



Location Housing Affordability: A quality of life indicator in Malaysia

M. Azren Hassan¹, Hazlina Hamdan²,
Jamalunlaili Abdullah², Yusfida Ayu Abdullah²

¹Centre of Postgraduate Studies,
Faculty of Architecture, Planning and Surveying,
Universiti Teknologi MARA, Shah Alam, Malaysia
²Centre of Studies For Town & Regional Planning,
Faculty of Architecture, Planning and Surveying,
Universiti Teknologi MARA, Puncak Alam, Malaysia

mohdazrenhassan@gmail.com

Abstract

To have quality of life is the ability to own a house. Housing affordability affects the quality of life concerning household well-being and economic security. The research sets to evaluate the location housing affordability for the low-income group base on housing and transportation expenditures in urban areas. 148 respondents have answered questionnaire and by using an integrated Location Housing Affordability, it had indicated that location does influence housing affordability. The findings showed the urban area for the low-income group is seriously unaffordable. "Location" should be part of affordable housing because it affects housing affordability thus concerning the quality of life.

Keywords: Quality of life, Location housing affordability, Housing and transportation expenditure, Low income group

eISSN 2398-4279 © 2018. The Authors. Published for AMER ABRA cE-Bs by e-International Publishing House, Ltd., UK. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>). Peer-review under responsibility of AMER (Association of Malaysian Environment-Behaviour Researchers), ABRA (Association of Behavioural Researchers on Asians) and cE-Bs (Centre for Environment-Behaviour Studies), Faculty of Architecture, Planning & Surveying, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21834/ajqol.v3i13.166>

1.0 Introduction

The condition of socioeconomic stability and development in a country concern the housing market. Therefore the ability to own a house is very crucial. The fundamental economic and social needs for everyone is the right to appropriate housing yet affordable and adequate needs (Drudy, 2007). It can be the same as the quality of life because the quality of life represented by evaluating the social, economic and environmental conditions. Comfortable housing will contribute to health, well-being and quality of life. Therefore owning a home is the dream of every individual to again that a quality of life especially for the low-income group (Hafazah, 2012). It is very significant to develop a structure of measurement of quality of life especially the affordability to own a house in an urban area

Housing within an urban area is more expensive as compared to housing in a rural area, added further there were few differences in the locations of greatest housing affordability between housing tenures, and this proven with the spatial mismatch of location and affordable houses (Dodson 2005; Khazanah Research Institute, 2015). Housing prices are also heavily dependent on location since there is a relation to the role of location in the housing market (Ahmad Fawwaz, 2016).

Therefore location does have an influence not just on housing expenditure but also towards on-going transportation expenditure, in particular, the distance between residential neighbourhoods and employment centres (Lipman, 2006; Mattingly & Morrissey, 2015). However, housing prices in the distant urban area are lower but compensate with high vehicle dependency, long distance commute which linked with high costs of petrol and vehicle maintenance.

To make a comparison between two residential areas are very crucial to identify housing affordability of an urban area for the low-income group. This research focuses on location housing affordability as an indicator for quality of life. To achieve that the aim of the research will evaluate the location housing affordability for the low-income group base on housing and transportation expenditures in urban areas of Selangor. Three objectives to achieve the aim are (1) To analysis how does affordability differ when transportation expenditure is part of affordability index? (2) To evaluate households' expenditure on housing and transportation vary for the two urban residential areas and (3) To determine housing affordability for the low household's income in an urban area.

The finding from the research would, therefore, provide various results of housing affordability of low-income households in an urban area based on Location Housing Affordability. At the same time, the result of the research would show that housing affordability should consider as part of measuring the quality of life with emphasize on location for affordable housing.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Housing affordability on quality of life

In Malaysia, the quality of life have been defined as encompassing personal advancements, a healthy lifestyle, access and freedom to pursue knowledge, and attaining a standard of

living which surpasses the fulfilment of the basic and psychological needs of an individual, to achieve a level of social well-being compatible with the nation's aspirations (Malaysia Quality of Life Report, 2011). The indicators in the report refer to the provision of the low-cost housing and the availability of utilities, but there is no indicator on housing affordability.

