



Rethinking Slum Planning: A Comparative Study of Slum Upgrading Projects

Istifada Alhidayatus Sibyan¹

[Received: 20 September 2019; accepted in final version: 20 February 2020]

Abstract. *The stigma slums have of being an urban problem is influenced by theoretical and empirical knowledge. This article reports a comparative study on the failure and success of slum upgrading projects in the Gecekondu slum area in Ankara, Turkey and the Semanggi slum area in Surakarta, Indonesia. In both cases there were different orientations and approaches in planning influenced by the perspective on slums. Related to the result of the study, this article offers at least three key perspectives to understand slums in the context of urban planning. Slum upgrading projects are not always about space formalization, physical improvement, or economic enhancement. Slum upgrading projects are also about community empowerment and social transformation contributing to urban development. The success of a slum upgrading project depends on the approach and perspective toward these urban issues within the local context. Different methods and focuses could result in different outcomes of the project. As such, those differences should be taken into account in the planning process.*

Keywords. *Perspective, planning, planning approach, planning orientation, slum.*

[Diterima: 20 September 2019; disetujui dalam bentuk akhir: 20 Februari 2020]

Abstrak. *Stigma permukiman kumuh sebagai masalah perkotaan dapat dipengaruhi oleh pengetahuan yang bersumber dari teori dan pengetahuan empiris. Artikel ini adalah studi komparatif yang mencoba menggambarkan kegagalan dan keberhasilan proyek peningkatan permukiman kumuh dalam kasus daerah kumuh Gecekondu di Ankara, Turki dan daerah kumuh Semanggi di Surakarta, Indonesia. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa ada berbagai orientasi dan pendekatan dalam perencanaan. Perbedaan-perbedaan ini dipengaruhi oleh perspektif terhadap kumuh dalam perencanaan. Terkait dengan hasilnya, artikel ini menawarkan setidaknya tiga perspektif kunci untuk memahami daerah kumuh dalam konteks perencanaan kota. Proyek peningkatan permukiman kumuh tidak selalu tentang formalisasi ruang, peningkatan fisik atau peningkatan ekonomi. Selain itu, proyek perbaikan permukiman kumuh adalah tentang pemberdayaan masyarakat dan transformasi sosial yang berkontribusi terhadap pembangunan perkotaan. Keberhasilan proyek peningkatan permukiman kumuh tergantung pada pendekatan dan perspektif konteks lokal terhadap masalah perkotaan ini. Berbagai metode dan fokus dapat menghasilkan berbagai hasil proyek. Dengan demikian, perbedaan-perbedaan tersebut harus diperhitungkan dalam proses perencanaan.*

Kata kunci. *Perspektif, perencanaan, pendekatan perencanaan, orientasi perencanaan, daerah kumuh.*

¹ The General Directorate of Regional Development, The Ministry of Home Affairs of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia. E-mail: istifadapwk08@gmail.com.

Introduction

Slums are considered urban informalities caused by uncontrolled urbanisation (Durand-Lasserve & Royston, 1998; Roy, 2005, 2009). They can be improved through upgrading projects, but the implementation of slum upgrading is not always successful. Viratkapan & Perera (2006) distinguish five factors to determine slum upgrading results, i.e.: 1) the convenience of the new location; 2) the compensation; 3) the unity of the community or the cohesion and strength of leadership; 4) the participation of community members; and 5) the attitude of the community members towards the new location.

Slum upgrading is an important part of the dynamics of urban development. However, it often does not accommodate success factors. This may be related to how theory and empirical knowledge consider slums. Generally, slums are considered settlements that are built without permission from the authorities (illegal or semi-legal) and neglected parts of the city where living conditions are very bad (UN-Habitat, 2016; Srinivas, 2005).

The epistemological perspective that considers slums a problem, a form of urban informality and a neglected environment tends to ignore the perspective of the dwellers. It is possible that there are different perspectives on slum upgrading between planners, decision makers and slum dwellers that cause planning to eventually fail.

