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Abstract. Housing is a basic right for humans other than clothing and food. Housing development must see the desires and needs of its inhabitants who have diverse characteristics and life cycles. The city of Depok is a suburb of the metropolitan Jakarta, which from the beginning was designated as a dormitory city for the people of Jakarta. This caused many residents including young families to move as commuters. The study uses mixed methods with samples taken accidental at the location of the commuter station and residential environment by collecting data in questionnaires and interviews. Who wants a home location that is close to public transportation, child-friendly, and very much depends on the price of the house. The difference between the life cycle that is the desire for environment preferences, safety and having a high desire to move from their current place of residence to the place of residence they want to fulfill the family life cycle. This can be input for the government, especially the Government of Depok City and developers in planning housing considering the family life cycle in order to improve the quality of life.

1. Introduction
Home is a basic need for humans. Homes must also be referred to as rights for citizens who will support the next level of need. Housing is closely related between human as personally or the community that is related between time and place.

Located in the south of Jakarta, Depok is a city where the Jakarta residents live which probably continue the mobility as a commuter [1]. The increasing population of Depok definitely impacted on the need for housing which is currently targeting younger generation. The younger generation, including young families, has a huge demand on the housing development, referring to the fact that the ownership status of houses in 12 major cities belongs to young families with 27.5% having their own homes after entering the marriage phase or having a job [2].

In this regard, this study intends to know the characteristics of young commuter family in Depok City and analyze most important housing attributes among young families by looking at the families’ life cycle (spouse without children and spouse with children before entering elementary school) on their housing preferences. This research is expected to be useful for developers and governments as the housing development actors who must consider the consumers’ housing preferences to achieve an optimal quality of life that will be different in each life cycle of an individual and family.
2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Materials

Studies of housing preferences have been conducted by researchers with a variety of disciplines. One theory of human behavior in housing research is the preference theory. The differences in housing desires and choices are closely related to human life cycles, such as from being single, married, married and no child, married and having young children, to the elderly age which is known as the Housing Life-Cycle Model [3].

Housing preferences are influenced by the demographic and socio-economic characteristics. Leh, O.L., Mansor, N.A., Musthafa, S.N. in his study used demographic-socio-economic factors such as gender, income, education, employment, home ownership, number of children, and length of stay to determine the housing preferences for young people in Selangor, Malaysia [4]. In Indonesia, the study of preference for housing is also conducted by looking at the attributes of housing. The results of Farasa and Kusuma's research found that young adults want homes that have green areas and views, locations close to public and social facilities, simplicity, home design, and accessibility [5]. As with Indrainiingrum the desire for ownership is the main choice and the location in the village is a choice because of its comfort and in accordance with their current lifestyle [6]. As well as, for the upper middle society in Indonesia, legality is an important thing after a location that is close to public facilities and transportation [7].

2.2. Methods

The study population is a young family with an early adulthood and midlife life cycle (22-39 years). However, the population is not known for certain were young commuters who currently live in Depok. Respondents have several criteria; 1) Young families with ages (22 - 39 years), 2) activities as commuters (Depok – surrounded cities), 3) stage family cycles (not having children and spouses with children before elementary school).

This type of research uses quantitative and qualitative (mix methods). The analysis is used to find out how the stage of the model life cycle chooses the priority of housing preferences and choice to young family commuters impacting to the desire to mechanism ownership and desire to move. Survey questionnaire was based on the concepts of housing preferences which is affected by stage life cycle model, which was adopted and modified from previous research.

Collecting data used in this study in the form of print questionnaires. Questionnaires were distributed accidental sampling interview method by asking the respondent directly and the questionnaire given to the respondent. To accelerate the collection of respondents and obtain information in accordance with the research objectives, the respondents were interviewed at the commuter station in Depok City from 5 until 9 pm. The total respondent is 71 that is proper to the analysis criteria with SPSS 23.0.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Results

Based on the research conducted through random sampling method located in Depok residential neighborhoods and across commuter stations (Universitas Indonesia Station, Pondok Cina Station, Depok Baru Station, and Depok Station. Respondents consisted of men (47%) and women (53%) and couples without children (53%) and couples with pre-school children (47%). Generally, they do daily activities using public transportation (60%) while the rest use private transportation (40%).

