

The Influence of Socio-demographic Characteristics to Housing Satisfaction and Mobility

Agra Senopati Anand Prasetyo¹, Joko Adiarto²

¹ *Department of Architecture, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia*
senopatiagra@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aims to understand the pivotal factors of housing satisfaction and mobility according to the demographic characteristics with its hindrances in Indonesia. Several studies prove the residents refuse to move despite experiencing housing dissatisfaction by adjusting the housing or adapting to the housing mostly because of the poor financial capacity or have realistic housing preferences to cope with the experienced housing dissatisfaction. This study employs a quantitative research method by collecting 534 respondents through an online questionnaire. According to the regression analysis, this study finds sex, age, monthly income, and marital status are the major demographic characteristics for driving housing satisfaction and mobility in the Indonesian context. In both sex categories, the increasing age tends to increase the monthly income and enter marriage, which enables the respondents to deliver housing mobility.

© 2022 IJBESR. All rights reserved.

Keywords: housing satisfaction, housing mobility, demographic characteristic, household, Indonesia

1. Introduction

Housing is an integral part of a complicated set of social conditions that determine the quality of well-being of the residents [62], as an essential nation program for well-being improvement [2], the wealth cultivator and protector [19]. These objectives are achieved when the residents manage to maintain their housing stability.

Housing stability is defined as residing in a house for more than 6-12 months, which is important to well-being improvement [16]. While Woodhall-Melnik et al [64] define it as the emersion of sense of home of the individual or household in the occupied house. Most studies conclude that housing stability is the antithesis of homelessness [30] or moving out from the current housing due to poverty [50]. In several studies, housing mobility is also

considered as a housing instability which contributes to decreasing well-being of households, such as the physical illness of the household members, losing social cohesion, capital, and networks [13], decreasing educational performance [57], increasing juvenile delinquencies, violence, and crime rate [24], dilapidated housing condition [40], increasing the risk of depression [34].

Nonetheless, moving out from the current housing can be considered as the well-being improvement by obtaining a better housing condition [28], improving well-being in the new and better neighborhood [56], and minimize financial pressures of the household [9]. This explains that housing stability is a result of complex consideration of their current housing condition according to the cultural housing norms and satisfaction [43]. Residential satisfaction is an indicator of how

the quality of residents life is perceived by them and depends on expectations dictated by cultural norms [12]. The suitable housing features with the cultural housing norms of the residents bring housing satisfaction, and its increasing discrepancies ignite housing mobility [51].

It is important to remember that housing is more than an engineering artifact, but also social which implicates the residential satisfaction and well-being improvement [8]. Housing satisfaction, as the result of the suitability of housing preferences and the experienced housing condition, contributes to the improvement of the residents' well-being [4]. It is a complex relationship of the physical, psychological, social, demographic, and economic attributes of the housing and the residents [45]. The housing market based on a socio-demographic survey of satisfaction, becomes important to seek housing stability in order to increase social welfare, especially in Indonesia developing communities. Nonetheless, it still receives little attention and interest from the policymakers, urban planners, and architects to elaborate the studies of housing satisfaction for improving the housing provision program and design.

Literature Review

Housing Norms

Morris and Winter [46] remind that housing satisfaction also depends on the cultural norms of the residents, regardless of the physical quantity or quality of their inhabited housing. They argue the cultural housing norms encompass the space needs, the quality of neighborhood, tenure, expenditure, and location. These norms are the pivotal determining factors of housing satisfaction and mobility.

Morris and Winter [46] in their classical works emphasize the residents experience a housing deficit or dissatisfaction when living in undesirable housing conditions according to their certain norms, such as location, space, neighborhood, types of structure, tenure, and expenditure. The first relates to the proximity to the surrounding functions, such as the workplace, public amenities, and transportation. The second corresponds to physical housing features, while the third refers to the classification of housing types, such as detached housing, or multi-story housing. While the fourth denotes the physical and quality of the neighborhood, the fifth comprises the types of homeownership, and the last is associated with the ability to pay the household for purchasing, maintaining, and operating.

Housing Satisfaction

Francescato et al [26] define housing satisfaction as the individual's accumulated emotional response towards the inhabited house. Howley [35] states housing preferences contain the consideration between the ideal housing condition with the available housing location in the present and its prediction in the future. While many studies emphasize the housing preferences result from the equilibrium of the lifestyle based on the socio-demographic conditions of the residents with the available housing in the market [37].

A study of housing satisfaction begins in the 1960s to obtain feedback from the residents for housing design and development in the future and claim its pivotal tool for improving the housing policy, design, and development in the 1980s [7]. It has been developed as an effective tool to investigate the housing behavior of residents and physical quality [25].

The location has been considered as the prominent housing satisfaction as it relates to the effort of the residents to meet their daily needs, such as workplace or public amenities

[49]. It does not only highlight the distance but also access to the surrounding public amenities [49], and the proximity to the transportation mode is preferable to minimize the commuting costs and time [31]. Nonetheless, the proximity to the public amenities serves environmental consequences such as noise, pollution, and frustrating traffic congestion, which also implicate housing satisfaction [65].

The housing features are important to determine housing satisfaction. The availability of numbers of bedrooms [49], kitchen and bathroom [49], public utilities, and facilities [32], type of structure, outdoor space, housing size [66], and appearance [49].

Tenure norms, which relate to the homeownership status, also influence significantly housing satisfaction and mobility [58].