This article assesses successes and failures of two slum upgrading projects related to the epistemological perspective on slums. Furthermore, this study investigated whether there are different perspectives on slum upgrading projects. The case studies reviewed in this article are the Gecekondu slum area in Ankara, Turkey and the Semanggi slum area in Surakarta, Indonesia. The review of the two case studies provides a comparison of slum planning perspectives. Finally, a new perspective may be needed to understand slums as part of urban development.

Slum and Planning

Slums have long been a priority in urban planning, especially in the Global South. Many cities revitalize and relocate slums to improve the quality and restore the image of the city. Furthermore, the land occupied by slum dwellers is projected to be used for more productive economic interests. The strategies most commonly used are relocation and revitalization to formalize slums. Critics of this approach argue that the relocation of slums has a tremendous negative impact on the area's microeconomic activities and community (Viratkapan & Perera, 2006).

The meaning of slum residents has shifted from migrants and marginal people to the broader group of an increasing number of unemployed, partially employed, casual labor, street subsistence workers, street children and members of the underworld (Alsayyad, 2004). The meaning of urban informality has shifted over time but this concept still contains elements of slum formation or squatting. Thus, slums are essentially seen as an urban problem or urban informality.

Seeing slums as problematic is related to various issues, including low environmental quality, health problems, irregularities, damage to the city's image and problems related to urban spatial planning (Srinivas, 2005). These issues are among the reasons to encourage slum upgrading.

Methods

This article reports a study on how slum upgrading projects can be successful or fail. The two case studies reviewed in this article illustrate this. They concern slum upgrading projects in Ankara, Turkey and Surakarta, Indonesia. The indicators used were drawn from the factors contributing to slum upgrading projects developed by Viratkapan & Perera (2006), i.e.: 1) the convenience of the new location; 2) the compensation; 3) the unity of the community or the cohesion and strength of leadership; 4) the participation of community members; and 5) the attitude of community members to the new location.

Case Study of Slum Upgrading Projects

The Case of Gecekondu Ankara, Turkey

The Gecekondu slum area in Gecekondu Ankara, Turkey has been evolving since the 1940s. In the 2000s, the state intervened in the lives of the Gecekondu residents in multiple ways. It intervened in their economic situation by forcibly incorporating them into the banking system for apartment ownership, in their physical space by relocating them to housing estates built by the Turkish Housing Development Administration (TOKI), and in their everyday behavior by governing the housing estates via TOKI's private management company (Erman, 2016; Kuyucu, 2014).

The Gecekondu slum area had been tolerated by the state to varying degrees and in selective ways, despite the urban elite's counter-position. Tolerance in this matter was state policy because of its prioritization of national industrialization (Erman, 2016). The Gecekondu population was seen as a pool of cheap labor and potential voters for political interests. Furthermore, the government regarded revitalization of slum areas as an economic asset that could be done in cooperation with the private sector to make profits (Erman, 2016).

The Gecekondu slum upgrading project occurred in two phases, as described by Erman (2016). Firstly, the land of Gecekondu was brought into the formal market via the distribution of titles to Gecekondu owners. Through the distribution of land ownership, the owners were entitled to construct apartment buildings that were up to four storeys high by contracting private developers. Secondly, the establishment or restructuring of institutions and legal systems related to the new policies to facilitate planning through TOKI.

The Gecekondu slum upgrading project through TOKI was a form of housing management and daily behavior formalization. Legal residents were relocated to apartment buildings built in the same location as the initial land by exchanging their 333 square metres of land for apartment units of 80 square metres (Erman, 2016). Illegal residents who did not have land titles were required to buy a K-TOKI unit (a housing estate built by TOKI in Karacaören) with monthly instalment payments for 15 years subject to an increase twice a year indexed to wage increases in the public sector.

TOKI necessitated dwellers to transform their lifestyle when living in the new apartment buildings by some regulation of behavior known as 'common rules of conduct'. These rules of conduct included: rugs and tablecloths should not be shaken out from windows; laundry should not be hung over balconies; litter and cigarette butts should not be thrown out of windows; shoes should not be left in the block hallways; fire stairwells should not be blocked by storage items; buildings should not be entered wearing muddy shoes; elevators should not be used to

move furniture; and so on. (Erman, 2016). These were common behaviors of Gecekondu residents as rural to urban migrants. The rules of conduct triggered conflicts between the dwellers and the management parties.

