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Abstract. Betawi community is the local community in Jakarta, residing in the city since the 17th century. Yet, since 1970s their number has declined significantly, and now it only remains 20% of the Jakarta total population. They have been displaced by several government urban development projects, and have moved to peripheral kampons. Moreover, the displacement of this local community was triggered by gentrification due to the presence of middle-income class (gentrifiers), who come to Jakarta as professional workers, and further demand housing. Gentrifiers prefer to stay in the inner-city kampons to save transportation cost even though the kampons are not equipped proper infrastructures. Then, the gentrifiers renovate the house and shape the physical appearance of the neighbourhood differently. This has made the land price surge, and the competition to occupy house increase. Also, the standard of living has gone up. Many local communities could not adapt with the situation and consequently sold the house to get money; most of them consist of uneducated and unskilled informal workers, who can be included as poor-class. Living in kampons, which are considered as informal settlements, the community do not get any government assistance to improve the neighbourhood quality; hence, the neighbourhood improvement only relies on the gentrifiers. As a result, the displacement continues to occur. Consequently, the Betawi community becomes the most vulnerable in the gentrification process, and are very sensitive to the neighbourhood transformation. Using a case-study research, his paper tries to reveal the relation between the gentrification process in the inner-city kampong and the Betawi community as the vulnerable community. This research focused on Kampong Kramat Asem, Matraman district as densely a populated district in DKI Jakarta Province. Furthermore, field observation and interview were conducted to the local community and gentrifiers to find out the community sensitivity factors and to picture the physical neighbourhood transformation. Moreover, an analysis of population trends was required to figure out displacement process.

1. Introduction

Betawi community has existed in Jakarta since 1673 or the late of 17th century. They resided in many inner-city kampons in Jakarta. Since 1970, their number has declined significantly because of some urban development projects, such as highway, road, and buildings developments. They were evicted to other parts of Jakarta and their previous places were changed into skyscraper offices, parks and other public facilities. Likewise, they have also been displaced along with the influx of newcomers who bought their houses.

The number of newcomers in Jakarta increases every year. It can be seen from the population growth in 2015; it increased by 2% and the total population was 12.7 million at noon and 9.9 million at night [1]. Mostly, newcomers are professional worker; bachelor or master graduated from well-
known university and skilled workers. They prefer to live in inner-city because it has high accessibility to their workplace, whereby they can save their transportation cost. Moreover, they bought houses in the inner-city kampons where the land price is cheaper than the price of new apartment units provided by private developers. Hereafter, they renovated the houses based on their styles and accordance with the number of the family. This renovation has shaped the physical face of the neighbourhood, increased the neighbourhood quality, and risen the land price. However, this situation influenced the existence of the Betawi community. The risen standard of living has given great pressures to the Betawi community, whom can be included as the poor or the low-income class in the society. As a result, they sold the house and displaced. The transformations of the physical condition, the pressures on the economic aspects, and the displacement of Betawi community indicate that the gentrification have occurred in the kampons. In this case, the gentrification is caused by the increasing demand of housing and the competition to occupy houses.

Gentrification is considered as a transformation of the neighbourhood process which is faced by almost all of big cities [2]. It has two sides; the positive side is in the term of physical neighbourhood improvement, whereas the negative side is in the context of displacement of the local community [3]. However, the improvement of the neighbourhood cannot be perceived by all of the community; it is only experienced by the newcomer (gentrifier), while the local community is displaced.

Gentrification continues to occur, signed by the displacement of the local community; however, the government has done nothing to respond this along with the neighbourhood upgrading level. Who gets benefits from all of these conditions? In the gentrification process, the local community is often neglected and have no bargaining power. Living in the kampons since they were born with all of their extended family is their desire. Yet, the economic pressure has caused them sell the house; working in informal sectors with salary of less than 2 million rupiah has made them unable to adapt with the increasing living standard. This community has become the most vulnerable actors in the gentrification process.

2. The definition of vulnerability
There are many definitions of vulnerability from various perspectives; namely, social, economic, politic, and technology. Vulnerability can be described as a condition where a person or a community is powerless, insecure and exposed to risk, shocks and stress [4]. The vulnerability level is difficult to assess because it is not in mathematic or statistic form; it is more complex and related to social relations and economic dynamics [5].