3.1.1. Type of House Preferences. In this study there are two types of houses that can be used for housing and vertical housing (apartments). The majority of women prefer to use (96%) and apartments (4%), while men prefer to use landed housing (100%).
In the difference between the family life cycle, based on table 1, the whole family (100%) who have had a child choose a home home site while a family without children 96 percent choose a site and only 4 percent choose a house with a vertical housing type like an apartment or flat.

### Table 1. The Desire Stage Life Family To House Types

| Stage Life Family                  | Type of House (X1) |        |        |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------|--------|
|                                   | Landed Housing     | Vertical Housing |
| Couple stage – no children        | 96%                | 4%     |
| Childbearing- family stage, Preschool family stage | 100%                | 0%     |

*Source: Author (2018)*

3.1.2. Housing Location Preferences. Respondents in the life cycle are divided into two categories (couples without children) and (couples with pre - school children). The differences in family life cycles are very important to know because they have a tendency towards different desires.

### Table 2. The Desire of Stage Family Life to House Location

| Stage Life Family                  | Housing Location (X2) |        |        |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
|                                   | City Center (X2.1)    | Suburban (X2.2) | Village (X2.3) |
| Couple stage – no children        | 67%                   | 26%    | 7%     |
| Childbearing- family stage, Preschool family stage | 54%                   | 46%    | 0%     |

*Source: Author (2018)*

Based on table 2, for people, family without children, they choose a location in the city center (67%) compared to the desire to live in the sub-urban area (25%), and the village (7%). For those who already have children (pre-school) who want to live in the city center (54%) compared to those who want to live in urban areas (46%).

3.1.3. Comfort and Environment Preferences. In the desire for comfort and the environment, respondents chose clean air (pollution-free) (37%), security (33%), and disaster-free (25%).

### Table 3. The Desire of Stage Life Family to Comfort and Environment Preferences

| Stage Life Family                  | Comfort and Environment Preferences (X3) |        |        |        |        |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|                                   | Beautiful View (X3.1)                    | Clean Air (X3.2) | Security (X3.3) | Free Flood (X3.4) | Others (X4.5) |
| Couple stage – no children        | 4%                                       | 48%    | 22%    | 33%    | 0%     |
| Childbearing- family stage, Preschool family stage | 0%                                       | 33%    | 46%    | 17%    | 4%     |

*Source: Author (2018)*

Based on table 3, in the difference in family life cycles, the majority of families do not have children 48 percent choose clean air, 33 percent avoid disasters, 22 percent security and the remaining 4 percent beautiful view. Unlike families with 46 percent of children who choose security as the most important thing, 33 percent clean air, 17 percent disaster-free air, especially floods.
3.1.4. Housing Price Preferences. In the differences in family life cycles, couple stage no children choose house prices at a price of Rp. 450,000,000 - Rp. 650,000,000 (67%), there is also a choice of housing at a price of Rp. 651,000,000 to Rp. 850,000,000 (22%), Rp. 851,000,000 - Rp. 1,000,000,000 (11%).

Table 4. The Desire of Stage Life Family to Housing Price Preferences

| Stage Life Family | Housing Price (X4) | Rp. 450 – 650 Million (X4.1) | Rp. 650 – 850 Million (X4.2) | Rp. 851 – 1 Billion (X4.3) | >Rp. 1 Billion (X4.4) |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Couple stage - no children | 67% | 22% | 11% | 0% |
| Childbearing family stage, Preschool | 75% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 0% |

*Source: Author (2018)*

The results based on table 4, couple stage - preschool are not much different from entering the lowest price range of 75 percent and then 12.5 percent at two higher price ranges. Prices are the most important thing in the preferences to buy a house. The higher the economic capability, the choice of a comfortable house that has a large area of land and buildings will be higher.

3.1.5. Accessibility Preferences. The majority of respondents want accessibility that is close to public transportation (52%) and the desire to want to be near the job site (33%). Furthermore, respondents want to live near the market / mall (2%), close to religious facilities (4%), close to recreational facilities (4%).