The TOKI apartment building, designed by architectural professionals, was not conducive to the 'Gecekondu activities' the majority of residents were engaged in: the crowded environment in the highrise blocks hindered the reproduction of informal practices of maintenance (Erman, 2016). The TOKI project was finally informalized by the dwellers. Despite the formalized process of exchanging Gecekondu land for TOKI apartments, the complexities and ambiguities of the process of bringing a massive piece of land that contained varying degrees of informality in terms of land tenure and house type into a formalized land tenure led to abuse (Erman, 2016; Kuyucu, 2014).

The case of Gecekondu shows how strategy to formalize slums can lead to conflicts resulting in unsuccessful planning. Slum relocation to a more adequate environment requires residents to transform their lifestyles. However, it is not easy to change a rural or lower class lifestyle to a middle class lifestyle. The resulting conflicts reflect the difference in perspective between the government, the private sector and the residents of Gecekondu. The government saw Gecekondu as a slum area that was illegal and should be revitalized to improve the image of the city. The private sector saw Gecekondu dwellers and squatters with the stigma of lower middle class people. These perspectives were inseparable from how slums were defined in the Gecekondu slum upgrading project.

The Case of Semanggi Surakarta, Indonesia

The other case of slum upgrading reviewed in this article is the Semanggi slum upgrading project. Semanggi is a residential and industrial area located on the Bengawan Solo river bank in Surakarta, Indonesia, covering an area of 76.30 Ha. The upgrading project of the Semanggi slum was initiated in 2016 according to Mayoral Decree Nr. 413.21/38.3/1/2016 on Location Determination of Slum Areas in Surakarta City.

Economically, the residents of the Semanggi slum area formed a low income community, including rural migrants from around Surakarta city. Most of the residents worked in the informal sector with a low income (Musthofa, 2011). This condition encouraged them to build non permanent or semi permanent houses near the Bengawan Solo river bank.

The Semanggi slum upgrading project was based on two considerations. Firstly, housing provision for the lower middle class population according to local government policy to provide access to adequate housing for urban society. Secondly, the Semanggi slum area was located in an area containing strategic functions for the city, i.e. the urban drainage system and a railway and economic zone, which needed intervention to maintain these functions.

The government created two projects for Semanggi slum upgrading, i.e. slum relocation to rented simple flats (*rusunawa*) and slum upgrading (Musthofa, 2011). The slum relocation to *rusunawa* aimed to provide access to adequate housing to dwellers as they did not have land rights. The interesting point here is that the relocation was not only directed to *rusunawa* but also to another location that was more suitable to the dweller's needs as they themselves suggested. The government cooperated with third parties, such as the private sector, state owned enterprises (BUMN) and non-profit organizations for relocation financing.

The slum upgrading project aimed to improve a legal settlement located far from the Bengawan Solo river bank. The settlement was redesigned to become a *kampung deret*, equipped with adequate infrastructure. *Rusunawa* and *kampung deret* are settlement types that are affordable to the lower class population, so no striking lifestyle transformation was required. However, a transformation of daily lifestyle was still needed to improve the quality of life through empowerment, socialization and education for residents of the *rusunawa* and *kampung deret*.

The mechanism of the Semanggi slum upgrading project consisted of seven steps, as explained by Musthofa (2011): 1) data collection; 2) socialization; 3) formation of a working group; 4) verification of grant receivers; 5) location or site selection; 6) land procurement; and 7) construction. Data collection was done to identify the residents of the Semanggi slum area. This process was done by the government of Surakarta and followed by socialization about the upgrading project. Through the socialization program, the government explained the urgency of the project and gave an understanding about slums, adequate housing and a healthy environment to the residents of the Semanggi slum area.