Vulnerability is related to risks and hazards that are addressed differently among communities; it is seen from the community’s readiness in facing the hazards, ability to adapt, and capacity to rise from the problems. Generally, in urban development, poor people tend to be vulnerable because they do not have affordability to bargain with the changes of situation. Yet, it does not mean that vulnerable community always have to be poor.

In this paper, the vulnerability assessment adopted the vulnerability and capacity analysis ([6] that consists of three principles. First, material or physical vulnerability can be seen from the vulnerability of finance, food, land, jobs and access to loan. Second, the social institutional vulnerability is observed from social networking, family bonding and family welfare institutional. Third, the attitude or the motivational vulnerability consist of self-confidence, authority and affordability. Besides, it is important to identify the community adaptation related to the transformation of the neighbourhood as one of the vulnerability parameters [7].

3. Gentrification Definition and Implications
Most metropolitan cities are experiencing gentrification process, which is a part of a city’s life cycle [2]. Having dissimilar entities and characteristics makes the gentrification process and implication different in each area [8]. Gentrification is a displacement process and neighbourhood transformation caused by an intervention of the government, private developers, or individual renovator [9]. Government intervention can be seen by giving incentives (low tax development activities, housing
loan, and low property tax), while private developers activities which triggers gentrification include developing new residential areas and redeveloping business districts of inner-city. Individual renovators’ role in the gentrification process can be seen in the form of the housing demolition and redevelopment, individual’s preference, and life style.

Giving incentives in the form of lower tax for development activities, housing loan, and low property tax are some incentives from the government related to urban development. It can be inferred from the previous statement that it is not only government who can be a pioneer but also private developers who build the neighbourhood. The pioneer of gentrification can also be many actors, resulting from the elaboration of the private developers’ attitude, government’ policies and also housing market. Furthermore, this elaboration leads to the economic growth of the neighbourhood, which is followed by the social transformation.

Gentrification occurs in inner-cities inhabited by low-income class who had low economic (financial) capability to improve their house and the neighbourhood. Moreover, the lack of facilities and infrastructure worsens the neighbourhood quality. Then the government with its urban development projects also influences the values of the neighbourhood. This situation attracts gentrifiers to stay; consequently, their number increases every year and they displace the local community.

The displacement of the local community (low-income class) and the transformation of economic, social, and physical condition of the neighbourhood are the signs of gentrification. Some gentrifying neighbourhoods can also be distinguished by the range of the location from the CBD (two miles); this includes inner-city, land tenure, land use, and community’s characteristics such as income, educational background, and job [10].

The perceived implication of the gentrification can be considered as the two sides of a coin; there are positive implications and negative implications. On one side, the improved neighbourhood quality, new job variations, and economic growth are considered as positive implications, whereas on the other side, the displacement of the local community, the uncontrolled surge of land price and land rent, the land speculators, and the extinction of the local culture are the negative implications. These implications affect the community differently with respect to gender, educational backgrounds, races, ages, incomes, and community relationship [11]. The low-income class and women are the most vulnerable actors in the gentrified neighbourhood, especially in the displacement process.

4. Research Method

A single case study strategy was used in this research, taking Kampong Kramat Asem as the research location. This research emphasized on how the Betawi people as the local community got displaced and became the most vulnerable actor in the gentrified neighbourhood. The vulnerability of Betawi community was seen from their displacement, the community’s sensitivity factors and their adaptation, as well as the dimensions of vulnerability. The displacement analysis concerned with the justification and the reasons why the Betawi community decided to sell their houses or to stay in the kampong; it was revealed from the financial affordability (income), the community relationship, and job. Meanwhile, the community’s sensitivity was focused on the main aspect that made the Betawi people susceptible in the gentrification process, the community’s adaptation concerning with how the Betawi people who stayed in the kampong adapted with the new neighbours, new lifestyle, and new physical appearance of the kampong. Then, the dimension of vulnerability was seen as the stages of gentrification process.