Many studies posit the level of importance of neighborhood norms, which include the physical quality [49] and social environment of the surroundings [7]. The availability of public amenities [36], level of crime rate [53], and ethnic composition [15] determine the level of housing satisfaction.

The expenditure norms, the affordable housing price, rent, and, even housing subsidy scheme is the dominant determinants [52].

The prominent study by Rossi [68] in Philadelphia (US), coins the life-cycles as the essential factors of housing satisfaction and mobility. Later, Galster [27] claims the everchanging life-cycles of the households transform their needs, which may be suitable with the current housing condition and leads to housing dissatisfaction then mobility.

These early studies highlight the noteworthy contribution of demographic characteristics to housing satisfaction, such as age [22], sex [39], marital status [67], types of tenure [61], level of education [39], types of employment [22],

monthly income [49], length of stay [39], race [10], and household size [33].

Furthermore, many studies show that residents tend to move to the location at an affordable price, which indicates the importance of expenditure norms in housing preferences, satisfaction, and mobility [39].

Consequently, many studies pose the importance of the life cycles of the households in determining the housing satisfaction and mobility through their empirical study, along with similar studies by [67]. However, Speare [59] finds the life-cycles of the households hold the housing mobility, such as insufficient monthly income or saving to pay the expensive cost. This argument is supported by some studies, which demonstrate the life cycles of the households become the potential trigger and impediment of housing mobility [67]. Therefore, the socio-demographic attributes of the residents cannot be analyzed partially as they are interrelated.

Housing Mobility

The unmet cultural housing norms potentially lead to housing dissatisfaction and adjustment, which includes housing mobility and adjustment [60]. The first relates to leaving for a better housing condition that is suitable with the housing cultural norms, while the second is delivered by changing the physical housing or adapting to the existing physical housing. Jiang [38] argues if housing satisfaction is the difference between the ideal and actual housing conditions then it decreases by the higher difference. Furthermore, lower housing satisfaction will increase the desire for housing mobility. Therefore, housing mobility is initiated by the level of housing satisfaction and its uncompromised difference for the residents.

Kim et al [39] believe the location norms are the dominant considerations for housing mobility. Musterd et al [48] emphasize the need for better

housing is the major drive for housing mobility, which is initiated by the discrepancy between ideal housing preferences and the experienced actual housing condition by the residents. A high crime rate in the neighborhood is considered as one of the major factors of housing mobility [20]. However, several studies address the financial capacity of the household holds a significant role for housing mobility, as it demands an expensive expenditure and requires a complicated economic calculation of the household [33] [47]. Therefore, the household tends to delay or cancel housing mobility despite experiencing housing dissatisfaction [67].

Demographic attributes of individuals or households also hold a substantial role in determining housing mobility. Several studies show the increasing age of residents minimizes their desire to deliver housing mobility [29] [39]. Marital status plays a decisive role in housing mobility, such as entering marriage or separation [23]. In several studies, a higher level of education provides wider job opportunities and increases monthly income, which enables the residents to move to better housing conditions [39].

Study Aim

Several studies prove the residents refuse to move despite experiencing housing dissatisfaction by adjusting the housing or adapting to the housing mostly because of the poor financial capacity [54]. Cronqvist et al [17] argue the residents should prioritize some of the considerations due to the imperfect housing market. Therefore, Jansen [37] convincingly states that residents have realistic housing preferences to cope with the experienced housing dissatisfaction.

Studies of housing satisfaction and mobility in Indonesia still receive minimal attention and begin to deliver within the last five years. A study by Fahrizal and Sukartini [21] in

Indonesia shows that age, levels of education, and monthly income determine housing satisfaction, along with homeownership status. Rahman and Rahdriawan [55] add the cleanliness of the neighborhood is one of the determinants of housing mobility. However, several studies find that housing price and features are the dominant factors of housing satisfaction and mobility [6]. While a study by Malik [42] shows a better housing quality and neighborliness are the prominent determinants of housing satisfaction and mobility.

Although the prior studies attempt to describe the determinants of housing satisfaction and mobility, the scope of the study is still limited in the city scale, which hardly serves a comprehensive understanding on the nationwide scale. According to a study by BPS [11], Riau island province is the most popular destination for the lifetime in-migration (50%), followed by North Kalimantan (34.90%), East Kalimantan (32.50%), West Papua (28.60%), and Riau (25.90%). While Central Java is the most dominant province for the lifetime out-migration (-15.40%) and followed by West Sumatera (-14.20%), South Sulawesi (-12.40%), North Sumatera (-11.40%), and East Java (-6.60%). This data displays the massive amount of Indonesian housing mobility, which is potentially caused by the failure to meet housing satisfaction.

Furthermore, their partial analysis fails to capture the relationship between housing satisfaction and mobility as a comprehensive housing behavior of the individual or household. Whereas, Galster [27] suggests the investigation on housing satisfaction should concentrate on the difference between the ideal and actual housing conditions for the residents. Therefore, this study aims to understand the pivotal factors in housing satisfaction and mobility comprehensively in the Indonesian context.

