 (www.peluangproperti.com). This price was the highest amount among others sub-districts in Matraman districts. This transformation indicated gentrification occurred in the kampong. Moreover, it also can be seen from the displacement of the local community. The number of Betawi people in the kampong decrease significantly from 90% to 10 % in 3 decades (jakarta.bps.go.id, 2013). Moreover, the increasing of land price and property values indicates gentrification then leads the surge of taxes and standard of living. The government views this situation as a positive implication of the gentrification because it generates area growth That beneficial for the inhabitants. In contrast, it does not consider gentrification effect to the local community members who would be displaced. They lose their opportunity to live in proper place; their mobility becomes limited because of affordability reasons. These people are the most vulnerable in the gentrification process.

Therefore, this paper aims to figure out the transformation of socio-economic of the local community in gentrifying area. The transformation observed was the kampong and community characteristics before and after multidimensional crisis in 1998. The crisis was influenced the community significantly and became the baseline of the middle-income class existence (bubble middle-income class in Indonesia). Some aspects analysed were community's income, educational level, job, and community's relationship. Research conducted by Skaburskis (2012) showed that gentrification effect to the community can differ with respect to gender and level of income. Women and people with low income tend to be displaced from the beginning in gentrification process. This research not only used direct observation but also used an in-depth interview to gain data which further, invited Sopiyah as the key person in the interview. Hereinafter, the head of sub-district Utan Kavu, the head of RT. Betawi people (first, second.) and third generation), and the newcomers were interviewed. The consequences gentrification for each community are dissimilar. It is influenced by gender, income, race, job and income, age and their position in the community (relationship). Socio-economic transformation can be used to identify the challenges and the potential issue which generate by gentrification. This is important to be handled by the government to minimize the segregation which usually followed by the gentrification.

GENTRIFICATION'S DEFINITION, CAUSES, AND IMPLICATIONS

The term of gentrification started to use to refer the displacement of the working class replaced by middle-class (Glass, 1964). Yet, the definition of gentrification mutated in many perspectives. Gentrification can be seen as neighbourhood revitalization (Williams, 1984), capital reinvestment of inner city to generate space which more affluent for better class than the previous class (Smith, 2005). Gentrification usually occurred in an area which inhabited by the working-class. After they displaced, the area was inhabited by another class: which had dissimilar middle-income class; characteristics in educational level, job, income, lifestyle, and the housing preference. The previous class cannot afford to stay in the revitalizing area with rising rents and property taxes, and then they displaced (Atkinson, 2003). In this research, gentrification is defined as influx capital process in the inner city and transformed the neighbourhood (Atkinson, 2003). Displacement of the long-term resident is seen as the consequence of gentrification.

There were two factors which cause gentrification. First, the government or private developers' intervention of some areas in housing provision and changes the neighbourhood condition. Physically, this development changed the neighbourhood appearance in a better way. Moreover, this development attracts newcomers to reside. Their existence starts to give some pressures to the local community; shifts the social structure. lifestyle, and economic, displacement. This cause is called supply side factor of gentrification (Brown-Saracino, 2010). The second factor is demand side which emphasize on the housing demand. Urban development in an inner city creates many new professional and creative jobs. Unfortunately, the local community who stayed in the inner city was unskilled and uneducated. Therefore, it attracted newcomers to come for working and living.

It is debatable over the gentrification implication. In one side, gentrification is seen as a dirty word that gives negative implication such as displacement of the local community, the loss of the right to reside in a proper place, and socioeconomic segregation (Atkinson, 2003). When somebody displaced from his previous place, it was mean that he did not only lose his house, but also his occupation and his opportunity to enhance his quality of life. Moreover, the emergence of the new neighbours, new shops, new lifestyle, new facilities, and new transportation pattern changed the neighbourhood and became pressure displacement for the local community. This displacement led several problems such as land conversion, housing demand, transportation, and infrastructures provision. Marcuse (1988: 155) said urban development and economic transformation made the local community "give up" to the situation and lost their houses. They did not compensation from anv the urban transformation. It is called abandonment. On the other side, the positive implication of gentrification can be determined by the increasing quality of life, the risina of land and property (Chaskin&Joshep, 2013). Transformation of the neighbourhood is seen from the proper facilities and infrastructures, orderly home development, and increasing of the community income. All of these positive implications of gentrification are perceived by the newcomers and made them wanted to buy the second or third house as an investment. The local community who stay has also experienced the better transformation.

