Mapping of Studentification Process in Tembalang Higher Education Area
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Abstract. The development of the University of Diponegoro as one of the biggest universities in Indonesia is signed by the increasing of the students’ number. The increasing of this students’ number has also been followed by the rising of students’ rooms demand and all of students’ facilities. These students resided in the settled settlement that inhabited by the Tembalang’s local community. As a consequence, their existence influences the local community and shapes the neighbourhood differently. Then, it causes the studentification process. Studentification is a process which presence of the students replaces the local community and influences the neighbourhood both in physical and social economic aspect. The identification of studentification in Tembalang was conducted by in-depth interview and field observation. Analysis showed that studentification in Tembalang included as the third wave studentification that signed by a great students’ movement along with campus centralization in Tembalang and many private landlords that invested in boarding house business. Competition to provide the boarding house between the local community, private investors (individual), students’ flat, and a private students’ apartment made the existence of local community more pressed.
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1. Introduction

Based on Semarang’s Spatial Plan Regulation [1], Tembalang district is included as Part of City VI (BWK VI) which has the education activities as the main function. This direction is in accordance to the existing condition that the existence of University of Diponegoro (Undip) which grows as a generator area. Actually, there are other universities in Tembalang, such as Semarang State Polytechnic, University of Pandanaran, and State Institute Health Science, yet Undip is the biggest universities which not only has national service coverage but also has international students.

The existence of University of Diponegoro in Tembalang district influences the local community characteristics. Moreover, ever since the education activities were centralized in Tembalang campus in 2010, Tembalang district grows significantly¹. It can be seen from the rented house (boarding house) demand in Tembalang had also increased, including development of the student-private apartment and campus’student flat development. As a consequence, the land use

¹ Previously, Undip conducted the academic activities in to two campuses that were Pleburan campus and Tembalang campus. Yet, since 2010, all of the bachelor academic activities moved to Tembalang campus. Then, it was only some of vocational schools and master degree academic activities were still used the Pleburan campus.
conversion, the changes of building facade, the changes of land or building owner, and transformation of community’s social economic condition occur in Tembalang district.

Tembalang district becomes one of the most fast growing regions in Semarang city and attract investors to invest. Many people from other districts or other cities bought a house or a parcel of land in Tembalang and built into a boarding house. This is considered as a prospective business. They realized that their properties’ price will be increased every year along with the increasing of the students’ number. Besides, many new facilities developed such Undip’s Hospital (Diponegoro National Hospital - RSND), private apartments, flats, supermarkets that also led the increasing of land price, property tax, and standard of living. As a result, some of the local communities chose to sell their house or their land because they cannot adapt with the changes and they cannot afford to pay the high property tax.

Most of the Tembalang’s local community elementary school graduated and work as trader. Having less income, they rent some of their house’s rooms for students. They really depend on the rented income to fulfil their daily needs (http://bappeda.semarangkota.go.id). More than 70 % of the rented incomes are spent for fulfilling their daily needs, so that they have less money to provide a proper rented room (fewer facilities). Therefore, few students willing to stay in their rented rooms; most of students prefer to stay in a boarding house which is equipped with proper facilities such as free Wi-Fi, room with air conditioner, car parking area, private bath room (not a communal bath room), a clean and modern pantry. Because of their rented rooms do not fully occupied by students; their rented income has also decrease. As a result, they cannot afford to fulfil their daily needs; they cannot improve their rented rooms with the newest facilities. On the other hand, most of the local community’s children still relied on their parents for living; graduated from senior high school they preferred to work as a public transportation driver, online-taxibike, and a trader; and live together with their parents in their rented house. Their rented house cannot compete with others and they had to bear all of the family needed (even for children who already married). As a consequence, one by one Tembalang’s local community sell their house and move to other kampongs in peripheral area such as Meteseh, Kramas, and Mangunharjo district. Their house is then bought by people from other districts or other cities that included as high-income class people. After bought, the house is renovated significantly and equipped with newest facilities.

Displacement of the local community that replaced by the students and the improvement of housing condition and facilities indicated gentrification process. Moreover, gentrification can be seen from the emergence of students which categorized as middle-income group that live in a settled low-income class settlements. Based on the Indonesian Dictionary, gentrification is seen as the middle-high income population mobility to low-income class area which degraded [2]. Likewise, Atkinson stated that gentrification is government or private sector or individual investor intervention in a disinvested neighbourhood then changes the physical, social, and economics of the community [3]. However, Tembalang district do not include as a disinvested area. Therefore, the displacement of local community to peripheral area and replaced by the students and the property owned by high-income class because of the higher education development are categorized as studentification.