2. Material and Methods

The most common approach to measure housing satisfaction is addressing the perception of the residents towards the housing attributes with the Likert scale [3]. The perceived experienced housing deficit is calculated by subtracting the perceived level of housing satisfaction with the aspiration, as mentioned by Morris and Winter [46]. The value of housing deficit from each feature of the measured cultural housing norms is analyzed with regression function to the perceived level of housing satisfaction mobility and adaptation to understand the key features of housing deficit that drive the housing mobility and adaptation. The same analysis is delivered to the perceived level of housing satisfaction to identify the less important features of housing norms.

The questionnaire consists of respondent characteristics, perception level of housing satisfaction, and mobility. The part of respondent characteristics comprises sex, age, monthly income, marital status, levels of education, and types of homeownership. The second is collected to identify the perceived level of aspiration of satisfaction towards the current housing condition. While the third contains the general perception level of the possibility of housing mobility.

The informed consent is equipped on the first page of the online questionnaire to meet the standard ethical research code in the human study [44] with sufficient readability features, as suggested in several references [63].

The online questionnaire is disseminated through social media. Several studies demonstrate the advantage of online surveys

such as reducing the time, cost, and mistakes of the data collection process on the nationwide scale while maintaining the anonymity of the respondents [69]. The five-Likert scale is utilized to allow the respondents for expressing a neutral opinion [41] and increase reliability [1]. The collected data is tested by Cronbach's alpha to verify its internal consistency with the result 0.7649, which is an acceptable value of reliability as it is between 0.70-0.90, according to prior literature [18].

The number of gathered respondents is 534 in all Indonesian provinces, which is higher than 385, as the minimum number of respondents to meet the confidential ratio is 95% according to the Slovin formula. Post-stratification is delivered for weighting adjustment to reduce the non-coverage and non-response biases [14], with adjusting the demographic differences between the collected respondents and the actual [14].

2.1. Characteristics of respondents

Most of the respondents have entered marriage (57.68%), followed by delayed marriage (41.57%), and experience separation (0.75%). Nonetheless, parental nests remain the dominant type of homeownership (41.20%), compared to freehold (37.08%), rent (19.48%), and official (2.25%).

This finding is most likely caused by the unaffordable housing market as shown in Table-1. Most of the respondents earn 5.01-10 million/ month (35.77%), and less than 5 million rupiahs/ month (32.86%). Staying longer in the parental nests after entering marriage is an economic decision to meet the basic needs, including housing.

Table 1: Sex and types of employment according to monthly income

Sex	Types of employment	Monthly income (in millions of rupiahs)					Total		
		< 5	5.01-10	10.01-15	15.01-20	20.01-25	> 25	(n)	(%)
Male	Civil servant	8	26	10	6	7	1	58	24.58

	Private employee	28	42	16	9	5	9	109	46.19
	Self-employed	13	12	5	3	1	9	43	18.22
	Student	22	-	-	-	-	-	22	9.32
	Retiree	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	.85
	Unemployed	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	.85
	(n)	74	81	31	18	13	19	236	44.19
	(%)	31.36	34.32	13.14	7.63	5.51	8.05		
Female	Civil servant	13	27	5	9	9		63	21.14
	Private employee	25	59	17	12	3	2	118	39.60
	Self-employed	13	13	2	1	1	4	34	11.41
	Student	23	3	1	-	-	-	27	9.06
	Retiree	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	.34
	Unemployed	28	8	7	4	-	8	55	18.46
	(n)	102	110	33	26	13	14	298	55.81
(%)	34.23	36.91	11.07	8.72	4.36	4.70			
Total	(n)	176	191	64	44	26	33		534
	(%)	32.96	35.77	11.99	8.24	4.87	6.18		
Types of employment	Civil servant	21	53	15	15	16	1	121	22.66
	Private employee	53	101	33	21	8	11	227	42.51
	Self-employed	26	25	7	4	2	13	77	14.42
	Student	45	3	1	-	-	-	49	9.18
	Retiree	1	1	1	-	-	-	3	.56
	Unemployed	30	8	7	4	-	8	57	10.67

3. Results and Discussions

Factors of housing satisfaction and mobility

Table-2 shows the monthly income (p -value = .0018 < .05) and marital status (p -value = .0472 < .05) play a pivotal role in housing satisfaction. While in housing mobility, sex (p -value = .0279 < .05) and age (p -value = .0390 < .05) are the major factors.

While for housing mobility, sex (p -value = .0279 < .05), age (p -value = .0390 < .05)

and marital status (p -value = .0146 < .05) are highly influenced factors. It indicates that the increasing age in both types of sex leads to the enter another life-course event, such as marriage, then drive housing mobility of the respondents.

This finding shows a similar finding with the prior worldwide studies, which state the sex [39], age [22], and marital status [67] as the major driving forces of housing satisfaction and mobility.

Table 2: Factor of housing satisfaction and mobility according to the demographic characteristics

Aspect	Regression Statistics					
	Multiple R	R Sq.	Adj. R Sq.	Std. Error	Obsv.	
	.7727	.0298	.0206	.1043	534	
Housing satisfaction	ANOVA		df	SS	MS	Sig F
	Regression		5	19.8004	3.9601	.0067
	Residual		528	643.8269	1.2194	
	Total		533	663.6273		
			Coeff.	Std. Error	t Stat	P-value
	Intercept		3.1570	.3729	8.4651	.0000
Sex		.0612	.0973	.6288	.0597	