BETAWI COMMUNITY: ROOTS AND THE CHARACTERISTICS

The name of Betawi was taken from Batavia which given by the Netherland when in colonization period (www.iakarta.go.id). Yet, when Japanese invaded Indonesia (1942-1945), Batavia name changed into Jakarta (www.jakarta.go.id). Betawi people are divided into two economic strata related to their properties; rich people (Betawi gedong) and poor people (Betawi kampong). In kampong Kramat Asem, Betawi community has resided since their grandparents. This people are categorized as the first generation of Betawi people; Betawi people who were born before 1945. While first generation's children who were born in 1945-1970s are called as the second generation, grandchildren of the first generation who was born in 1980-2000s were categorized as the third generation.

First generation

The first generation of Betawi gedong and Betawi kampong have similar characteristics. Both Betawi gedong and Betawi kampong live in one house with all of their big family (extended family). Therefore, it is a common situation which a house occupied by more than 7 persons. It is not a big problem for Betawi gedong who have a big house (more than 100 m2), yet for Betawi kampong, they are willing to stay in a narrow house (less than 80 m2). They feel comfort and peaceful when all of the family member physically close with them. Related to the assets, Betawi gedong gives all of the properties to their children, they divide equally for each person. While Betawi kampong who only has one house for all of the family asks their children to live together in the house.

Regarding to education, both Betawi gedong and Betawi kampong have similar perspective. They consider that education is not an important thing, especially for women. In line with the women, the most important thing for men is how they can generate money as much as possible, and he does not need any certain skills. For women, go to school is a secondary task, while their primary task is learning how to cook, how to clean the house, and other household chores. Most of them are graduated from elementary school level, whereas some of them are elementary school dropout.

In culture preservation, the first generation of Betawi people is still holding their tradition. Ondelondel and tanjidor as the traditional performances of Betawi have often been seen in some community activities, wedding ceremony, and sunatan (circumcision) ceremony. These performances are considered as an entertainment which is always

waited by the people. Likewise, the lenong (Betawi traditional theatrical performance) and palang pintu (a tradition before wedding ceremony started) are often held.

Betawi family submit Islam religious spiritual values as their guidance, and all of the family must obev the (iakartapedia.bpadiakarta.net). For kinship system. they follow the parental system or bilineal system (lineage paternal or maternal), and hold a strong family kinship. Men must work to feed the family, included feed their parents when they get old. In matrimonial culture, it is possible for Betawi men to marry with women who still included as their relatives. Therefore, almost all of the first generation married with another Betawi people. Most of these people were married in young age (around 17 years old). Furthermore, in the community, they also have a strong bonding (gemeinschaft). Whenever their kampong faced some problems, they will discuss the solution in a community meeting. In kampong bureaucracy, the young person who is mandated as community leader will be not visited by the old people (they adopt seniority system). This young person must come to the old people to discuss some issues, even he is the community leader.

Second generation

In the 1970s, Jakarta experienced significant developments which there were many road expansions in the inner city, new skyscrapers, new offices, and malls (jakartapedia.bpadjakarta.net). This rapid development influenced by the Indonesia condition which generated high income. In this year, world crude oil prices were rose significantly. As a result, Indonesia as one of the oil exporting countries gained high income. Most of these developments occurred in the inner city where Betawi people lived in some kampongs. As a consequence, many Betawi people were displaced and newcomers started to come to Jakarta. Similarly, kampong Kramat Asem faced the same situation where there was a highway construction (flyover) which over the kampong. Then, many newcomers who were the middle-income class came.

As a middle-income class, they have a high educational level (at least they hold a bachelor degree), work as civil servants and other formal jobs. Having higher educational level than the Betawi people makes the newcomers are mandated as the community leader (head of Rukun Tetangga , head of the mosque committee). They have a good relationship with Betawi people as the local community in the kampong. Moreover, they often contribute in some Betawi traditional activities. They realize as a newcomer they must adapt to the local values which exist to avoid the social

segregation. The Betawi people accept the newcomers as a part of the community.

The presence of the newcomers influences the marriage pattern of the Betawi people. Some of the second generation of the Betawi gedong marry with the newcomers (intermarrying), while the second generation of the Betawi kampong keep their tradition to marry with another Betawi people. Young-age married couple was still found both in Betawi kampong and Betawi gedong. The second generation who marries with the newcomers has a different preference of living. They reside in another kampong in the peripheral area, it has a good public transport connection and no flood. Moreover, they can occupy a broader house in their new place (more than 100 m2). Dissimilar situation found in the Betawi kampong second generation, who stand to stay in the kampong.