The next process was the formation of a working group. The working group, called *Kelompok Kerja* (Pokja), had the responsibility of inventorying the residents who were entitled to receive a relocation grant, facilitating the dialogue between the residents of the Semanggi slum area and monitoring, reporting and evaluating the relocation project. The Pokja members were members of the village government, an institution of community empowerment and key persons or residents as representatives of the Semanggi slum area. Residents of the Semanggi slum area were proposed for a relocation grant facilitated by Pokja. After this proposal process, Pokja verified and submitted the proposal to the Revenue Department.

The following step was location or site selection. This consisted of a dialogue to decide where the relocation would take place. The Semanggi residents and Pokja discussed and chose the relocation site and Pokja reported the selected site to the National Land Agency. The final step was land procurement and construction, which processes also accommodated resident participation.

Both the *rusunawa* and *kampung deret* were the results of discussions between the government and the community facilitated by Pokja (Musthofa, 2011). The *rusunawa* and *kampung deret* were chosen by the slum dwellers through advocacy and consultation with the government and the private sector. The community regarded these two types of settlement as more suitable for the community needs, culture and lifestyle. Thus, the planning was well accepted by the community and successfully implemented without conflict.

The success of the Semanggi slum upgrading project is inseparable from the government's perspective regarding the Semanggi slum area: not seeing it only as an area with strategic functions, but also as a social entity that has the right to have access to adequate housing and a healthy environment. Participative and collaborative planning approaches encourage participation and increase support for the planning.

Discussion

Comparison of Case Studies

Both the Gecekondou and the Semanggi slum upgrading project used relocation. In the case of Gecekondou, the government relocated slum dwellers to apartments managed by the private

sector. In the case of Semanggi, the government, the community, the private sector and a non-profit organization discussed the new settlement pattern and location (see Table 1).

The Gecekondu slum upgrading project failed as the objectives of transforming dwellers' lifestyles, earning investment profits and improving the quality and image of the city could not be achieved. In contrast, the objectives of the Semanggi slum upgrading project have all been achieved. The Semanggi residents now have land rights and the residential buildings now are appropriate according to healthy and adequate housing standards. Furthermore, adequate infrastructure and public facilities have been developed in the relocation area and the microeconomic situation is enhanced as the community was empowered, resulting in an improved city quality and image.

Table 1. Comparison of case studies.

Comparative Aspects	Case of Gecekondu	Case of Semanggi
Planning approach	Top-down.	Participation and collaboration.
Planning orientation	Market oriented.	Provision of adequate housing for lower class people.
Planning strategy	Relocation to apartments requires middle class lifestyle.	Relocation to simple rented flats (<i>rusunawa</i>) and <i>kampung deret</i> .
Actor participation (related to the participation of community members)	Government and private sector.	Government, private sector, community, non-profit organization.
The convenience of the new location (related to the expected transformation pattern)	Forced transformation of the community lifestyle into unsuitable community culture.	Accommodate community culture and encourage to transform community lifestyle into more healthy lifestyle.
Supporting element (empowerment)	No empowerment to improve life quality of the community.	Community empowerment to improve economic and social capacity of the community.
Compensation	Exchanging 333 square meters of land with apartment units of 80 square meters.	Giving relocation grants to slum dwellers.
Unity of the community and strength of leadership	Some residents took a permissive attitude towards <i>Gecekondu</i> activities while others being strictly against them brought residents into conflict and resulted in failure to build a community with shared norms.	Commonly, the residents involved in the social community. The dialogue or discussion among the actors in the project was facilitated by Pokja at the city and village level, utilizing the social community as a platform to communicate the project with the community.
Attitude of the community to the new location	Residents regarded TOKI apartment building not as a middleclass housing estate that should not be compared to such estates.	Because the new location was chosen by the community themselves, it was accepted by the community.

The fundamental differences between the Gecekondu and Semanggi slum upgrading projects are the planning approach and orientation. A top-down planning approach tends to neglect the community's perspective. This results in the strategy implemented not being suitable to the community's needs. This will make the planning difficult to implement and be accepted by the community. In contrast, a participative and collaborative approach accommodates the

community's perspective. Through this approach all parties involved can jointly develop the most suitable strategy for the upgrading project.