	Age	-.0478	.1224	-.3905	.0963
	Monthly income	.1109	.0354	3.1306	.0018
	Marital status	.0406	.0564	.7197	.0472
	Level of education	.1155	.0622	1.8561	.0640
	Multiple R	R Sq.	Adj. R Sq.	Std. Error	Obsv.
	.7527	.0233	.0141	.2320	534
	ANOVA	df	SS	MS	Sig F
	Regression	5	22.3730	4.4746	0.0286
	Residual	528	936.7599	1.7742	
	Total	533	959.1330		
Housing mobility		Coeff.	Std. Error	t Stat	p-value
	Intercept	3.4723	.4499	7.7187	.0000
	Sex	.2588	.1174	2.2047	.0279
	Age	-.3056	.1477	-2.0695	.0390
	Monthly income	.0018	.0427	.0415	.0069
	Marital status	-.0560	.0680	-.8234	.0146
	Education	-.0088	.0751	-.1167	.9071

Failure of housing mobility

According to Table-3, most of the respondents are aged 26-45 years old (78.65%), followed by 19-25 years old (16.29%), 46-65 years old (4.68%), and 13-18 years old (.37%). In the marital status category, most of the respondents' marital status is married (57.68%), followed by single (41.57%) and divorced (.75%). However, living in the parental nest is the most favorable option (41.20%), compared to freehold (37.08%), rent (19.48%), and official (2.25%). It indicates most of the respondents do not delay marriage but homeownership.

The age of most married respondents is 26-45 years old (89.94%), followed by 46-65 years old (8.12%), and 9-25 years old (1.95%). Most of the respondents in this marital status group have freehold homeownership (59.09%), which indicates a sufficient financial capacity to purchase houses. A small number of respondents live in rented houses (16.88%), and official houses (1.62%) to raise their families independently. However, there are 69 respondents (22.40%) who remain to live in their parental nest after entering a marriage.

Table 3: Marital status and age of respondents according to the types of homeownership

Marital status	Age (yrs. old)	Homeownership				Total	
		Freehold	Official	Rent	Parental	(n)	(%)
Single	13-18	-	-	2	-	2	.90
	19-25	2	1	18	60	81	36.49
	26-45	13	6	32	88	139	62.61
	(n)	15	7	52	148	222	41.57
	(%)	6.76	3.15	23.42	66.67		
Married	19-25	1	-	2	3	6	1.95
	26-45	158	4	49	66	277	89.94
	46-65	23	1	1	-	25	8.12
	(n)	182	5	52	69	308	57.68
	(%)	59.09	1.62	16.88	22.40		

Divorced	26-45	1	-	-	3	4	100.00
	(n)	1	-	-	3	4	.75
	(%)	25.00	.00	.00	75.00	4	.75
Total	(n)	198	12	104	220	534	
	(%)	37.08	2.25	19.48	41.20		
Age (yrs. old)	13-18	-	-	2	-	2	.380
	19-25	3	1	20	63	87	16.29
	26-45	172	10	81	157	420	78.65
	46-65	23	1	1	-	25	4.68

Most of the single respondents are at the age of 26-45 years old (62.61%), followed by 19-25 years old (36.49%), and 13-18 years old (.90%). For the respondents who are not entering marriage, living in the parental nest (66.67%) is the most popular option rather than renting houses (23.42%), freehold homeownership (6.76%), or staying in the official houses (3.15%). A similar finding is identified in the divorced/ widow respondent group with the age of 26-45 years old, in which most of the respondents move back to the parental nest (75.00%), compared to living in the house with freehold ownership (25.00%). Separation with spouse leads to the division of accumulated

family wealth, including houses, which compels most of the respondents in this marital status group to return to their parental nest.

This finding implies that housing mobility is highly dependent on marital status, as mentioned by several authors [67]. Those who delay entering marriage, tend to extend their tenancy in their parental nest, similarly with those who experience separation. It depicts the essential role of the parental nest as the trustworthy harbor for the respondents in their turmoil life-course events.

Table 4: Sex and age of respondents according to the types of homeownership

Sex	Age (yrs. old)	Homeownership				Total	
		Freehold	Official	Rent	Parental	(n)	(%)
Male	13-18	-	-	2	-	2	.85
	19-25	1	1	3	24	29	12.29
	26-45	80	3	41	64	188	79.66
	46-65	16	1	-	-	17	7.20
	(n)	97	5	46	88	236	44.19
	(%)	41.10	2.12	19.49	37.29		
Female	19-25	2	-	17	39	58	19.46
	26-45	92	7	40	93	232	77.85
	46-65	7	-	1	-	8	2.68
	(n)	101	7	58	132	298	55.81
	(%)	33.89	2.35	19.46	44.30		
Total	(n)	198	12	104	220	534	
	(%)	37.08	2.25	19.48	41.20		
Age (yrs. old)	13-18	-	-	2	-	2	.37
	19-25	3	1	20	63	87	16.29
	26-45	172	10	81	157	420	78.65
	46-65	23	1	1	-	25	4.68

The housing tenure is also determined by the monthly income of the respondents, as

shown in Table-5. In the respondent group with a monthly income of less than Rp. 5 million

(32.96%), living in the parental nest is the favorable option to meet their housing need (61.93%). Although a small number of respondents manage to leave their parental nests to live in their owned houses (21.02%), rental houses (15.91%), and official houses (1.14%). It also confirms a similar finding with the prior worldwide studies [78].