Table 5. The Desire of Stage Life Family to Accessibility

| Stage Life Family | Proximity to work (X5.1) | Proximity to market (X5.2) | Proximity to public transportation (X5.3) | Proximity to worship facilities (X5.4) | Proximity to hospital (X5.5) | Proximity to recreation (X5.6) | Proximity to school (X5.7) |
|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Couple stage - no children | 33% | 0% | 59% | 7% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Childbearing family stage, Preschool family stage | 33% | 4% | 46% | 0% | 0% | 9% | 8% |

*Source: Author (2018)*

Based on table 5, respondents who do not have children majority want the proximity public transport (59%) compared to the close to work proximity (33%) and the rest close to worship facilities (7%). Whereas for respondents who already have children (pre-school) the preference tendency of proximity public transport (45%) and proximity close to work (33%).

The desire for accessibility is a form of the accessibility tradeoff. Assuming that the location is considered homogeneous except to the city center. For young families who want to live in the city center or in this case close to the work site with the reason of reducing the time and cost of commuting, of course must be willing to pay for the house with a more expensive price.

3.1.6. Mechanisms of Homeownership Preferences. The majority of respondents who want to buy a house are 96 percent and only 4 percent want to rent. Most respondents who want to buy a house are
96 percent and only 4 percent want to rent. From the results of the study, families who do not have children have a 93% desire to buy and 7% rent.

| Stage Life Family | Mechanisms of Homeownership |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|
|                   | Purchase | Rent |
| Couple stage – no children | 93% | 7% |
| Childbearing - family stage, Preschool family stage | 100% | - |

Source: Author (2018)

Table 6. The Desire of Stage Life Family to Mechanisms of Homeownerships

Based on table 6, whereas families who have had children as a whole want to buy 100%. The desire for home ownership is because it can not only be used but also be invested in the future. For families who want to rent even though the percentage is very small, it is very much influenced by the factors of work location and work that can be transferred or also due to the consideration of the family (child and spouse).

3.1.7. Desire to move. The desire to move has a high enough percentage. From the data collected, respondents who were asked to move were 48 percent and those who were not 51 percent. Respondents who want to move generally have reasons such as currently being a tenant, the desire for a location which is close to the public transportation and work, or a home environment that is uncomfortable or unable to fulfill family activities.

| Stage Life Family | Desire to Move |
|-------------------|----------------|
|                   | Yes | No |
| Couple stage – no children | 56% | 44% |
| Childbearing - family stage, Preschool family stage | 42% | 58% |

Source: Author (2018)

Table 7. The Desire of Stage Life Family to Desire to Move

Based on table 7, comparison of the life cycle, respondents who do not have children who want to move 56 percent versus 44 percent who do not want to move. In contrast to, who already has children wants to move 42 percent compared to 58 percent who do not want to move.

3.2. Discussion
According to Duval, young families are married couples within the stage in the life cycle (Couple stage - no children, Childbearing - family stage, Pre-school family stage) [8]. Homes are vital for young families as Siregar argues that it functions to develop the family psychology in managing their relationships in urban households [9].

In this study, the respondents’ characteristics who tend to prioritize the children needs are the family-oriented groups; if the choice is to remain in the suburban area because they feel comfortable, close to family, generally have lived or were born in Depok are the social prestige oriented group; while for respondents who tend to reside in the city center at an expensive price by considering the location to work or public transportation are part of the consumption oriented lifestyle. By looking at the current phenomenon, e.g. land prices in the city center that are increasingly expensive or the demand for full housing which cannot be fulfilled (trade off) [10].

Generally this desire is related to the perception of those who see the development of Depok City which is increasingly untrained such as an increasing population density but not accompanied by an expansion of roads so that traffic is inevitable. In addition, hopes for young families to want a home with facilities for the needs of children should be a concern for the City of Depok government by
increasing open space as a playground and a place for community interaction.

4. Conclusion
Many respondents want to live in suburban area (Depok) as it is considered more decent and friendly to live, also because they are familiar with the environment especially for those who were born or have lived there for a long time. In addition to being a commuter, there is no difference between the family life cycle and gender in terms of their desire to live close to public transportation. But in the future, the possibility to move to a closer location to work is still a hope especially for women.

A significant difference between families who do not have children and families who have children is the desire for comfort and the environment while families who have children have a better security environment. Furthermore, the desire to move is more desirable by families who do not have children with consideration of the price of the house and work location that I might move and their condition as tenants. Finally, by studying the study of preferences and housing choices, there will be a lot of knowledge and understanding of human behavior to improve the quality of life.
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