In terms of orientation, a market-oriented approach pursues economic profit, which tends to neglect social and environmental factors. This leads to planning failure, as explained by Viratkapana & Perera (2006). The factors of the convenience of the new location, the compensation, the unity of the community, the participation of community members and the attitude of community members towards the new location were well accommodated in the Semanggi slum upgrading project as the planning orientation was to provide adequate housing for the Semanggi community.

Rethinking Future Slum Planning

The slum upgrading project of Gecekondu is regarded as a failure of slum formalization (Erman, 2016). The market oriented planning approach resulted in a failure to respond to the economic situation of the Gecekondu residents. In contrast, the public oriented planning approach used in the case of Semanggi resulted in successful planning.

The different planning orientation between the cases of Gecekondu and Semanggi was influenced by the epistemological perspective on slums. This article offers a number of key perspectives to understand slums in a wider frame:

1. A slum is a community

Slums should not only be viewed as a neglected area or a type of settlement but also as a community with socio-economic activities. Viratkapana & Perera (2006) argue that the key factor of successful slum planning are the community or the slum dwellers. In the case of Gecekondu, the government saw the Gecekondu residents as squatters and low class people as well as a labor pool and potential voters. Social entities, such as the culture of the community, were not accommodated in the planning, which caused conflicts. This is a factor that contributes to failure in slum planning (Mukhija, 2000).

In the case of Semanggi, the government and third parties viewed the Semanggi slum area as a community that is a part of urban society. Thus, the community was seen to have a right to be part of the city, including to have the right to adequate housing and a healthy environment. This epistemological perspective encouraged the government to use a participative and collaborative approach for the Semanggi slum upgrading project.

The Semanggi residents were seen as part of urban society, whose social entity is unique and could not be ignored in the planning process. The residents were involved in the planning and could confer ideas, suggestions or critiques about the planning from the community's perspective. In the case of Semanggi, the community was facilitated by non profit organizations and the community leadership, which this also contributed to the success of planning as explained by Vale (2018) and Viratkapana & Perera (2006) according to whom community leaders have an important role in planning.

Both the Gecekondu and Semanggi slum upgrading projects encouraged a community lifestyle transformation. The lifestyle transformation in the Gecekondu slum upgrading project referred to the transformation of a rural and urban migrant lifestyle into a middle class lifestyle. It can be concluded that the planning ignored the community culture, which caused conflicts. On the

other hand, the lifestyle transformation in the Semanggi slum upgrading project referred to the transformation of an unhealthy lifestyle into a more healthy lifestyle. It aimed to encourage the community's awareness and knowledge about adequate housing and a healthy environment.

The description of the different perspectives on slums is relevant in determining the success and failure of slum planning. A perspective that sees slums as a physical entity, settlement form, urban problem or a neglected area of the city tends to ignore the community. Lyon & Driskell (2011) explain that a community is a group of individuals in a certain place who share bonds and interests, interact with each other and form a separate entity. This community should not be ignored in the planning because it is a part of urban society that also has a right to the city.

The realization of slum community rights depends on interaction with the government. The key factor is creating a dialogue whereby the community and the government communicate on issues, strategies and problems in the planning as an effort to improve the life quality of the community. This dialogue facilitates everyone to define rights and responsibilities and jointly formulate a slum improvement program that is responsive to the community's needs. The case of Semanggi represents community participation and collaboration not only with the government but also with the private sector and NGOs. This process is important to be understood in planning as it can accommodate all of the perspectives to develop the strategies that fit best with the community's needs.

A perspective that sees a slum as a community can lead to community-based urban development, because a community has transformational power as it is a growth machine (Lefebvre, 2003; Lyon & Driskell, 2011). Finally, when slums are seen as a community, the entity of the community will always be considered in planning. This can prevent planning from extremely different perspectives that can trigger conflicts and lead to planning failure.

2. Slums are an opportunity

Slums should not be seen only as an urban problem or informality, but also as an opportunity. This perspective is not something new, especially in regional development. Most urban authorities view the slum population only as a labor pool or potential voters, but it also provides other opportunities.