Although living in the parental nest remains the dominant option (36.65%), this composition gradually changes according to the increase of monthly income. In the higher monthly income group (Rp. 5.01-10 million/ month), the number of respondents, who manage to live in their own houses, increases (30.89%), followed by rental houses (29.32%), and official housing (3.14%).

Living in the owned house (59.38%) emerges as the dominant tenure type for those who earn Rp. 10.01-15 million/ month, followed by the parental nest (26.56%), and rental houses (14.06%). A similar composition occurs in the respondent group with the monthly income Rp. 15.01-20 million/ month, as living in the owned house (47.73%), followed by the parental nest (34.09%), rental houses (11.36%), and official houses (6.82%). This domination continues in the higher monthly income, such as Rp. 20.01-25 million (69.23%) and more than Rp 25 million (75.76%). This finding demonstrates that increasing monthly income enables the ability of the respondents to leave their parental nest for their own houses.

Table 5: Monthly income and age of respondents according to the types of homeownership

Monthly income (in millions of rupiahs)	Age (yrs.)	Homeownership				Total	
		Freehold	Official	Rent	Parental	(n)	(%)
<5	13-18	-	-	2	-	2	1.14
	19-25	1	-	5	50	56	31.82
	26-45	33	1	21	59	114	64.77
	46-65	3	1	-	-	4	2.27
	(n)	37	2	28	109	176	32.96
	(%)	21.02	1.14	15.91	61.93		
5.01-10	19-25	-	1	12	11	24	12.57
	26-45	51	5	43	59	158	82.72
	46-65	8	-	1	-	9	4.71
	(n)	59	6	56	70	191	35.77
	(%)	30.89	3.14	29.32	36.65		
	10.01-15	19-25	2	-	1	2	5
26-45	29	-	8	15	52	81.25	
46-65	7	-	-	-	7	10.94	
(n)	38		9	17	64	11.99	
(%)	59.38	.00	14.06	26.56			
15.01-20	19-25	-	-	2	-	2	4.55
	26-45	21	3	3	15	42	95.45
	(n)	21	3	5	15	44	8.24
	(%)	47.73	6.82	11.36	34.09		
20.01-25	26-45	15	-	3	5	23	88.46
	46-65	3	-	-	-	3	11.54
	(n)	18	-	3	5	26	4.87
	(%)	69.23	.00	11.54	19.23		
>25	26-45	23	1	3	4	31	93.94
	46-65	2	-	-	-	2	6.06
	(n)	25	1	3	4	33	6.18

	(%)	75.76	3.03	9.09	12.12		
Total	(n)	198	12	104	220		
	(%)	37.08	2.25	19.48	41.20	534	
Age (yrs. old)	13-18	-	-	2	-	2	.37
	19-25	3	1	20	63	87	16.29
	26-45	172	10	81	157	420	78.65
	46-65	23	1	1	-	25	4.68

However, most of the married respondents possess freehold homeownership (59.09%), followed by parental nest (22.40%), rent (16.88%), and official house (1.62%). It occurs despite most of the married respondents still earning less than 10 million rupiahs/months, such as 5.01-10 million rupiahs/ month (34.09%), and less than 5 million rupiahs/ month (23.05%). For most of the respondents, who delay marriage, the parental nest is the dominant type of homeownership they live in (66.67%), compared to rent (23.42%), freehold (6.76%), and official (3.15%), despite a similar

composition of monthly income with the aforementioned respondent group. A similar finding is identified in the divorced respondents, who prefer to live in the parental nest (75.00%), and only a small number live in a house with freehold homeownership (25.00%) with a similar composition of monthly income with the prior respondent groups. This finding indicates that marital status plays a pivotal role in determining the types of homeownership, despite the monthly income barely meeting with the price of the housing market.

Table 6: Marital status and types of homeownership according to the monthly income

Marital status	Types of homeownership	Monthly income (in millions of rupiahs)						Total	
		< 5	5.01-10	10.01-15	15.01-20	20.01-25	>25	(n)	(%)
Single	Freehold	7	2	2	1	2	1	15	6.76
	Rent	18	28	2	-	3	1	52	23.42
	Official	-	5	-	2	-	-	7	3.15
	Parental	78	51	7	6	3	3	148	66.67
	(n)	103	86	11	9	8	5	222	41.57
	(%)	46.40	38.74	4.95	4.05	3.60	2.25		
Married	Freehold	30	57	36	19	16	24	182	59.09
	Rent	10	28	7	5	-	2	52	16.88
	Official	2	1	-	1	-	1	5	1.62
	Parental	29	19	10	8	2	1	69	22.40
	(n)	71	105	53	33	18	28	308	57.68
	(%)	23.05	34.09	17.21	10.71	5.84	9.09		
Divorced/ Separation	Freehold	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	25.00
	Parental	2	-	-	1	-	-	3	75.00
	(n)	2	-	-	2	-	-	4	.75
	(%)	1	-	-	1	-	-		
Total	(n)	176	191	64	44	26	33	534	
	(%)	32.96	35.77	11.99	8.24	4.87	6.18		
Types of homeownership	Freehold	37	59	38	21	18	25	198	37.08
	Rent	28	56	9	5	3	3	104	19.48
	Official	2	6	-	3	-	1	12	2.25
	Parental	109	70	17	15	5	4	220	41.20

This finding demonstrates the types of homeownership are not merely determined by the financial capacity of the household to obtain freehold home ownership, as mentioned by several authors [61]. Entering marriage drives the families or households to leave their parental nest for new homes with several types of homeownership, from freehold, rent, or official, despite their unconvincing financial capacity.