A depth-interview was conducted to collect data related to the community’s (i.e. the Betawi people’s and gentrifiers’) perception and the local government’s perspective on the gentrification process. Some interviewees were chosen, including both Betawi people who stayed in kampong and Betawi people who moved from the kampong, gentrifiers, the head of the kampong, and the head of the village. The key person of this depth-interview was the head of the kampong, which then snowballed to others. Moreover, field observation was also conducted to clarify the physical transformation of the kampong, the community’s relationship, and the community’s (cultural)
activities. Besides, secondary data were also collected from some government institutions such as East Jakarta Central Bureau of Statistics and Utan Kayu Selatan district office.

The descriptive qualitative method was used to reveal the community’s adaptation and perception on the gentrification. Moreover, statistical data were also used to enrich and to support the analysis.

5. Gentrification in Kampong Kramat Asem: an overview

Kampong Kramat Asem is one of the urban kampongs in Jakarta which experienced gentrification. This kampong is constituted a part of Utan Kayu Selatan village, Matraman sub-district, East Jakarta municipality. The Utan Kayu Selatan village is 1.12 km² wide, whereas kampong Kramat Asem is 143.165 m² wide [5]. This village consists of 174 RT (Rukun Tetangga) and 14 RW (Rukun Warga). Having a good connection and accessibility to both Jakarta’s downtown (7.9 km) and Jakarta’s peripheral areas is the main pulling factor that attracts gentrifiers to reside in these kampongs. It is not only passed by the public transport (bus rapid transit – TransJakarta) but also by the highway access.

Kampong Kramat Asem has already existed before Indonesian Independence Day (1945). Based on the history, in 1920 there was an Asem Tree (a Tamarind Tree), which was considered sacred by the Betawi community. Hence, this kampong was named Kramat Asem. Yet, in 1970s there was a land acquisition by the central government for road and government buildings development. Some parcels of land of the community, open space, the Asem tree and the sacred grave were included as redevelopment areas. As a consequence, there was no identity of the kampong and the community lost their belief related to tree and the grave. Only few of Betawi old generation keep their belief by putting some flowers and sesajen (the ritual offering) in previous location of the grave. At this moment, the Asem tree and grave location has changed into a mosque, an Islamic boarding school, and tenements.

Concerning the number of the population, this kampong has the highest share of population in Matraman sub-district (24%) with 43,396 people in 2011. This number consists of Betawi people (25%) and gentrifiers. In detail, the gentrifiers are the professional workers, the Betawi people worked as employees, labours, and small-scale entrepreneurs. These small-scale entrepreneurs use the front part of their houses as stalls for selling traditional foods, snacks, and small grocery stores. The number of Betawi people in the kampong continues to decline along with the presence of gentrifiers.

Figure 1. Research Location; Kampong Kramat Asem [12]

The land use pattern is dominated by settlements; informal settlements with an organic pattern. Since 2005, many houses have changed from settlements into offices, particularly on the main
kampong street. The facilities provided are limited, such as a mosque and a community hall that is also used as a kindergarten. Likewise, the infrastructures are also limited to street and drainage, while water and waste infrastructure were provided by the community itself. Furthermore, the open space in this kampong is in the form of kampong street, whereas the green open space is very limited (less than 10%). Some fields exist in the kampong, yet they are used as parking lots for the gentrifiers who did not have carport in their houses. Hence, the children do not have playground and use roadside as the playground.

This kampong was chosen to study because of some reasons. First, the displacement of Betawi people as the local community from their hometown where they were born, grew up, married, and had their own family. They were replaced by the gentrifiers from various cities in Indonesia who had dissimilar educational backgrounds, jobs, and lifestyle. Second, the kampong resides in the strategic location with high accessibility. Further, the demand of the land in the area has also increased. Third, this kampong is considered as one of the dense kampons in the dense sub-district.

