

Title of the project	Study On Livelihood Strategies: Household Economies And Environmental Expenditures In Selected Group Of Neighborhoods In Kelurahan Penjaringan North Jakarta
Conducted by	The Center for Health Research University of Indonesia
Supported/funded by	Mercy Corps Indonesia
Date	March 2007
Sample size	400 households
Team	Mardiati Nadjib, Sabarinah Prasetyo, Purwa K Sucahya, Kurnia Sari, I Made Djaja, Subarkah

Introduction. Mercy Corps Indonesia is developing a program named Healthy Place Prosperous People (HP3). The uniqueness of this upcoming program is that the program linking the environment and household economy issues, as how far household environmental-related activities affect the household economy and how far the household economy affects the environment.

Objectives. Description of baseline data on household socio economic aspect (expenditure, income, assets) related to environmental behavior (water, latrine, solid waste) in selected group of neighborhoods in Kelurahan Penjaringan, North Jakarta.

Methodology. The study design was cross sectional with quantitative approach and using structured instruments. The study sites in 4 RWs, which were RW 08, RW 12, and RW 13, and additional RW which is actually not acknowledged by the government, RW00 since it is located under the toll bridge. Sample size was calculated by using estimation of population proportion in each RW. With confidence interval of 90%, precision level 12%, and proportion of unknown event was 50%, and design effect of 2, then the minimum samples were 94 households per RW, rounded up to 100 households per RW.

Sample procedure used probability proportional to size (PPS) and using sub hamlet as primary sampling unit (PSU). Within each RW, 10-12 clusters were selected, except in RW00 8 clusters. Respondent selection in each cluster used random with spiral method, while in *rumah susun* used systematic random.

Results. Most respondents were females and in 30-39 years age group. More than three fourth of respondents' were at low educational status and mostly did not work. About half of respondents owned the houses, where 1 out of 5 houses the part of which was rented to other people.

There are some approaches in measuring household socio economic status, which are income, expenditure and asset approaches. The uniqueness of this study is that it sees all the approaches in details, plus the environmental expenditure. Household expenditure was used as a basis to determined socio-economic status. Median of household expenditure was about Rp.2.4 million per month, where expenditure for non food was higher than for food. However, when the expenditure for *arisan*, credit, drugs, and illness were excluded, the median household expenditure became Rp.2.1 million per month, and the proportion of food expenditure became higher than non food expenditure. Based on quintile expenditure, the poorest group was mostly living in RW00 whereas the richest was in RW 08.

The proportion of environmental expenditure to total expenditure was about 5% or about Rp 120 thousands per month. Median percentage of environmental expenditure for the poorest (Q1, 9%) was twice as much as the richest group (Q5, 4%).

Many households used two water sources (48%). The water usage by quintile was also differed by RW and quintile. PDAM was one of the water source commonly used in all RWs, except RW00 (commute water vendor/*gerobak air*). Not all respondents used PDAM for drinking. Many of the richest group used PDAM and bottled/sealed water, whilst the poorest usually used the water sourced from commute water vendor/*gerobak air* and shallow/dug well. Shallow/dug well water quality was perceived as the poorest quality than the other sources so that none of them used the water from shallow/dug well.

There was only a small percentage who contributed to sanitation (14%). The poorest contributed more than the richest for sanitation or cleanliness. The pattern of latrine use was also differed by quintile. The richest used more private latrine, while the poorest used more public MCK. RW00 used more public MCK than the other RWs.

Solid waste disposal method mainly used by the households was by collecting it in the house and picked by the officers. Unfortunately, there were few households who separated the solid waste (10%), although many of them cooked the food. The reason why did not separate the solid waste was because they were not interested or it was not important. But, more than half of respondents said that there was no problem related to cleanliness and solid waste in their neighborhood.

Many households in RW 13 and RW00 were categorized in poor category. When we used World Bank definition of poor (US\$ 2 per capita per day), about 73% households were considered as poor, while when we used BPS definition, those who were categorized as poor and nearly poor was 24% in RW 13 and 13% in RW 00.

Conclusion. Although the richest spent more on environment than the poorest group in absolute term, the poorest group relatively bears higher expenditure for environmental services than the richest group.