In term of monetary, housing expenditure is a large amount of the household budget. The low-income group, however, have extra strain on a budget for others essential expenditures. According to Streimikiene (2015), households were paying more than half of their income on housing expenditure usually spend substantially less than other families on essential expenses. As the size of the family increases, these difficulties tend to worsen.

Hence the housing stress will formulate and hinder the relations between the household members and damper the development of the children in term of the children education and health (Nor Rashidah et al., 2012). It agreed in the past that location of the low-income group has fewer amenities compare to other income groups, due to their ability to spend more on great amenities (Bieri, 2013). Therefore housing affordability can impend the households' physical well-being and economic security. Based on a report by Khazanah Research Institute (2015) housing prices were also heavily dependent on location. Evidently, there is an issue of housing affordability in the urban area, and spatial geographical location does play as part of housing affordability. Finding affordable, secure and adequate housing in term of location is one of the biggest problems of low-income households' today especially in urban area.

There are many types of research on housing affordability in Malaysia which focused on different types of sociodemographics by using various measurements fitted to their research (Khazanah Research Institute, 2015; Zafirah, 2014; Ariffian Bujang et al, 2010; Khadijah & Rosadah, 2002; Norazmawati, 2007). The main problem with housing affordability in Malaysia is that there is no specific indicator or measurement for housing affordability. Consequently, the measurements from previous researchers were only adaptations of measurements from other countries which were relevant for Malaysia's situation. However, there is no agreement on the correct or precise measurement.

2.2 Housing affordability concept and measurement

The concept of housing affordability was first used in the United Kingdom and the United States since 1960 and 1980 with different policy objectives. Households have to balance their housing costs, on the one hand, and their non-housing expenditures, on the other, given a limited income (Chowdhury, 2013). However, housing affordability still lacks a precise and exact definition because of affordability is not a natural characteristic of housing but rather a relationship between incomes and relative prices (Diwa et al., 2016).

Housing affordability is to ensure housing provided affordable for each high-income, middle-income or low-income groups. The affordability problem concerning the housing market is one of the most controversial issues in most developed and developing countries. From various perspectives and context that have considered, the term of housing affordability has concluded as the ability of an average household of willingness to own and sustain an average home (housing-related costs) without being financially distressed after the purchase and own a socioeconomic stability (Hassan et al., 2017).

Most countries had commonly practice housing expenditure-to-income ratio. It is easily understood that the meaning of affordable and unaffordable whereby allocated 30% of the income, on which if the housing cost more than 30% of income is considered as unaffordable. Nevertheless, the indicator measurement for housing expenditure-to income ratio has several limitations. One of the critics for this indicator is the incompetence of distinguishing the quality of housing because higher housing prices simply have better characteristics relatives to another area. Where else lower housing price that household spend less than 30% of the housing cost have the insufficient characteristic to live such as an unsafe structure of the building and located far from a known working area. However, this measurement can be applied to identify the low and middle-income groups' financial problem related to housing affordability.

An alternative method of measurement is the residual income measure which could reflect on the household's ability to own a house. For easy understanding, residual income is the balance after paying the housing expenditure which the household has difficulty to meets their non-housing needs at some level of capability of influenced by social and cultural norms. (Stone, 2006). Some have found that residual income is suitable because of the ability to scale the unaffordable household, especially for the low household's income. The residual income needs to be compared to the budget of the standard of household type because every household types have different non-housing expenditure and cannot be measured with the various household types. It is useful to assess an individual housing affordability because the size of the household plays an important figure for residual income.

In recent years, there has been a new indicator on housing affordability which includes transportation expenditure (Litman, 2014). The reason because of housing and transportation are the two largest expenses for most households. Together, they account for more than one-half of all household spending (Jewkes & Delgadillo. 2010). The transportation expenditure will measure the geography and transport factor housing affordability. The three most important variables to determine transportation expenditure are vehicle ownership, vehicle usage and public transit. The scale of measurement of housing and transportation expenditure was chosen for this research since it had considered location as a factor of affordability. According to Litman (2014) to achieve affordable life both housing and transportation expenditure must be under 45 percent than total income and therefore the percentage mark will be the core affordability category for the Location Housing Affordability.