The studentification in Tembalang continuous to occur until now and it is beneficial only for the community who have a capital. Furthermore, the local community sell the house gradually and move to peripheral area and make the Semarang city more sprawls. This paper tried to identify the studentification process in Tembalang particularly influenced by Undip development.

2. Problem Statement

High demand of students’ rooms in Tembalang makes the competition to occupy the land increase significantly. The land price jumped into 3,500,000-5,000,000 IDR per meter²; compared to land price in 2010 that was only 1,500,000 IDR per meter² (http://www.urbanindo.com). Likewise, some facilities had also emerged such as supermarkets, cafes, restaurants, and hotels influenced the increasing of land price. Tembalang district is very attractive for investor because of the students’-rooms demand increased every year.
The existence of students in Tembalang and the changes of property ownership from the local community to others influence the neighbourhood. Previously, in 2000s there was a boarding house owner group which held routine meeting every bimonthly to discuss several issues for instance the range of rented price, the boarding house facilities, and other problems related to the community and to the renter (students). Yet, this group does not exist anymore along with the changes of the boarding house owner. Another influencing factor is the economic aspect such as the changes of job opportunities; from the traditional food stall changed into modern and franchise (online) food, from the (conventional) public transport driver to online taxi driver.

Some of the local communities tend to be more conventional so that they difficult to adapt with the changes. They still stand with the conventional food stall even the buyers (students) are limited, they still run their boarding house with less facilities even rarely full occupied. They are less educated and less skilled so that hold on until the limit they cannot survive and sold the house. The increasing students’ numbers do not give important influence for them; they cannot compete with the new boarding house and modern food stall.

Therefore, it can be concluded that studentification in Tembalang changes the community and its neighbourhood. The local community cannot capture the (financial) opportunity along with the increasing of students’ number. The increasing of students’ room demand and all of the students’ facilities and services cannot be provided by the local community, because they are less capital and less skilled. As a result, many people from other districts or other cities capture this opportunity and make the land and property in Tembalang become very demanding. The increasing land price and standard of living make the local community more desperate and finally choose to sell their house.

This paper tried to reveal the studentification process in higher education area like Tembalang. Tembalang was chosen as the research area because of the existence of Undip as one of the biggest universities in Indonesia. Therefore, the students’ number is higher than other universities and its influence is considered more significant to the community and to the neighbourhood.

3. Gentrification and It’s Process

Gentrification is a physical and social economic neighbourhood transformation from degraded or slum to be better. There are several trigger factors that led gentrification, for instance, the kampong improvement program and kampong revitalization conducted by the government or by private institutions. Likewise, the individual renovator (the community) who renovates the house and enhances the quality of the neighbourhood has also included as the actor of gentrification [4]. Atkinson stated that gentrification is a settlement transformation because of some interventions and indicated by the local community displacement [3].

Generally, gentrification occurs in inner-city where it is inhabited by the local community that included as the low-income class. They have low affordability to improve their house and their neighbourhood because of financial limitation [4]. Therefore, the area becomes slum, disinvested, and the rent-gap found there; unbalance situation between the land value that should be high because located in inner-city but it has low price, since it is categorized as slum area. Capturing this situation the government redeveloped the neighbourhood by developing an economic centre (a central trade zone) and some public-services buildings. As a consequence, the neighbourhood appearance changed, the land price and tax property increased, it makes the local community cannot stay in their previous settlement [5]. Then they sold the house and displaced.

The displacement of the local community is considered as a negative implication of the gentrification; the low-income community loses their right to reside in a place where they were born and grew up. On the other hand, the improved neighbourhood with proper facilities, high land value, and new jobs opening are considered as the positive implications of gentrification [6]. However, the new job opportunities cannot be captured by the local community because it needs specified skills [7]. Subsequently, there are many young professional workers from other cities come to the area to fulfil the jobs. The housing demand in the inner-city increased and the housing rent price also increased. Later on, the standard of living followed increased makes the local community cannot adapt with this situation and displaced [8].
4. Studentification

Gentrification mutates over time due to many perspectives, one of the mutations is studentification (see Table 1) [9]. Studentification led by the emergence of students in a settled neighbourhood that situated in education area [10]. Generally, it is found in a low-income class settlement which changed into luxurious boarding houses; residential function transformed into HMO (Housing on Multiple Occupancy). Then, the students influence the community in physical, cultural, and social economic aspects [9].