Third generation

A number of newcomers increased every year in kampong Kramat Asem. In Asem Gede II Street, many blocks are occupied by the newcomers. Their presence influences the Betawi people such as in term of awareness of the important of education. Moreover, in 1998-2000s, the economic situation in Indonesia was multidimensional (jakartapedia.bpadjakarta.net). As a result, the number of poverty increased and the number of unemployment increased significantly. Looking for a job was very difficult especially for people who had less skill and less educated. Therefore, having a good education and enhance skills capability considered as the best way to get a job. Some of the third generation took the university, whereas most of them took vocational schools to have a certain ability and

The presence of the newcomers in the neighbourhood makes the third generation more open mind; they learn about the differences and diversity. It is also influenced by the increasing of internet usage and easy access of the social media. Opportunity to get an education for women is now widely open, although they still require taking care of household chores. They are more confident to speak up, to express their ideas and opinions. and to take the newcomers as their partner in the community. In this period, the community leader (head of RT) shifted from the newcomers into the third generation of Betawi people. Yet, they still respect the newcomers which show by asking their idea and contribution for some venues in the kampong.

Betawi people mind set progress is not matched by the increasing of cultural

preservation awareness. The third generation prefers to have a modern and simple lifestyle than traditional style. On the other hand, the young-age married couple is still found in the third generation of Betawi kampong. While in the third generation of Betawi gedong, the number of a young married couple is declining. They concern on their education in the university. They prefer to marry after they establish in their career.

GENTRIFICATION PROCESS AND ITS IMPLICATION

Gentrification in kampong Kramat Asem occurs in gradual process which started since the 1970s which signed by displacement of the local community. Firstly, displacement started occurred in kampong Kramat Asem in the 1970s when the newcomers bought the Betawi people house in Asem Gede I street. They bought the house with priced 150 thousand rupiahs per m2 (compared to the land price in the inner city area that reached 600 thousand rupiahs per m2). After they bought the Betawi house, they renovated it that adapted with their needs; member of the family, preference of kitchen, etc. They used their own money to renovate the house because there was no government support for housing government improvement. The existina assistance was on the down payment subsidy and loans with soft interest for a new house purchase, whereas assistance for old house improvement was not programmed.

Along Asem Gede 1 street there is many second generation Betawi kampong houses which located in dense and narrow alley. Therefore, it is difficult to sell the house. Moreover, if they sell the house and then divided the money equally to the family, they could not afford to buy another house, because the house selling price would be very low. It would be terrible if they sold their house and their money did not enough to buy another house, then they lived in the tenements. They must pay the rent every month excluded the electricity and water bills. Therefore, a number sold houses are located in the main kampong street. Then the trend of displacement shifted into Asem Gede II Street.

Previously, Asem Gede II Street is mostly occupied by Betawi gedong people. Each plot of the house was bigger than plot house in Asem Gede 1 Street. The newcomers who bought Betawi gedong house were professional and creative worker such as a lawyer, a manager, and businessman. Their income was higher than the newcomers who stay in the

Asem Gede 1 Street who mostly work as civil servants. After they bought the Betawi house, they directly demolished and rebuilt it. This newcomer had also used their own money to buy and to rebuild the house.

Housing renovation conducted by the newcomers changed the kampong appearance. It can be seen from the housing plots, it looks more orderly than before. drainage infrastructure is connected properly, and bins were neatly arranged. As a result, the flood which occurs every year was handled; only temporary puddle in certain places (dense alleys). Better neighbourhood transformation can be seen clearly in Asem Gede 2 Street, whereas changed of kampong sightings in Asem Gede 1 is found the main kampong street only. The narrow and dense alleys are still faced flood every year because there is no clear drainage channel; stuffy due to lack of light; flooded and damaged street. This kampong does not get waste and water network infrastructures since the first generation. The community use artesian wells to fulfil water needs, while for the waste network they ask the private institution to handle it and they pay it monthly dues.

In the 2000s, there was some assistance for kampong improvement from the government and a political party. The government assisted in drainage network improvement, particularly in Asem Gede 1 Street to reduce the water puddles. Assistance from a political party was given when the presidential election in 2009, they improved the kampong main streets, renovated the mosque, renovated community halls which can be used as a kindergarten, and some trash. These assistances had also changed the kampong appearance to be better than before.