3.0 Methodology

This research involves a significant amount of understanding on housing affordability that relates to the quality of life, as well as the low-income group of an urban area in Malaysia. The focus is mainly to identify the location housing affordability in an urban area well as an indicator for quality of life. The research design was through Case Study. The main function of the case study will be a descriptive case study, which the research will undergo a narrative theory before the survey conducted, and this theory will use as the guide for the research (Chua, 2012).. For this research, the case study will focus on the two prominent residential areas in Selangor.

3.1 Case study area

Selangor was chosen because of its highest population in Malaysia. The two residential areas selected were Subang Bestari and Putra Height. These two areas are prominent residential in Petaling district of Selangor. Putra Height has ranges of houses including the low-cost housing, and the same goes for Subang Bestari. Therefore the people living in these two residential areas are within the targeted group of income. The difference between these two residential areas is that Putra Height has the availability and accessibility of public transportation, and while Subang Bestari does not have the connectivity of public transit. The recent opening of the extended LRT lines to Putra Height had indicated that this residential area is very convenient for public transit users. The comparison between a residential area with a public transit and one residential without a public transit will indicate the location housing affordability.

3.2 Data Collection

This research had employed the quantitative method based on the housing affordability survey. The limitation of the research is that using questionnaire form due to the sensitivity of the respondent's financial information. Randomly 142 respondents were interviewed and selected within the research areas whereby 61 respondents were from Subang Bestari and the rest 81 respondents from Putra Height. The selected respondents are the low-income group. The structure of the questions was divided into three main variables involving location housing affordability, which were housing household, housing and transportation expenditure.

3.3 Household income, housing & transportation expenditure

In this research, household income for the low-income group in an urban area range is less than RM3,860 also known as B40 (11th Malaysia Plan, 2015). The median value was exercised to measure the household income rather than mean value because the median value eludes the skewing of data by outlier (see Table 1). For housing expenditure, the monthly mortgage payment and monthly amount of utility bills such as telephone, electricity, water, the internet and others represent the variables.

Transportation expenditure divided into three variables which studied the vehicle ownership, vehicle usage and public transit. Vehicle ownership determined by the number of the vehicle, monthly payment of vehicle, the annual amount of insurance and tax. Vehicle usage based on the average annual kilometer travel in Selangor which is 28,576km together with the distance of the respondents travelling to work (Shabadin et al., 2014).

Table 1: Elements and variables of location housing affordability

Measure	Variables
Median household income	Total household income
Mean housing expenditure	Monthly mortgage payment + total utilities payment
Mean transportation expenditure	Vehicle ownership + vehicle usage + public transit

The price of fuel based on average fuel price of RON95 started from 27 April 2017 to 31 May 2017 which is RM 2.11 This, therefore allowed calculation of the amount of fuel used.

Apart from that, vehicle usage was also based on the monthly amount of toll and parking fees together with vehicle repair cost and maintenance. Public transit will be the total amount of monthly expenses on public transport as the main transportation. Adding up all the variables will then give the mean transportation expenditure.

The method to compute a simplified location housing affordability as refer to Haas et al. (2016) is as per equation below:

$$LHA: \frac{mHi - (\mu He + \mu Tc)}{mHi}$$

LHA is Location Housing Affordability. Where *mHi* is the median of household income, *μHe* is the mean housing expenditure for the household, *μTc* is the transportation expenditure. The equation to compute for *μHe* and *μTc* is as per below:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu He &: Mp + Ub \\ \mu Tc &: Vo + Vu + Pt \end{aligned}$$

Where *Mp* is the monthly mortgage payment, *Ub* is the total monthly amount of utility bills, *Vo* is the vehicle ownership, *Vu* is the vehicle usage, and *Pt* is the public transit. Affordability categories based on the result of the location housing affordability index as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Affordability categories

Rating	LHA Result
Affordable	> 0.55
Moderate unaffordable	0.54 – 0.40
Seriously unaffordable	0.39 – 0.25
Severely unaffordable	< 0.24

(Source: Litman, T. 2014).

4.0 Results and Discussion

The data analysis was divided into three part based on the two low-income groups (B40) from two residential areas (Subang Bestari and Putra Height) and added both residential areas to become an overall total representing the low household's income in an urban area. The median household income for the residential areas was RM3,201 for Subang Bestari, and RM2,502 for Putra Height together with the median household income of total of respondents of RM2,852 which is still in the range of B40. This demonstrated that there are still low-income groups in an urban area in one of the developed state in Malaysia.