However, the parental nest becomes the popular destination for those who delay or have broken marriages to live. In these respondent groups, the financial capacity of the respondents is potentially pivotal in determining the types of homeownership. The low financial capacity compels the single respondents to stay longer in their parental nest. While the separation from their spouses hampers the financial capacity of the respondents, the parental nest may solve their housing problems. Therefore, the marital status becomes the dependent variable to determine housing mobility which implicates the types of homeownership.

4. Conclusion

This study aims to understand the pivotal factors of housing satisfaction and mobility according to the demographic characteristics with its hindrances in Indonesia. It finds sex, age, monthly income, and marital status are the major demographic characteristics for driving housing satisfaction and mobility in the Indonesian context, which is similar to the findings of the prior worldwide studies. In both sex categories, the increasing age tends to increase the monthly income and enter marriage, which enables the respondents to deliver housing mobility.

However, most of the respondents remain to live in their parental nest, compared to living in their homeownership, rent, or official houses. It indicates two major hindrances, as mentioned in prior studies, which are socio-cultural factors

such as nurturing parents, and the unaffordable housing market. Most of the respondents prefer to live in a strategic location to public transportation and other public amenities to meet their daily needs, which also demands higher expenditure for purchasing and maintaining the freehold housing. Extending residence time in the parental nest becomes the plausible solution to meet the housing norms and satisfaction, which delays housing mobility.

Furthermore, delaying marriage emerges as an option for the younger generation in Indonesia, which implicates the postponement of housing mobility. Although the single respondents enter employment and earn sufficient monthly income for homeownership, they prefer to extend their residency in the parental nest. Therefore, socio-demographic characteristics, such as sex, age, monthly income, and marital status play a pivotal role in housing satisfaction and mobility.

This study contributes a new perspective to understand the housing satisfaction and mobility for Indonesian society. Most of the studies tend to examine the prominent physical attributes to provide housing satisfaction and the causes of housing mobility. However, this study shows that socio-demographic characteristics should also be considered to provide housing satisfaction and mobility for Indonesian society.

Further studies are demanded to delve into the interrelationship of each socio-demographic characteristic, which is useful for housing providers to understand the housing consumers. Studies on the interrelationship of socio-demographic characteristics and physical attributes are necessary to enable the housing providers to meet the suitable housing design for a certain consumer group.

Acknowledgement

The work is supported by Department of Architecture, Faculty of Engineering, University of Indonesia and research group of 2020 cohort of Urban Housing and Settlement studies.

References

- [1] Adelson J L, McCoach D B. Measuring the mathematical attitudes of elementary students: The effects of a 4-point or 5-point Likert-type scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 2010;70(5): 796–807. doi:10.1177/0013164410366694
- [2] Adjei K O, Fobiri G, Owiredu G K. Policies and barriers in the provision of affordable housing in Ghana. *African Journal of Applied Research* 2015;1(1):159-169.
- [3] Adriaanse C C M. Measuring residential satisfaction: A residential environmental satisfaction scale (RESS). *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 2007;22: 287–304. DOI: 10.1007/s10901-007-9082-9
- [4] Alber J, Fahey T. *Perceptions of living conditions in an enlarged Europe* (consolidated report), European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Dublin; 2004.
- [5] Amerigo, M., Aragones, J I. A theoretical and methodological approach to the study of residential satisfaction, *Journal of environmental psychology* 1997;17(1): 47-57, DOI: 10.1006/jev.1996.0038
- [6] Anastasia N, Kusuma J G. Determinant of Housing Mobility di Surabaya. *BISMA* 2019;11(2): 104-116.
- [7] Azimi N, Esmaeilzadeh Y. Assessing the relationship between house types and residential satisfaction in Tabriz, Iran. *International Journal of Urban Sciences* 2017;21(2): 185–203. <http://doi.org/10.1080/12265934.2016.1273128>
- [8] Berköz T L, Kellekci Ö L. Environmental Quality and User Satisfaction in Mass Housing Areas: The Case of Istanbul. *European Planning Studies* 2009;17(1): 161-174.
- [9] Blanchard O, Katz L F. 1992. Regional Evolutions. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 1992;1: 1-75.
- [10] Bolt G, van Kempen R. Escaping poverty neighbourhoods in the Netherlands. *Housing, Theory and Society* 2003;20(4): 209-222.
- [11] BPS. Profil Migran: Hasil Survey Sosial Ekonomi Nasional 2019. Jakarta: BPS; 2019.
- [12] Bunster, V.; Noguchi, M. Profiling space heating behavior in Chilean social housing: Towards personalization of energy efficiency measures. *Sustainability* 2015, 7, 7973–7996.
- [13] Carrillo L, Pattillo M, Hardy E, Acevedo-Garcia D. Housing decisions among low-income Hispanic households in Chicago. *Cityscape* 2016;18: 109–149.
- [14] Cervantes I F, Brick M J, Jones M. Efficacy of post-stratification in complex sampling designs. *Methodology Series* 2009;4: 25-38.
- [15] Clarke A. *Understanding Demographic, spatial and economic impacts on future affordable housing demand*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge; 2008.
- [16] Coley R L, Leventhal T, Lynch A D, Kull M. Relations between housing characteristics and the well-being of low-income children and adolescents. *Developmental Psychology* 2012;49(9): 1775–1789. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0031033>
- [17] Cronqvist H, Münkler F, Siegel S. Genetics, Homeownership, and Home Location Choice. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 2014;48(1): 79–111.
- [18] DeVellis R. *Scale development: theory and applications: theory and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2003.
- [19] Di Z X. *The Role of Housing as a Component of Household Wealth*. Joint Centre for Housing Studies, Working Paper WO1-6. Harvard: Harvard University; 2001.
- [20] Diaz-Serrano L, Rodríguez-Pose A. *Decentralization, happiness, and the perception of institutions*. Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA); 2011.
- [21] Fahrizal, Sukartini Ni Made. Housing Satisfaction Indicators in Indonesia: Analysis of SPTK 2017. *Plano Madani* 2020;9(1): 41-48.
- [22] Fattah H A, Salleh A G, Badarulzaman N, Ali K. Factors Affecting Residential Mobility among Households in Penang, Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2015;170: 516–526.
- [23] Feijten P, van Ham M. Residential Mobility and Migration of The Divorced and Separated. *Demographic Research* 2007;17: 623–654. <http://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2007.17.21>
- [24] Fowler P J, Henry D B, Schoeny M, Taylor J, Chavira D. Developmental timing of housing mobility: Longitudinal effects on externalizing behaviors among at-risk youth. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 2014;53(2): 199-208.
- [25] Francescato G, Weidemann S, Anderson J R. *Evaluating resident's satisfaction in housing for low and moderate income families: a multi-method approach*. In: D Carson (ed.), *Man-environment interactions: evaluation and Applications*. Washington, DC: EDRA; 1974, 5: 285-296.
- [26] Francescato G, Weidemann S, Anderson J R. 1989. *Evaluating the built environment from the users point of view: An attitudinal model of residential satisfaction*. In W.F.E. Preiser (Ed.), *Building evaluation*. New York: Plenum Press; 1989, pp. 181-198.
- [27] Galster, G. Identifying the Correlates of Dwelling Satisfaction: An Empirical Critique. *Environment and Behavior* 1987;19(5): 539–568. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0013916587195001>