Displacement of the local community in this kampong was dissimilar with the massive displacement which occurred in the inner city. Whereas displacement in the inner city addressed for the government development program. displacement in this kampong included as voluntary displacement (Brown-Saracino, 2010). Betawi people sell their house because of their own desire: they need money. they need a broader house, they prefer closed to the workplace. Some of the second generation of Betawi kampong who stay are revealed that they did hard effort to survive in the kampong. Yet, if the condition made them have to sell the house, they would sell it to the newcomers.

Influx capital process caused gentrification in kampong Kramat Asem can be

seen from two perspectives; internal and external. Internal perspective sees the newcomers who renovate the house and contribute to the kampong improvement have a dominant role in the physical neighbourhood transformation. This internal perspective means that the gentrification triggered by the actor who directly connected to the gentrification itself and has a significant role.

The role of the other actors in the gentrification in kampong Kramat Asem began to see in the 2000s. In 2004, the government of DKI Province the Jakarta launched TransJakarta (bus rapid transit) which intended to increase the accessibility from Jakarta peripheral region to the inner city and vice (transjakarta.co.id). Although versa infrastructure is reserved to enhance the Jakarta community mobility in general, it gives great influence to the kampong which directly connected to this infrastructure. Likewise, the government has also given the assistance in kampong drainage improvement. Although it does not cover all of the drainages in the kampong, but in fact, it increases the kampong quality of life. Another assistance was given by the political party in 2009 when the presidential election took place, they improved some public facilities. As external actors, both government and the political party had a minor role in the gentrification. This is called as external perspective.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATION

It has been discussed previously that one of gentrification implication is socio-economic transformation. In general, Betawi people and its culture start to extinct. It is caused by the displacement of Betawi people from their previous place and move into Jakarta peripheral area. In kampong Kramat Asem, Betawi gedong tend to be dominant in selling their house. Since they have many options for living; they can live in the heritage house or sell it and buy another one. These people claimed that living in their new place is better than the previous kampong. Not only they have a broader house and close to the workplace, but also they can develop themselves. Hence, they do not have any desire to live back in the previous kampong with all of the family. While for Betawi kampong, there is no option for them beside stay and try to survive in the kampong. Selling the house and moving to another kampong are the last option for them. Or, they will move from the kampong if the government displaced them for infrastructure development. In term of displacement program from the government, they will get higher compensation than the present sale price. Although the land price of the kampong rises significantly, their house is still less commercial; no legal land certificate and located in a narrow alley. The kampong improvement is only increased their quality of life, but not the house selling price.

Related to housing renovation, there are no significant improvements done by the Betawi people. They will renovate the house only if they have a new family member, or other reasons, such as need a stall for selling items and the house itself need renovation. The renovation has only added some partitions in some rooms. Taking a loan from the bank for housing improvement was not easy for Betawi people, because to get the loan, someone must have monthly income and legal land certificate as the guarantee, or officially business license. Moreover, they do not have the legal land no certificate and business licenses. Financially, their affordability to renovate the house is low, because more than 70% of their income is used to fulfil the daily needs.

Betawi kampong people who are displaced from the kampong prefer to stay back in the kampong. It is difficult for them to look for a new job in the new place without skills and no any relatives. Some of these displaced people choose to work in their previous job as the newcomers' driver, housemaid, or employee of some companies which resided around the kampong. If it is possible, they also want to live back in Kramat Asem. Yet, they have to pay for a rent house or tenement if they want to stay in the kampong. As a consequent, they choose to stay in the new kampong and they go for work in the morning by using public transport (a regional train which connected Jakarta and its peripheral areas), and go home at night.

Women worker and women education awareness are the implications of the gentrification process. Previously, the there was no women worker in the Betawi culture. The women "worked" at home and responsible to all of the household chores. Yet, it changes after the presence of the newcomers. All of the women newcomers are career women so that they have a limited time to take care of the house. Newcomers, further, offers some jobs to the Betawi women such as a housemaid and babysitter. The men of the Betawi people support their wife to work for the newcomers. They are also offered to work as a driver, gardener, carpenter, and so forth.

In Betawi paradox, children mean investment; the parents had already raised and educated them, so when the parents get old,

the children must take the responsibility for the parents. When the children have already occupied a job, they will able to give the parent money monthly. Moreover, most of the Betawi parents do not work in the formal sector which provides pensions in the retired period, so they do not have a monthly income. Hence, they depend on the children for fulfilling daily needs. including when they got sick. However, the school dropout is still found in the fourth generation of Betawi kampong generation's child), even from the second grade of elementary school. The government of DKI Jakarta Province is concerned on the education of the community by launching the smart card to enhance the community education level since 2012 (kjp.jakarta.go.id).