Transportation expenditure does influence housing affordability (Table 3). Based on the location housing affordability index, the result indicated that the transportation expenditure for overall respondents was RM1,329 which stood as 46 percent of overall median household income, nearly half of the household income. The findings, therefore, confirms previous research by Jewkes & Delgadillo (2010) which claimed that the low-income group would spend half of their total income on transportation expenditure.

However, none of the respondents utilised the public transit as their main transportation. This was expected in Subang Bertari since there is no connectivity of public transit compared to Putra Height, which has the connectivity of two LRT lines. The LRT station built after Putra Height is known as a prominent residential area not as Transit Oriented Development (TOD). Most of the residents used their vehicle for mobility hence resulting high transportation expenditure on vehicle usage and ownership. In term of value, Subang Bestari has slightly higher mean household expenditure (RM 732) and mean transportation expenditure (RM 1,432) than Putra Height (mean household expenditure RM 516 and mean transportation expenditure RM 1,226). This is because Putra Height has better accessibility and nearer to the city centre in comparison with Subang Bestari. In term of household income, the residents of Subang Bestari have slightly more and have the ability to spend more in term of higher utility bills (RM 92) contrast with the residents of Putra Height (RM 86).

Table 3: Location affordability result for low-income group in Putra Height and Subang Bestari

Measure	Variables	Subang Bestari	Putra Height	Overall Respondents
Median household income (RM)	Respondent Salary	1,441	1,331	1,386
	Spouse's Salary	1,760	1,171	1,446
	Total	3,201	2,502	2,852
Mean household expenditure (RM)	Monthly Payment	640	430	535
	Utility Bills	92	86	89
	Total	732	516	624
Mean transportation expenditure (RM)	Vehicles Ownership	537	393	465
	Vehicles Usage	895	833	864
	Public Transit	0	0	0
	Total	1,432	1,226	1,329
LHA Result		0.32	0.30	0.31

The result of location housing affordability for Subang Bestari is 0.32, and Putra Height is 0.30. A different of 0.02 between both of the residential areas are still seriously considered as an unaffordable state. This revealed that a residential area with public transit is the same as a residential area without the public transit in term of housing affordability. The overall location housing affordability result is 0.31, and this explains a recent research, that urban area is seriously unaffordable (Khazanah Research Institute, 2015).

The low household's income in the urban area is having difficulty concerning housing affordability. It will have an influence on low household's income ability for to live with the rapidly increasing living cost in the urban area. Moreover, it will definitely have an impact toward the low-income's quality of life.

5.0 Conclusion & Recommendation

Location housing affordability in this research had shown that low households income in an urban area is seriously unaffordable and at the same time demonstrated that location does influence housing affordability. Therefore the outlying urban areas are becoming seriously

unaffordable especially for the low-income group. The outcome of the findings suggests that location housing affordability is associated with the quality of life.

Location Housing Affordability Index is the proposed indicator for quality of life assessment because the measurement is inclusive of transportation expenditure which is very relevant especially to determine the location as affordability. Housing affordability can impend the households' physical well-being and economic security, and the importance of transportation elements should have been in the mindfulness of the policy makers regarding the quality of life in term of locality of affordable housing.

Moreover, the term "location" should be part of the definition of affordable housing because it have influence toward the household expenditure and in the same time Location Housing Affordability as indicator that needs to be measured as part of the quality of life in Malaysia. It is recommended that further studies should be carried out on location housing affordability with other types of socio-demographic where it can have more understanding on the issue of housing affordability in Malaysia.