Seeing slums as a community encourages community development, which can be seen as a good opportunity in urban development, because communities have transformational power (Lefebvre, 2003; Lyon & Driskell, 2011). The community's power is connotated as social capital, which plays an important role in urban development. Several studies have shown that social capital encourages community empowerment, enhances microeconomic activity, strengthens social cohesion and prevents social conflict (Bourdieu, 1986; Fukuyama, 1995; Ibrahim, 2006; Putnam, 1993).

A perspective that sees slums as an opportunity brings planning into a new paradigm. Slum planning will be more orientated to community empowerment and not only to achieving physical and environmental sustainability but also to social and economical sustainability. In the case of Semanggi, the slum was considered an opportunity to improve the social, economical and physical aspects of the slum through community empowerment. This was not the case in Gecekondu, where the government merely saw the community as a labor pool. Thus, the community's capacity remained at a low level, not able to enter the industrial labor market and improve its urban microeconomic situation as expected from the planning.

An epistemological perspective that sees slums as an opportunity will encourage planning that tries to find ways to take advantage of the opportunities that are available. This is related to the endogenous development concept, whereby the urban or regional development empowers local actors, including slum communities, to improve competitiveness (Barquero, 2006; Hague, Hague, & Breitbach, 2011; Rogers, 2010; Stimson, Stough, & Roberts, 2006; Stimson, Stough, & Salazar, 2009). This can be understood as a new perspective in achieving socially, economically and environmentally sustainable urban development.

Finally, a perspective that sees slums as an opportunity brings a new understanding of slums. Slums are actually an opportunity to improve urban quality. This opportunity should be utilized to achieve competitive and sustainable urban development.

3. Slum is a part of urban dynamics

Slum emergence is an inevitable phenomenon as an urban environment transforms into a more urbanized form. It is necessary to understand slums as a part of urban dynamics. Many slums have a long history in global cities, especially at the beginning of the urbanization and industrialization eras. Slums grow following the growth of cities and are inseparable from urban transformation.

Urban transformation also takes place in slums, which means that slum transformation contributes to urban transformation. Katerji & Ozakça (2015) argue that urban transformation is a multi-faceted and complex process and that the success of this process can be maximized by achievement of physical, social and economic aspects all combined. Furthermore, this process is a form of creative destruction, whereby the quality of life in the slum area is improved physically, socially and economically through a transformation that is accommodated by urban planning.

A perspective that sees slums as a part of urban dynamics in the case of Semanggi was shown by the root of the planning and the underlying policy. The vision of housing policy in Surakarta was: "Everyone should have adequate housing in a healthy environment". This demonstrates that the slums were a housing planning priority. The government realized that as the city grows and urbanization occurs, slum formation is inevitable. The government understood that slums are a part of urban dynamics and thus created a housing policy in which slum upgrading was prioritized.

The Semanggi slum area transformation delivered impacts in the urban development of Surakarta city. The microeconomic situation was enhanced through community empowerment, which contributed to the urban economic situation. Finally, through this perspective, slums are seen as part of the city. They have the same position as other areas in the city. Hence, the planning will encourage urban development not only in particular economic spaces for a specific social class, but also in slums areas.

Conclusions

The case studies in Gecekondur, Ankara and Semanggi, Surakarta illustrate success and failure in slum planning. They represent a different perspective toward slums in planning. The orientation of the Gecekondur slum upgrading project was market oriented. In contrast, the orientation of the Semanggi slum upgrading project was public oriented. Furthermore, the

Gecekondus slum upgrading project used a top-down approach while the Semanggi slum upgrading project used a participative and collaborative approach. Both projects encouraged a community lifestyle transformation. The lifestyle transformation in Gecekondus referred to the transformation of a rural and urban migrant lifestyle into a middle class lifestyle. The lifestyle transformation in Semanggi referred to the transformation of an unhealthy lifestyle into a more healthy lifestyle. These differences were influenced by the perspective toward slums used in the planning. The planning in the case of Gecekondus viewed the slum dwellers as squatters, lower class, a labor pool and potential voters. In contrast, the planning in the case of Semanggi viewed the slum dwellers as a community that is part of urban society.