Previously, most of the Betawi people did not register in any health insurance because they were objection to pay the monthly premium. When they were sick, they went to the drugstore to buy some medicines and met the doctor if needed. In 2014, the central government launched the public insurance with new form whereas all of the community can register (finance.detik.com). The old version of the public insurance was considered for the civil servant or employee (in some institutions, industrial company, etc), while for a jobless person or housewife or students could not register for this health insurance. The only option for them was signed up in private health insurance company with higher monthly premium; compare with public insurance. Now, all of the community member can register for the public health insurance. Therefore, the number of poor people who sign up for this insurance increased, including the Betawi people. Moreover, the DKI Jakarta government was launched Jakarta health card since 2012 which addressed to enhance the quality of life of the poor community (www.jakarta.go.id).

Betawi kampong people have plenty of leisure time so that they have "outdoor living" which means many activities conducted outside the house. They spent their time mostly outside the house for chatting and gossiping with the neighbors and drinking coffee together. This activity is not only triggered by their house, which narrowed so, they cannot freely move in the house, but also these activities are entertainment for them. Moreover, these activities have another implication; strengthening the relationship and the bonding among Betawi people. It also increases the community cohesion. On the contrary, the Betawi gedong and the newcomers have "indoor living" which means most of their daily activities are done in the house. While the newcomers prefer to have their leisure times with the family such as watching television, chatting, and playing with the kids.

Community relationship between the Betawi people and the newcomers are good; no conflict arise. Newcomers who stav in Asem Gede II Street have daily activities more than newcomers in Asem Gede 1 Street. Therefore. they often skip many community meetings and choose to give some money as their contribution to the community. Betawi people and another newcomer try to understand and compromise with their situation. Besides, the newcomers often give support to Betawi people who work for them as a driver, a gardener, or a housemaid. They give some money to fulfil school needs such as uniform, shoes, books, etc. Basically, the newcomers who live in the Asem Gede II Street prefer to have less social interaction with the local community, therefore they build a high fence in their house. While the newcomer in the Asem Gede 1 Street always attempts to accept these differences and still have interaction with the local community.

Gentrification which transforms of the neighbourhood can be seen from the lifestyle shifting. The presence of newcomer who has dissimilar characteristics in education, job, income, culture, and lifestyle shape the neighbourhood. Newcomer who lives in Asem Gede 1 Street tend to merge with Betawi people; they take part in every cultural activity. As a result, their presence does not give significant influence to the Betawi people; the Betawi people live as usual they used to be. The Betawi people still have less educated, jobless, less in environmental concern, and hold women marginalization stigma. This situation changes along with the presence of the newcomer in Asem Gede II Street who adopts the modern lifestyle and works in some professional and creative jobs. They live in a modern and spacious house, wear the latest and branded clothes, use a smartphone, and ride the new model car. These activities make Betawi people begin to consider about education. They also try to imitate the newcomer's lifestyle. Although this newcomer is rare to participate in the community and interact with the Betawi people, but their relationship is still good. Their relation with Betawi people mostly in the form of employee and the employer, but respect each other.

CONCLUSION

Displacement of Betawi people from their kampong and replaced by the newcomers from

middle class indicate gentrification. The presence of newcomers in the kampong influences the Betawi people and neighbourhood. Their role individual as renovator contributes in the influx capital process directly by renovating the house and supporting the kampong improvement. The government role in the gentrification is limited on the urban development in general which also influences the neighbourhood, not precisely in kampong improvement. Gentrification causes the transformation of socio-economic of the community especially Betawi kampong people such as shifting in the education and health awareness and women worker in the Betawi's second and third generation. On the other side, gentrification makes the community bonding decline, because of the presence of newcomers, new habits, and new lifestyle which is found in the third generation. Besides, the Betawi traditional culture has also become obsolete and changed into a modern lifestyle. However, the Betawi people already aware of their identity as the local community in DKI Jakarta Province. Somehow, they want to establish their position in the community. Therefore, many Betawi community organizations emerge to strengthen the Betawi existence. Some political parties often approach these organizations in the election period to get Betawi community support. The presence of newcomers and their lifestyle was influences the Betawi traditional culture which transforms into the new format. It is believed that the Betawi traditional culture will be still existed because it is assimilated to the other cultures. The positive implications of gentrification arise because the community is willing to accept gentrification inconvenience (Schlictman, 2014) so that there is no conflict among the communities. Both Betawi people and the newcomers try to adapt the transformation in different ways; some newcomers choose to elaborate with the community, while others choose to minimize the interaction with the local community. All of these ways are addressed to avoid conflict with the local community. The local community tries to adapt the changes by working, schooling, and displacing (the last option).