6. The Vulnerability of Betawi Community

6.1 The decreasing Number of Betawi Population; The Consequences of Displacement

Displacement is a direct implication of gentrification, which transforms the social, economic, and physical structures of a neighbourhood. The Betawi community could not avoid the displacement process, which as though a “natural” occurrence. On one hand, there was no pressure and no compulsion for the Betawi people to sell their houses: they even felt that they had been helped by the gentrifiers who were willing to buy their houses. It was not easy to sell the house without legal land certificate. In addition, houses in kampons were not equipped with proper water and waste infrastructures, suffering flood annually, and located in narrow alleys. On the other hand, gentrifiers preferred to stay in accessible areas, which does not only mean less traffic jams, but also better access to good public transport connections. Therefore, they were willing to accept the inconvenience to stay in the kampong [13]. As a consequence of displacement, the number of Betawi people in Kampung Kramat Asem continues to decrease, along with the increasing number of gentrifiers who move there. The Betawi population was replaced by gentrifiers coming from Sumatra, Java, and Borneo islands.

However, there are differences related with the displacement influence to the Betawi people. Generally, Betawi people are respectively classified into orang gedong and orang kampong. While orang gedong are considered as rich Betawi people who are landlords that occupy broad land and big houses (more than 100 m²), orang kampong are categorized as the poor Betawi people who stay in small houses. The dissimilarities of gentrification influence between Betawi gedong and Betawi kampong can be seen from the job variations and inhabitation preference.

The presence of the gentrifiers in the kampong who renovate the house, and improve the neighbourhood physically has significantly increased the land price and housing rent started due to the high demand. This situation is perceived by the Betawi people as an opportunity to get profit as much as possible. They start to sell their houses to the gentrifiers; they move to other kampons in Bekasi, Bogor, or Tangerang, which are included as Jakarta’s peripheral area. This displacement can be included as a voluntary displacement [14] since there is not any pressure from others to sell their houses and they really want to gain profit. Most of orang gedong sell their house and buy broader land in their new places, and then build new houses with some tenements. Renting tenements becomes their “new” job, which can increase their incomes. This situation is not found among orang kampong because they only have small houses- the one and only property they have. Also, they must share this property with all of the family members that usually consists of five siblings. They cannot afford to buy new houses in the new places. Moreover, most of orang kampong’s houses are located in the densed and narrow alleys (in Asem Gede 1 Street), so it was more difficult for them to sell the houses because less people want to buy them. This is different with orang gedong’s houses that are situated in the kampong main street (Asem Gede 2 Street), and hence have higher values.
The orang gedong’s houses are offered to the gentrifiers individually. This means the houses are not sold in groups, such as simultaneously putting one block houses on sale. Instead, each year, the houses are sold one by one. The housing sale is also influenced by the relocation the work place. DKI Jakarta government’s regulation allocates the sites for industries and companies to the peripheral areas because they attempt to reduce the density and congestion in the inner-city. It can also be triggered by the development of peripheral areas by considering the development of these industries and companies as the new growth centre. Living close to the work place is preferable for the orang gedong so that they choose to sell their houses in the inner-city kampungs.

Different situation is found among orang kampongs who sell their houses. Selling the houses is their last option when they do not have any options. Some of them may need money to pay the hospital fee when they are sick, or to fulfil their daily needs as their income as labourers is not enough, and some of them may be stuck in debt with high interest either to private or individual moneylenders. Given the choice to relocate, some of them move to other peripheral kampungs and try to find a new job while others choose to stay in rented houses in kampong Kramat Asem because they do not want to lose their job; they realize that it is difficult for them to find new jobs. It is really ironic that they must stay in rented houses in their previous places (which is their home town). Besides, some of orang kampongs who sell the house choose to buy affordable new houses in other inner-city kampungs (located adjacent with kampong Kramat Asem) even when the new houses have no clear status (they do not have legal land certificates). Most of these people are food street vendors that run their business in kampong Kramat Asem.