This article offers key perspectives on understanding slums to achieve successful planning. Firstly, a slum should be regarded as a community, which means that the planning must accommodate the community as a socioeconomic entity. Secondly, a slum should be regarded as an opportunity so the planning can utilize the social capital of the community to encourage urban sustainability and competitiveness. Thirdly, a slum should be regarded as part of the urban dynamic wherein socioeconomic and spatial transformations take place and contribute to urban development. Through these perspectives, slum planning is not only about space formalization, physical improvement or economic enhancement. Moreover, slum planning should also be about community empowerment and social transformation contributing to urban development.

References

- Alsayyad, N. (2004) Urban Informality as a “New” Way of Life. In *Urban Informality: Transnational Perspectives from the Middle East, Latin America, and South Asia*, 7–30.
- Barquero, A.V. (2006) *Endogenous Development: Networking, Innovation, Institutions and Cities*. Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986) The Forms of Capital. *Cultural Theory: An Anthology*, 81–93.
- Durand-lasserve, A. and L. Royston (1998) *Holding Their Ground: Secure Land Tenure for the Urban Poor in Developing Countries*. Earthscan Publications Ltd.
- Erman, T. (2016) Formalization by the State, Re-Informalization by the People: A Gecekondus Transformation Housing Estate as Site of Multiple Discrepancies. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 40(109), 425–440. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12349>
- Fukuyama, F. (1995) *Trust: The Social Virtues and The Creation of Prosperity*. Free Press Paperbacks.
- Hague, C., E. Hague, and C. Breitbach (2011) *Regional and Local Economic Development*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ibrahim, L.D. (2006) Memanfaatkan modal sosial komunitas lokal dalam program kepedulian korporasi. *Jurnal Filantropi dan Masyarakat Madani GALANG* 1(2), 19–28.
- Katerji, S. and M. Ozakça, (2015) Urban Transformation as a Process for Inner-City Slums in Turkey, The Experience of Gaziantep City. *Artium* 3(2), 22–36.
- Kuyucu, T. (2014) Law, Property and Ambiguity: The Uses and Abuses of Legal Ambiguity in Remaking Istanbul’s Informal Settlements, 38(March), 609–627. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12026>
- Lefebvre, H. (2003) *The Urban Revolution*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Lyon, L., & R. Driskell (2011) *The Community in Urban Society: Second Edition*. Waveland Press, Inc.
- Mukhija, V. (2000) *Squatters as Developers? Mumbai’s Slum Dwellers as Equity Partners in Redevelopment*. Massachusetts Institut of Technology.

- Musthofa, Z. (2011) *Evaluasi Pelaksanaan Program Relokasi Permukiman Kumuh (Studi Kasus: Program Relokasi Permukiman Di Kelurahan Pucangsawit Kecamatan Jebres Kota Surakarta)*. Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta.
- Putnam, R.D. (1993) The Prosperous Community. *The American Prospect* 4(13), 35–42.
- Rogers, E.M. (2010) *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Roy, A. (2005) Urban Informality. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 71(2), 147–158.
- Roy, A. (2009) Planning Theory. *Planning Theory* 71(2), 147–158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095208099299>
- Srinivas, H. (2005) Defining Squatter Settlements. Global Development Research Center Web site. Retrieved from <http://www.gdrc.org/uem/squatters/define-squatter.html>
- Stimson, R.J., R.R. Stough, and B.H. Roberts (2006) *Regional Economic Development: Analysis and Planning Strategy*. New York: Springer Science and Business Media.
- Stimson, R.J., R.R. Stough, and M. Salazar (2009) *Leadership and Institutions in Regional Endogenous Development*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Vale, L.J. (2018) Cities of Stars: Urban Renewal, Public Housing Regeneration, and The Community Empowerment Possibility of Governance Constellations. *International Journal of Urban Sciences* 22(4), 431–460.
- Viratkapan, V. and R. Perera (2006) Slum Relocation Projects In Bangkok: What Has Contributed to Their Success or Failure? *Habitat International* 30(1), 157–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2004.09.002>