| Aspect       | Gentrification                           | Studentification                           |
|--------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Location     | An disinvested area in inner-city        | An area surround education area            |
| Process      | Displacement occurred gradually          | Occurred faster because of students’ resided in short period of time |
| Landuse      | Changed from settlement function to mixed use (settlement, commercial, offices,) | Changed from settlement to HMO            |
| Economic     | New job variations, increased standard of living | Students’ service and commercial activities |
| Social       | Modern and consumptive lifestyle, a permissive community | Student-cultural lifestyle, transformation of population composition and structure |

*Source: Moos, Revington, Wilkin, Andrey, 2018*

Studentification process is started by the presence of students in a settlement inhabited by the local community. They live in the local community settlement and make the local community displaced. Moreover, the students’ number increase every year that is led the students’ room demand also surge. They reside in s settled settlement because the university did not provide students’ flat, or the university has provided the students’ flat yet the number cannot cover all of students’ room demand. As a consequence, the students look for rooms in a private boarding house. The first wave of studentification was signed by the research that emphasized on HMO-Housing on Multiple Occupancy; many local community houses changed from residential used into mixed use. Whereas second wave studentification concerned on PBSA-Purpose-built Student Accommodation, which was signed by the improvement of students’ room and provided by complete facilities, the third wave of studentification was seen from increasing number of the private landlords who competed in providing the boarding house [11].

5. Community’s characteristics in Studentificated Area

In gentrification process the newcomer is not always middle-income class, but also high-income class [12], in studentification process the newcomer is students that mostly from middle-high income families. They prefer to stay in luxurious boarding house with modern and complete facilities. The students (studentifiers) are the main actor that lead studentification and shape the community in social economic aspect. Yet their existence does not give a significant influences in new houses development (housing supply), because what they need are a rented room nor a house [13].

Generally, the local community in studentified area was working-class group (low-income class). They have also played role in boarding house supply, yet in a minimum quality (fewer facilities served). Most of them relied on the room rented money to fulfil their daily life needs. Furthermore, they do not have any savings for a boarding house or room rented maintenances and improvements. On the other hand, the students (the renter) did not responsible for the rooms’ maintenance so that they tend to be more careless regarded to the property. As an implication, the rooms became less well maintained and less desirable by the students [10]. This situation continues to happen and makes the local community cannot survive in the neighbourhood. Then they sell the house and move to
another kampong in peripheral area. The buyers are mostly high-income class who worked as professional and lived in inner-city.

6. Research Method

This research used qualitative method to reveal the studentification process that emphasized in the realities exploration so that can be known the comprehensive understanding about the phenomena [14]. The community’s perceptions and preferences were explored by conducting in-depth interview. This interview used snow-ball sampling that taken the district and community leader (KepalaKecamatan and KepalaKelurahan) as the key persons. Moreover, there were other interviewees such as the local community who have already resided and run the boarding house business (five persons), the “new” owner of the boarding house that bought the local community house (five persons), and students (as a renter) who already stay in the same boarding house at least 1 year (five persons). Whereas the field observation was conducted to gain data about the land use conversion, boarding house’s condition and quality, and community’s social economic activities. The secondary data obtained from Tembalang district office and Semarang’s Statistical Bureau were needed to get monographic data. The descriptive qualitative analysis method used to describe the studentification process in Tembalang. Moreover, this research had also used spatial analysis-map overlay method, to describe the development of Tembalang Undip campus, the development of students’ accommodation, and the studentification process.

7. Tembalang Higher Education Development

Based on government policy, education activities are directed in Semarang’s peripheral area such as Tembalang district. It is intended as an economic generator so that can activate the economic growth and reach the equitable development; the development does not center in the inner-city only. Moreover, most of Tembalang communities are included as low-income class so that this development addressed to enhance the community economic. The university plays a major role in the development of Tembalang and the community, not only because of the students that need rooms and facilities but also Undip’s development policy that expand the campus by developing several new facilities. The university is considered as a booster of the economic development of its surrounds [11].

Tembalang higher education area is situated in Tembalang district and covers two sub districts that are Tembalang sub district and Bulusan sub district. The determination of these sub districts is considered by the area which taken the significant influence from the higher education activities, for instance, the massive development of boarding houses, the emergence of HMOs, and development of many students’ facilities.

Established since 1957, Undip is located in main Tembalang district area with 7,685 hectares. Previously, Undip was divided the education activities into two campuses; one campus in Plebaran district was used for four faculties (diploma, bachelor, master, and doctoral degrees), seven faculties were in campus Tembalang (for bachelor degree only). In 2010, the Rector of Undip decided to remove most of the education activities to Tembalang campus. There were several reasons of this decision, such as the efficiency of the teaching and learning process and limitation of Pleburan campus development (Plebaran campus situated in Semarang city-center so that very difficult to expand the development) (see Figure 1).