- [28] Galster, G. *Neighbourhood social mix: theory, evidence and implications for policy and planning*. In: N Carmon & S Fainstein (eds), *Policy, planning and people: promoting justice in urban development*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; 2013.
- [29] Green, M. *Social Networks and Residential Mobility in Later Life: The Effects of Moving on Social Network Supportive Capacity amongst Older People in the UK*. University of Southampton; 2014.
- [30] Greer, A L, Shinn M, Kwon J, Zuiderveen S. Targeting services to individuals most likely to enter shelter: Evaluating the efficiency of homelessness prevention. *Social Service Review* 2016;90 (1): 130-155
- [31] Gutierrez-i-Puigarnau E, Mulalic I, Van Ommeren, J N. 2014. Do rich households live farther away from their workplaces? *Journal of Economic Geography* 2014 1–25. Doi:10.1093/jeg/lbu046.
- [32] He L, Zhao L. *Study on Determinants of Housing Demand for Community in Beijing*. Beijing: Beijing Normal University; 2006.
- [33] Helderma A C, Mulder C H, van Ham M. The changing effect of home ownership on residential mobility in the Netherlands, 1980–98. *Housing Studies* 2004;19(4): 601-616.
- [34] Herbers J, Reynolds A, Chin C. School mobility and developmental outcomes in young adulthood. *Developmental and Psychopathology* 2013;25(2): 501-515. Doi:10.1017/S0954579412001204.
- [35] Howley, P. Attitudes towards compact city living: towards a greater understanding of residential behavior. *Land Use Policy* 2009;26: 792-798.
- [36] Huang Z, Du X, Yu X. Home Ownership and Residential Satisfaction: Evidence from Hangzhou, China. *Habitat International* 2015;49: 74–83. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2015.05.008>
- [37] Jansen S J T. 2013. Why is Housing Always Satisfactory? A Study into the Impact of Preference and Experience on Housing Appreciation. *Social Indicators Research* 2013;113:785–805. DOI 10.1007/s11205-012-0114-9
- [38] Jiang W. *Gap-theoretical analyses of residential satisfaction and intention to move*. Technische Universiteit Eindhoven; 2018.
- [39] Kim H, Woosnam K M, Marcouiller D W, Aleshinloye K D. 2015. Residential Mobility, Urban Preference, and Human Settlement: A South Korean Case Study. *Habitat International* 2015;49: 497–507. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2015.07.003>
- [40] Krysan M, Crowder K, Bader M D M. *Pathways to residential segregation*. In: A. Lareau & K. Goyette (Eds.), *Choosing homes, choosing schools*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press; 2014, pp. 27–63.
- [41] Kulas J T, Stachowski A A. Respondent rationale for neither agreeing nor disagreeing: Person and item contributors to middle category endorsement intent on Likert personality indicators. *Journal of Research in Personality* 2013;47(4): 254-262. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2013.01.014
- [42] Malik, Alpraditia. Willingness to Move to and from Rusunawa: Looking from the Perspective of both Prospective and Existing Residents of Rusunawa in Tangerang City, Greater Jakarta. *Asia-Japan Research Academic Bulletin* 2021;2(32): 1-16.
- [43] Marquez E, Dodge Francis C, Gerstenberger S. Where I live: A qualitative analysis of renters living in poor housing. *Health & Place* 2019;58: 102–143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2019.05.021>
- [44] Millum J, Bromwich D. Informed Consent: What Must Be Disclosed and What Must Be Understood?, *The American Journal of Bioethics* 2021; DOI: 10.1080/15265161.2020.1863511
- [45] Mohit M A, Azim M. Assessment of Residential Satisfaction with Public Housing in Hulhumale’, Maldives. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2012;50: 756–770.
- [46] Morris E W, Winter M. A Theory of Family Housing Adjustment. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 1975;37(1): 79-88, DOI: 10.2307/351032
- [47] Mulder C H, Hooimeijer P. *Residential relocations in the life course*. In L.J.G. van Wissen., P.A. Dykstra (eds.), *Population issues: an interdisciplinary focus*. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers: New York; 1999.
- [48] Musterd S, van Gent W P, Das M, Latten J. Adaptive Behaviour in Urban Space: Residential Mobility in Response to Social Distance. *Urban Studies* 2014; 53: 1–20.
- [49] Nguyen A T, Tran T Q, Vu H V, Luu D Q. Housing satisfaction and its correlates: a quantitative study among residents living in their own affordable apartments in urban Hanoi, Vietnam. *International Journal of Urban Sustainable Development* 2017;10(1): 79–91. doi:10.1080/19463138.2017.1398167
- [50] O’Flaherty B. *Homelessness as bad luck: Implications for research and policy*. In: I. Gould Ellen and B. O’Flaherty (Eds.), *How to House the Homeless*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2010, pp. 143-182.
- [51] Oladapo R A, Ojo B, Ayoola A B, Kemiki O A. 2019. Factors Influencing Tenants’ Choice of Location of Residence in Bosso Local Municipality, Minna, Nigeria. *Journal of African Real Estate Research* 4(1): 23-41. DOI: 10.15641/jarer.v4i1.662.
- [52] Olayiwola A M, Olaitan, A. A. 2019. Spatial Preference of Urban Residential Location in Osogbo, Nigeria, *Ghana Journal of Geography* 11(1): 140–158 DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/gjg.v11i1.9>
- [53] Parkes A, Kearns A, Atkinson R. 2002. What makes people dissatisfied with their neighbourhoods. *Urban Studies* 2002;39(13): 2413-2438.
- [54] Permentier M, Bolt G, van Ham M. Determinants of neighborhood satisfaction and perception of neighborhood reputation. *Urban Studies* 2011;48: 977–996.