Most of Betawi people are uneducated and unskilled because of their low awareness to the education. Moreover, the women are marginalized, which makes the women position in the community very susceptible. They are considered as the families’ guardians who must do all of house chores, such as cooking, washing all of family clothes, and cleaning the house. Going to school is the last option for them, which is not prioritized because it will be useless; they will not go work and will only become housewives. Thus, their educational background is unimportant. This situation is faced by both the orang gedong women and orang kampong women. While educations for the Betawi’s men are slightly similar with the women; they go to school until they only graduate from the elementary or junior high school. Then, they must work; feed all of the family and fulfil all of their big

![Figure 2. Total Population by ethnic in Kramat Asem](image-url)

(in terms of percentage) [12]
family daily needs. Less education and less skill make the job occupancy very limited for them. Whereas orang gedongs choose to have their own small business by using their family financial support, the orang kampons work as public transportation drivers who may not have any driving license, illegal parking attendants, and motorcycle taxi drivers. Yet, after the presence of the gentrifiers, the new jobs offered changes, such as the gentrifiers’ drivers, gardeners, and housemaids (for women). Therefore, the replacement of the community shapes the job variation, which also increases the number of Betawi women workers. Previously, most of orang kampong women were housewives who spent their whole day at home. Currently, however, many of them work as gentrifiers’ housemaids. The reason is not only because their “work places” are very close to home, but also because they can contribute to increase the family income.

6.2 Sensitivity Factors of Betawi’s Community
The rise of middle-income class in Indonesia since 1998 has influenced various new job vacancies offered in inner-cities, including Jakarta. Besides, the shift from manufactured industry to service-based industry has also demanded new workers suitable for the jobs. Consequently, the Betawi people who are mostly less educated and less skilled could not be absorbed in this type of jobs. Therefore, many young professionals from other cities come to Jakarta to pursue this jobs. Residing in inner-city houses close to the workplaces is preferable for them. Hence, they choose to stay in inner-city kampons where the land price and the rent are still affordable.

The increased land price and housing rent make the properties in the kampons high in demand. Realizing this opportunity, many Betawi people sell their houses to the gentrifiers to get profit, while the gentrifiers capture this situation to invest as much as possible; they buy their second or even their third house from Betawi people, and then renovate it as boarding houses or tenements. Then, the gentrifiers become land speculator who try to buy the Betawi people’s houses. The rented houses or tenements in the kampong Kramat Asem are high in demand. This can be seen from the current rented houses and tenements that are always fully occupied. The rent price started from one million rupiahs to two million rupiahs per month per room; the gentrifiers can have more than ten rented rooms. Renting rooms or tenements is the gentrifiers’ side income because they still work in formal sectors.

Theoretically, gentrification can be caused by the rent gap [2]; the significant range between existing rent price (land price) and the potential rent price that could be got. The rent gap in Kampong Kramat Asem is captured by the gentrifiers as the opportunity to gain additional income and as an investment. The land price in kampong Kramat Asem is lower than the land in other inner-city kampons. It is not only caused by the fact that kampong is not equipped with proper infrastructures, but also by the fact that most of the Betawi community who do not have any legal land certificates. Then, it makes the land value decline; the buyers take a high risk if they buy land with no legal land certificate because they are vulnerable to face land disputes. Yet, the gentrifiers are willing to accept this risk and prioritize more on the profit than can be gained. Previously, the gentrifiers bought the Betawi’s people house for 150,000 rupiah per m² in the 1980s, which became up to 1 million rupiahs in 1990s [15]. In 2016, the land price jumped into 12 million - 16 million rupiahs per m².

Many Betawi kampong people cannot stand in their kampong and sell the house because they are poor. Most of them work in informal sectors as a handyman, freelance drivers, labourers, and housemaids. Gaining income of less than 2 million rupiah/month is really difficult to fulfil all of their daily needs. As the standard of living in the kampong rises along with the improvement of the physical neighbourhood by the gentrifiers, it becomes more difficult for the Betawi kampong people to survive. The poverty makes them very vulnerable to get displaced in the gentrification process. Although not all of the vulnerable community is a poor community, the poor community is more vulnerable than other income class. Vulnerability is categorized as the central element of poverty [16]. Poverty, low education, and no legal land certificate make their bargaining position in the neighbourhood low. Similarly, they have less bargaining position when they sell the houses to gentrifiers.
However, the most vulnerable community in gentrification process is the Betawi kampong people who reside in the kampong. They live with all of their extended family; i.e. grandparents, parents, siblings, uncles, and aunts, in an inherited house; there are more than 7 people in a house, which is less than 70 m² wide in a very dense and narrow alley. They have no choice other than staying in the kampong because if they sell the house they must divide the money to all of the siblings and it will not be enough to buy a new house. Most of their time is used to work, even not only in one job but also second or third job. For instance, they work as handymen in the morning until afternoon, and then as drivers (taxi bike) from afternoon until midnight. Most of their kids are elementary school dropout and choose to make money as motorcycle and car washer, labourers, and illegal parking attendants. Selling the house to fulfil their daily needs is the last option for them.