In 2018, Undip has 11 faculties, 2 (vocational) schools, and 43,157 students (www.undip.ac.id). The students’ number that enrolled to Undip increased every year; in 2018 the students that chosen Undip in national selection into state universities (SBMPTN) reached 21,257 persons and 10,000 persons accepted as Undip’s student.

The campus removal decision and the increasing of students generated the massive development of boarding house. Moreover, there were many new facilities built: commercial and public service. Along with the Medical Faculty removal to Tembalang, Undip had also established the Diponegoro National Hospital in 2014. This hospital does not only serve the Undips’ employees but also open for public. It attracts more people to come to Tembalang.
Figure 1. Undip’s Development; comparing Undip development between 2007 and 2017 which some building built such as student’s flats, student center, Faculty of economic and business, Diponegoro national Hospital, Faculty of cultural science, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Social and Political Science, and Faculty of Medicines

8. Studentification Process in Tembalang Higher Education Area

The studentification process in Tembalang started since the campus removal in 2014. There were around 3,000 students moved from Pleburan campus to Tembalang campus. As a consequence, the students’ room demand increased significantly. Moreover, the students did not only from the diploma and bachelor degrees, but also master and doctoral students. These master and doctoral students have the dissimilar preferences with the diploma and bachelor students related to the rooms and facilities. It is because most of master and doctoral students have already held a settled job; they have monthly income so that they prefer to stay in comfort boarding house with complete facilities. Moreover, some of these students have been married and have children that accompany them while studying in Undip. Therefore, they need a boarding house or a house that can accommodate their family needs.

Undip students does not only come almost from entire Indonesia cities, but also international students. This is along with Undip vision that is becoming a top research university not only in national level but also international level. Since 2011, Undip has started to accept international students and the number of these international students increased every year; not only bachelor degree’s students but also master degree’s students. The international students’ preferences are different from local (Indonesian) students related to the room and the facilities.

8.1 Boarding House Development in Tembalang

The boarding house development in Tembalang started to grow along the main street; Sirajudin Street, Banjarsari Street, and Prof. Soedarto Street in 2000s. Besides, there were several boarding house areas, such as Baskoro, Iwenisari, Tanjungsari, Jatimulyo, and Bulusan. On the other hand, the areas that precisely closed to the campus were less demanding and less developed. It is because these areas do not have good connection with public transportation. Moreover, education activities in Undip are limited from 08.00 am until 17.00 pm. After these activities finished, the campus and surrounds were less quiet. Likewise, the public transportation was operated until 17.00 pm (see Figure 2).
The situation changed after the Pleburan campus activities moved to Tembalang campus. Increasing of students who need rooms make the boarding house development spread over Tembalang areas. In 2000s, Mulawarman Street, previously dominated as agricultural function (80%) converted into boarding house, coffee shop, conventional food stall and HMOs. The land conversion trend in Mulawarman heads to south (away from campus); because of land price reason that lower than north area. Moreover, the growth of Mulawarman Street is along with the highway development that connected Semarang-Solo and Semarang-Yogyakarta. The rest agricultural land in this area was 30% in 2018. As a result, the boarding house development in this area is not only occurred in the main street but also spread over Mulawarman area. Likewise, the growth of conventional food stalls and small grocery stores spread over the area followed the boarding house growth, the coffee shop and

Since 1990s, Baskoro area was known as boarding house area, yet less desirable. Now, it becomes one of demanding areas because very close to the Faculty of Law and Faculty of Social and Political Sciences. There is also a shortcut street (in a good condition) that connected from Baskoro to other faculties.

Figure 2. Students’ Accommodation development surrounds

...
restaurant growth along the Mulawarman main street (see Figure 3). The spread growth is influenced by the good accessibility (good street condition), good lighting, the boom of online taxibike, and increasing of motorcycle used by the students.

Similarly, the boarding house development in Timoho and Prof Soedarto Street area spread over the area. Education activities in Undip are ended at 9 pm, so the students’ mobilization is also finished in the same time. Therefore, boarding house demand that closed to campus increased which some students preferred on foot for going to campus. Some students had also chosen to use bicycle to go to campus. Undip supported the use of bicycle by providing the bicycle track (line) in 2012; Undip had also has around 800 bicycles that can be rented by the students or lecturers or other Undip employees.

Based on interview to the students and field observation, it was found that the most demanding area for boarding house were located in Tembalang main street such as Sirajudin Street and Banjarsari Street. A good accessibility and availability of many facilities (such as food stalls and photocopy stalls) are the reasons why students prefer to stay in boarding house located in these streets. However, the luxurious and modern boarding house does not concentrate in these streets only. It’s spread over the Bulusan, Timoho, Iwenisari, Mulawarman, and Baskoro areas. Therefore, highest room’s rented price did not only found in the two main streets but also spread out over the Tembalang areas (see Figure 4).