- [55] Rahman S, Rahdriawan M. Pengaruh kondisi perumahan terhadap kepuasan penghuni di perumahan Grand Tembalang Regency Semarang. *Jurnal Pengembangan Kota* 2017;5(1): 69–77. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jpk.5.1.69-77>.
- [56] Rosenbaum J E, DeLuca S. *Is Housing Mobility the Key to Welfare Reform? Lessons from Chicago's Gautreaux Program*. Washington D. C.: The Brookings Institution; 2018.
- [57] Roy A L, McCoy D C, Raver C C. Instability verses quality: Residential mobility, neighborhood poverty, and children's self-regulation. *Developmental Psychology* 2014;50(7): 1891–1896.
- [58] Zhang F, Zhang C, Hudson J. Housing conditions and life satisfaction in urban China. *Cities* 2018;81: 35–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2018.03.012>
- [59] Speare J A. Residential Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable in Residential Mobility. *Demography* 1974; 11(2): 173–188. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2060556>
- [60] Steggell C D, Binder S K, Davidson L A, Vega P H, Hutton E D, Rodecap A R. The Role of Theory in the Study of Housing. *Housing and Society* 2001;28 (1-2): 87-100, DOI: 10.1080/08882746.2001.11430463
- [61] Ubani P, Alaci D S A, Udoo V. Determinants of Residential Neighbourhood Choice in a Nigerian Metropolis. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 2017;22(7): 1-11.
- [62] United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT). *Sustainable Housing for Sustainable Cities: A Policy Framework for Developing Countries*. Nairobi: UN-HABITAT; 2012.
- [63] Varnhagen C K, Gushta M, Daniels J, Peters T C, Parmar N, Law D, Hirsch, Takach B S, Johnson T. How Informed Is Online Informed Consent? *Ethics & Behavior* 2005;15(1): 37–48.
- [64] Woodhall-Melnik J, Hamilton-Wright S, Daoud N, Matheson F I, Dunn J R, O'Campo P. Establishing stability: Exploring the meaning of 'home' for women who have experienced intimate partner violence. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 2017;32(2): 253–268. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-016-9511-8>
- [65] Yi C, Lee S. An Empirical Analysis of the Characteristics of Residential Location Choice in the Rapidly Changing Korean Housing Market. *Cities* 2014;39: 156–163.
- [66] Zhou B, Kockelman K. Microsimulation of residential land development and household location choices: bidding for land in Austin, Texas. *Transportation Research Record* 2008;2077: 106–112.
- [67] de Groot C, Mulder C H, Das M, Manting D. Life events and the gap between intention to move and actual mobility. *Environment and Planning A* 2011;43(1): 48.
- [68] Rossi P H. *Why families move: A study in the social psychology of urban residential mobility*, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press; 1955.
- [69] Nayak M S D P, Narayan K A. Strengths and weaknesses of online surveys. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 2019;24(5): 31-38.