Likewise, Betawi kampong people who stay are also vulnerable in social aspects. Working almost all day makes them have less time to have social relationship with their family and their neighbours; they participate less in community activities. Previously, Betawi people were well-known as a community that had strong relationship and preserved their culture; they have their own language, food, custom home, custom clothes, performances (ondel-ondel and rebana) and traditional dances. Now, preserving the culture is considered as a waste of money, so that they prefer to skip the cultural ceremonies in some community activities. Similarly, the Betawi gedong people have also started to leave the cultural ceremonies because most of them are married to people from other tribes who have different cultures. Therefore, they prefer to choose modern style for their wedding ceremonies, invite modern music performances (pop or dangdut band) in the community activities rather than ondel-ondel or rebana performances.

The low Betawi’s cultural preservation and the weak community relationship are not only influenced by the money that they must spend and the limited time, but also by the gentrifiers’ lifestyle. As a middle-income class, the gentrifiers preferred to have modern and individualistic lifestyle. They prefer to have interaction with other members of middle-income class. In addition, the television programs, internet, and other social media have also blown up the news about celebrities
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**Figure 3. Sensitivity Factor of the Vulnerable Betawi Community**
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with their modern and up to date styles. Hence, the Betawi people are affected by this modern lifestyle which is seen as update preferences.

6.3 Dimensions of Vulnerability
In this research, the dimensions of vulnerability are seen from the gentrification implication to the Betawi community. Betawi people’s houses are gradually sold, one house at a time. When a house is offered to sell today, next couple of months or next couple of years, other houses are offered. The house are not simultaneously sold in blocks; instead, a unit at a time is offered. The sold houses are then renovated by the gentrifiers and consequently change the physical appearance of the neighbourhood. The new rent houses and tenements replace the previous houses. This has not only changed the housing functions but has also generated new sources of income (economically).

The improvement of the physical appearance leads to the increased price of land and housing rent. Subsequently, the standard of living has also risen. Moreover, the Betawi people are influenced by the modern lifestyle, which affects their orientation of job, education, and health. Besides, the DKI Jakarta’s government are more concerned to improve the community’s quality by giving Jakarta’s Smart Card (KJP) and Jakarta’s Health Card (KJS) for the low-income class, including the Betawi kampong people. The Betawi people start to realize the necessity of having a health insurance, because they do not want to face the same problem as the previous generations of Betawi kampong people who sold the houses to pay the hospital fee.

Furthermore, the DKI Jakarta’s government is concerned to improve the community’s education by giving the Jakarta’s Smart Card (KJP), which is similar to a debit card with some balance, for students from poor families. They can use the money to buy shoes, uniforms, bags, other school supplies, and even nutritious food. Yet, dropped out kids from the second grade of elementary school are still found in kampong Kramat Asem. Unfortunately, the Betawi kampong people are still less concerned with education. Besides, the marriage of young couples (youth aged less than 20 years) are also still found among Betawi kampong people. School dropouts and early-age marriage force them to work in a narrow job choice. Hence, they are still included as poor families, and unfortunately this pattern also applies to their next generation.