Students who stayed in a boarding house along the local street revealed that most of boarding house along the main streets did not provide car parking lots. It expressed by the students who owned (ride) car. The boarding house in some kampong alleys with car parking lots are mostly rented rooms with a larger size than boarding house in the main streets. The vacant land availability became the reason why the boarding house along the main streets cannot expand their property.
8.2 Studentification Stages

Studentification started by the presence of students as the newcomer in a settled settlement. Their existence influences the neighbourhood, while in physically aspect it can be seen from the space use changed from residential into HMOs, commercial used, and services used, the social economic aspect signed by the economic activities that mostly accommodate the students’ needs. In population composition, it is dominated by the students, while the local community number decreased along with the space use transformation.

The first wave of studentification is signed by the boarding houses or rented rooms provision [11]. After Undip developed Tembalang campus, there was a big population of (students) movement in Tembalang. The rented rooms demand increased dramatically; the local community use a half of their house to be rented. The boarding house or rented rooms was provided in modest way; furnished by a bed, a cupboard, a table and a chair, a communal bath room, and a communal pantry. It was rarely found a rented room that equipped with air conditioner, car parking lots, private bath room, and Wi-Fi (the usage of internet was limited and still used personal computer). The provision of boarding houses adjusted with the financial capability of the local community that included as low-income class. This situation found in 1990s until 2000s.

After all of education activities are centralized in Tembalang campus, the great students’ mobilization occurred for the second time. Then, it marked the second wave of studentification. There were many options for students to choose the preferable boarding house. Many luxurious and modern boarding houses with complete facilities offered. Competition in the provision of boarding houses was indirectly occurred. The local community still stand by providing the modest boarding house, whereas many individual investors from other areas offered boarding house with the modern facilities. Students’ preference referred to the boarding house with many facilities because it means that they did
not need to pay more to get facilities from outside. For instance, to support their academic activities, they needed a good internet connection. Therefore, they preferred to choose the boarding house that provided high-speed Wi-Fi connection (free), even the rented price is more expensive. As a consequence, boarding houses that did not provide free Wi-Fi connection for the renter started to abandon. It made most of the local community’s boarding house did not fully occupy. Then, it made their income significantly decreased and some of them chosen to sell the house and moved. Moreover, there were several institutions or other regency governments that provided free rented rooms for their local students, such as government of Aceh and Papua Province. This situation made competition on boarding house provision increased.

In 2011, Undip built students’ flat that addressed for accommodating the first semester students for one year only. Likewise, in 2017, Undip had also developed one more students’ flat that was granted from Ministry of Public Works. The existence of this flat increased the students’ options for living. Even though equipped with proper facilities and affordable rented price, some students preferred to stay in boarding house rather than in students’ flat. Living in students’ flat means they must obey the strict rules that sometimes cannot be followed by the students because of some reasons. The residence options are increasingly diverse. Since in 2017, there has been a private apartment that built and also addressed the students’ room demand (see Figure 5, 6 and 7).

![Figure 5. HMO’s development; compared between 2007 and 2017](image1)

![Figure 6. PBSA’s development; compared between 2007 and 2017](image2)

![Figure 7. Private investor boarding house development; compared between 2007 and 2017](image3)
Land and property in Tembalang become very demanding then lead the increasing of land price and property tax. This situation gives social economic pressure to the local community. Moreover, decreasing of income because their boarding house rarely full of occupants and increasing standard of living made the local community sold the house. Then, a private investor started to buy the local community property. As a consequence, many luxurious boarding houses are owned by the people who work and stay in Semarang inner-city, Jakarta, Bandung, and other areas; they realized that having boarding house in Tembalang is really a good investment. They employed one or two people of local community as the boarding house caretaker; they check the house once or twice a year. All of the problems related to the rooms maintenances handled by this caretaker (see Figure 8).

9. Conclusion
Studentification is a neighbourhood transformation found in educational area and cannot be avoided. Studentification in Tembalang area influenced by Undip development; centralized education activities from Pleburan campus to Tembalang campus, and the increasing of students’ number every year. The increasing of residence option for students make the property demand in Tembalang also rise. At this moment, studentification in Tembalang indicates entering the third wave studentification. It is signed by many private landlords that owned boarding house which is previously owned by the local community. Displacement of the local community does not only cause by the presence of the students that replaced the local community but it is also caused by increasing of land price, tax property, and standard of living. Moreover, it is because the local community cannot compete with others in providing the students’ room, so that they are undesirable and less occupants.
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