References

- Ahmad Fawwaz A.S., Hwa, T. K., & Rohayu, M. (2016). Housing Mismatch Model in Suburban Areas. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 234, 442–451.
- Ariffian Bujang A., Zarin, H. A., & Jumadi, N. (2010). The Relationship Between Demographic Factors and Housing Affordability. *Malaysian Journal of Real Estate*, 5(1), 10.
- Bakar, A. A., Osman, M. M., Bachok, S., & Ibrahim, M. (2016). Investigating Rationales of Malaysia Quality of Life and Wellbeing Components and Indicators. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 222, 132–142.
- Bieri, D. S. (2013). *Housing Affordability*. Michalos, Alex C.(Ed.).
- Chua, Y. P. 2012. *Mastering Research Methods*: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Diwa Samad, Nurshuhada Zainon, Faizul Azli Mohd Rahim, Eric Lou, Saipol Bari Abd Karim. (2016). *Malaysian Affordability Housing Policies Revisited*, (January).
- Drudy, P. J. (2007). Housing in Ireland: Philosophy, Affordability & Access. *Journal of the Statistical & Social Inquiry Society of Ireland*, XXXVI 3
- Eleventh Malaysia Plan (2015). *Strengthening Infrastructure to Support Economic Expansion*. Rancangan Malaysia Kesebelas (Economic Planning Unit) : 2016-2020.
- Haas, P.M, Newmark, G. L. & Morrison, T. R. (2016): Untangling Housing Cost and Transportation Interactions: The Location Affordability Index Model—Version 2 (LAIM2), *Housing Policy Debate*,
- Hafazah A.K. (2012). Low Cost Housing Environment: Compromising Quality of Life? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 35(December 2011), 44–53.
- Hamdan, H., Yusof, F., & Marzukhi, M. A. (2014). Social Capital and Quality of Life in Urban Neighborhoods High Density Housing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 153, 169–179.

- Hassan, M. A., Hamdan, H., & Abdullah, J. (2017). A Conceptual Overview of Socio-spatial Pattern for Housing Affordability of Urban Area in Malaysia, *Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Science*, 7(5S)
- Ibrahim, F. I., Omar, D., & Mahamad, N. H. N. (2015). Theoretical Review on Sustainable City Indicators in Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 202(December 2014), 322–329.
- Jewkes, M. D., & Delgadillo, L. M. (2010). Weaknesses of Housing Affordability Indices Used by Practitioners. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning*, 21(1), 11.
- Khazanah Research Institute (2015), *Making Housing Affordable*, Kuala Lumpur, Khazanah Research Institute, Malaysia.
- Lipman, B. J. (2006,). *A heavy load: The combined housing & transportation burdens of working families*. Center for Housing Policy.
- Litman, T. (2014). *Transportation Affordability*. Victoria Transport Policy Institute.
- Malaysia Quality of Life Report (2011). *The Malaysian quality of life index 2011*. Putrajaya: Economic Planning Unit, Prime Minister's Department.
- Masri, M. H. b M. @, Nawawi, A. H. b, & Sipan, I. b. (2016). Review of Building, Locational, Neighbourhood Qualities Affecting House Prices in Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 234, 452–460.
- Mattingly, K., & Morrissey, J. (2014). Housing & transport expenditure: Socio-spatial indicators of affordability in Auckland. *Cities*, 38, 69–83.
- Mohit, M. A. (2013). *Quality of Life in Natural and Built Environment – An Introductory Analysis*. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 101, 33–43.
- Napic. (2016). *Indeks Harga Rumah*, (6), 1–79.
- Norazmawati M.S. (2007). *Kemampuan Pemilikan Rumah Kos Rendah Di Kuala Lumpur*. Universiti Sains Malaysia
- Nor Rashidah Zainal, Gurmit Kaur, Nor 'Aisah Ahmad & Jamaliah Mhd. Khalili. (2012). Housing Conditions and Quality of Life of the Urban Poor in Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 50(July 2012), 827–838.
- Rosadah Mahmud, K. H. (2002). *Kajian Ke Atas Keupayaan Golongan Berpendapatan Sederhana Dalam Memiliki Rumah di Kawasan Johor Bahru*. Fakulti Kejuruteraan Dan Sains Geoinformasi. University Teknologi Malaysia.
- Shabadin, A., Johari, N. M., Jamil, H. M., & Engineering, R. S. (2014). Car Annual Vehicle Kilometer Travelled Estimated from Car Manufacturer Data – An Improved Method. *World Research & Innovation Convention on Engineering & Technology*, (November), 25–26.
- Streimikienė, D. (2015). *Quality of Life and Housing*, *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 5(2).
- Stone, M. E. (2006). What is housing affordability? The case for the residual income approach. *Housing Policy Debate*, 17, 151-184.
- Zafirah A.S.Z (2014). *Assesment of Housing Affordability Problems Among Younger Working Households In Greater Kuala Lumpur*. Universiti Malaya.