![Figure 4. The Dimensions of Vulnerability [17]](image-url)
6.4 The Betawi Community’s Adaptation

Living with new neighbours coming from other cities, other islands, and other cultures makes Betawi kampong people try to adapt. Moreover, being shifted from the majority population to becoming the minority population has also influenced their way of life. Previously, there was a strong social bonding among these Betawi people; they used to consider all of Betawi people as a part of extended family in that they usually shared food, drinks, and money. They used to have outdoor activities with other Betawi neighbours for chatting, playing, and gossiping at the weekends. Nowadays, most of their gentrifiers neighbours have high fenced houses and keep their door closed almost all day long. Somehow, some of them do not know each other; the name, the job, and the family. Yet, this situation does not cause the social gap or social conflict because the Betawi people have the flexibility to adapt with the changes; they try to understand why their gentrifiers neighbours cannot attend the community meetings. This understanding happens because the gentrifiers have also tried to contribute to the community by giving some money to support the community activities; something that is difficult to do for the Betawi people.

Considering the continuous decline of their number in Jakarta, the Betawi people try to maintain their existence. Jakarta is their home town, so that they prefer to live there, and even become leaders for the newcomers. Therefore, many Betawi community organizations have established media for the Betawi people to discuss and cooperate. Through these organizations, they struggle to become the householders (hosts) in their own (previous) land even though their number has decreased and they become the minority in their own homeland. Yet, these organizations are somehow misused by the political powers. As a result, there have been some conflicts between the Betawi people in these organizations with other communities. However, declaring and getting involved in some Betawi community institutions show that they adapt with the changes in their city.

Moreover, the presence of gentrifiers in their neighbourhood has changed the job orientation of the Betawi people. Previously, among the Betawi people, mostly only men worked, whereas the women stayed at home and did household chores. Yet, along with the rising standard of living, these women have tried to work to help fulfill their family financial needs. Almost all of gentrifiers women are workers so they need help from others to do the household chores. Then, many Betawi kampong women work as housemaids for the gentrifier families from 8.00 in the morning until 14.00 in the afternoon. The gentrifiers often give extra money to their housemaids; they also support the housemaids’ children school by giving money to buy the new uniform, new shoes, new bags, and nutritional foods for the kids. The variation of jobs have also been experienced by the men of Betawi people; they ask to be gentrifiers’ drivers, gardeners, or painters of the houses.

The adaptation of the Betawi people have also been found in lifestyle; they are tempted by the consumerism lifestyle. It is because the gentrifiers’ influencethat mostly are university graduates and hold modern lifestyle; they prefer using the latest mobile phone models and cars, wearing branded clothes, bags, and shoes, shopping to supermarkets to traditional markets, going to restaurants to cooking at home, and going picnic to other cities and even to overseas. Likewise, most of the television programs and social media have also showed the modern lifestyle, which tend to promote consumerism. The Betawi people also prefer adapting to modern style to preserving cultural patterns, such as in the wedding ceremonies and other community activities. In addition, they preferred shopping at supermarkets to shopping at traditional markets. All in all, they show little effort to preserve their culture.

7. Conclusion

The gentrification in Kampong Kramat Asem occurs gradually. It causes the displacement of the Betawi people. The housing investment has caused the rent gap, which has then triggered the gentrification. The Betawi people, as the Jakarta’s local community who resided in the kampong, become the most vulnerable actor in the gentrification process. This vulnerability shapes not only the physical aspects but also the social and behaviour aspects. The physical vulnerability can be seen from
the Betawi people’s lost residence; they can no longer live in their previous places where they were born, grew up, got married and bore children. They cannot not afford to live in their previous places.

The social vulnerability occurs after the presence of gentrifiers, which has increased significantly and the decline number of the Betawi population. The social bonding among the Betawi people has decreased along with the fact that many Betawi people get married with people from other cities or other islands. Moreover, Betawi people who stay in the kampong spend most of their time to work so that they only have limited time for having social relationship with their neighbours. As a result, the Betawi’s culture start to extinct and get replaced by the modern lifestyle.

Another sign of vulnerability can be observed from the Betawi people’s attitude such as their self-confidence, authority and affordability. Realizing their status as the low-income and less educated community has made the Betawi kampong people choose the gentrifiers as the community leader (head of RT and head of mosque committee). The gentrifiers believe that they can contribute to the improvement of the community and neighbourhood. Considering the kampong development, the gentrifiers always take the Betawi people as their partners to discuss together. Therefore, there has not been any social conflict in the community, which improves the Betawi people’s trust to the gentrifiers.
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