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, R. (2003) Introduction: Misunderstood saviour or vengeful wrecker? The many meanings and problems of gentrification. Urban Studies 40.12, 2343-2350.
- Bacqué, Marie-Hélène, Eric C. & Stéphanie V.(2014) The middle class "at home among

- the poor"- how social mix is lived in Parisian Suburbs. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 38.4, 1121-33.
- Brown-Saracino, J. (2009) A neighborhood that never changes; gentrification, social preservation, and the search for authenticity. The University of Chicago Press,Ltd. London.
- Brown-Saracino, J. (2010) The gentrification debates. Routledge. New York.
- Clay, P. (1979) Neighborhood renewal: Middleclass resettlement and incumbent upgrading in American neighborhoods. Lexington, MA: D.C. Health.
- Desena, Judith N. (2009) Gentrification and inequality in Brooklyn, New Kids on the block. United Kingdom: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Freeman, L. (2008) Neighbourhood diversity, metropolitan segregation and gentrification: what are the links in The US? Urban Studies Journal, 84.
- Glass, R. (1964) "Introduction: aspects of change", in centre for Urban Studies (ed.) London. MacKibbon and Kee, London.
- Hamnett, C. (2003) Unequal city. Routledge. New York.
- Hamnett, C. (2003) Gentrification and the middle class remaking of inner London, 1961–2001. Urban Studies 40 (12), 2401–26.
- Hamnett, C&Randolph, B. (1988) Tenurial transformation and the flat break-up market in London: the British condo experience. Blackwell Publishing.
- Less, L et al. (2008) Gentrification. New York: Rautledge Taylor & Frands Group, LLC.
- Ley, D & Teo, Sin Yih. (2014) Gentrification in Hong Kong? Epistemology vs. Ontology. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 38.3, 1286-303.
- Lin, G. (2007) Chinese urbanism in question: state, society, and the reproduction of urban space. Urban Geography 28.1, 7-29.
- Rose, D. (1984) Rethinking gentrification: beyond the uneven development of Marxist urban theory. Environment and Planning D: Society & Space 1.1, 57–69.
- Skaburskis, A. (2012) Gentrification and Toronto's changing household characteristics and income distribution.

 Journal of Planning Education and Research 32(2), 191-203.
- Schlichtman, John.J & Patch J. (2014) Gentrifier? Who, Me? Interrogating the gentrifier in the mirror. International

- Journal of Urban and Regional Research 38.4, 1491-508.
- Smith, N. (2005) The New Urban Frontier. Gentrification and the revanchist City. Taylor & Francis e-Library. New York: USA.
- Walters, P & Mc.Crea, R. (2014) Early gentrification and the public realm, A case study of west end in Brisbane Australia. Urban Studies 51(2)
- http://jakarta.bps.go.id/flip/statda2013/files/asse ts/basic-html/page18.html (UMR) Statistik Daerah Provinsi DKI Jakarta 2013
- http://bplhd.jakarta.go.id/SLHD2013/Docs/pdf/Buku%20I/Buku%20I%20Bab%203B.pdf Data jumlah rumah di Jakarta
- http://properti.kompas.com/read/2014/11/27/15 5450721/Ini.Perbandingan.Harga.Lahan. di.Kawasan.Favorit Ini Perbandingan Harga Lahan di Kawasan Favorit
- http://www.jakarta.go.id/web/encyclopedia/detai l/3842/Betawi-Suku , Suku Betawi
- http://finance.detik.com/read/2012/12/14/13015 9/2118575/1016/jabodetabekkekurangan-pasokan-165-juta-rumah-di-2015 Jabodetabek Kekurangan Pasokan 1,65 Juta Rumah di 2015
- http://www.peluangproperti.com/wilayah/dkijakarta/jakarta-timur/matraman Kisaran harga tanah. 2016.
- http://jakartapedia.bpadjakarta.net/index.php/Si stem_Kekeluargaan_Masyarakat_Betawi Sistem kekeluargaan masyarakat betawi.
- http://jakartapedia.bpadjakarta.net/index.php/Ta hun_1970-an_dan_Tahun_1995 Tahun 1970-an dan Tahun 1995.
- http://www.jakarta.go.id/v2/news/2012/11/peser ta-kartu-jakarta-sehat#.WKrs3zgnLDg Peserta Kartu Jakarta Sehat