International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Determinants Of Residential Location Choice In Labuapi District, West Lombok Regency, Indonesia

Nala Sabrina[1], Akhmad Jufri[2]

[1,2] Department of Development Economics, Faculty of Economics and Business
University of Mataram, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia

Corresponding author: nalasabrina0206@gmail.com

Abstract

Rapid population growth and urban expansion have increased housing demand in peri-urban Indonesia. This study examines the factors influencing housing location decisions in five formal housing estates in Labuapi District, West Lombok Regency. Using a quantitative approach, data from 70 respondents were analysed with multiple linear regression in IBM SPSS Statistics 25. The results show that accessibility, infrastructure and facilities, and building quality positively influence housing choice, while price and environmental condition have negative effects. Down payment has no significant effect. The findings highlight that housing location decisions are influenced by physical, economic, and environmental factors simultaneously.

Keywords: Housing Location Choice, Accessibility, Housing Price, Residential Preference, Urban Development

INTRODUCTION

Housing constitutes one of the three fundamental human necessities — alongside food and clothing — yet it remains the most difficult to fulfil. Unlike consumable goods, residential property is characterised by high capital cost, limited land supply, and continuous appreciation in value, all of which render home ownership increasingly challenging for a growing segment of the population. Indonesian Law No. 1 of 2011 on Housing and Settlement Areas defines a house as a habitable structure that serves as a medium for family development, a reflection of the occupant's dignity, and an asset for its owner. As population growth accelerates, so too does the pressure on housing provision.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

West Lombok Regency recorded a population of approximately 737,000 in 2023, an increase from 732,000 the previous year, representing an average annual growth rate of 0.7 per cent (BPS Lombok Barat, 2023). This demographic expansion, combined with limited buildable land in established urban centres such as Gerung, Kediri, and Labuapi, has generated substantial unmet demand for affordable and well-located dwellings. Nasution et al. (2020) demonstrated that urbanisation and rapid population growth are key drivers of rising housing demand in developing country contexts, making it progressively more difficult to satisfy basic shelter needs at the community level.

Under the Regional Spatial Plan (RTRW) of West Lombok Regency 2011–2030, Labuapi District has been designated as a large-scale residential development zone, serving as a buffer area for the City of Mataram. Residential construction in the regency currently occupies approximately 30 per cent of available green open space (RTH), with a regulatory ceiling set at 60 per cent utilisation (Baehaqi, 2013). Consequently, Labuapi has become one of the most active residential development corridors in Lombok, accommodating projects by major developers including Perumnas (1,000 units), Mekar Caraka Saputra (700 units), Varindo (800 units), and Salva Inti Properti (960 units), among others.

Within this landscape, five formal housing estates have emerged as representative examples of contemporary residential provision in the district: Griya Sehati in Telagawaru village, offering affordable, modern housing targeting lower-middle-income households; LA Resort in Perampuan village, a semi-exclusive development with modern tropical design catering to the middle-to-upper segment; Jogot Madani in Labuapi village, emphasising eco-friendly design and proximity to public amenities; Kila Rengganis 2 in Terong Tawah village, known for minimalist architecture and competitive pricing; and Vila Harmoni in pagutan village, developed around a green and serene concept. The diversity of these estates reflects the increasingly complex and dynamic preferences among residential consumers in the district.

Prior research has identified a range of factors influencing residential location choice. Putra and Rahayu (2015) demonstrated that location, price, and building quality were the most decisive attributes in housing selection. Sugiarto (2019) showed that proximity to the urban centre, access to transportation, availability of public services, and security were paramount concerns for buyers of subsidised housing. Azhar and Handayani (2018), employing the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), found that price ranked first in consumer priority, followed by location, facilities, and developer reputation. Sibarani (2017) used conjoint analysis to confirm that price, built-up area, and location

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

jointly accounted for the greatest share of consumer preference. Prasetyo and Pudjihardjo (2024) further highlighted that down payment schemes and mortgage accessibility significantly affect purchase decisions, particularly for lower-income households.

Despite the richness of existing literature, empirical evidence specifically addressing multi-variable determinants of housing location choice in rapidly growing peri-urban areas of eastern Indonesia remains sparse. This study seeks to bridge that gap by examining six theoretically grounded determinants — accessibility, infrastructure and facilities, price, environmental condition, building quality, and down payment — within the context of Labuapi District. The research question is: Do accessibility, infrastructure and facilities, price, environmental condition, building quality, and down payment jointly and individually influence housing location decisions among residents of formal housing estates in Labuapi District?

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Concept of Housing and Demand Theory

Housing may be understood as a physical and symbolic expression of individual and collective identity, reflecting the occupant's standard of living, personality, and cultural values (Yudhohusodo, 1991). At an aggregate level, housing demand is a function of demographic expansion, income levels, access to credit, price levels, and the availability of supporting infrastructure and public facilities (Awang Firdaos, 1997). In line with the law of demand, an increase in housing prices — assuming all other determinants remain constant (ceteris paribus) — depresses the quantity of housing demanded, while improved affordability, credit accessibility, and public service provision stimulate demand (Sukirno, 2008).

Theoretical Frameworks for Residential Location Choice

Several theoretical traditions have sought to explain why households choose particular residential locations. The Filter-Down Theory (Burgess, 1920) posits that central business district expansion makes inner-city locations less attractive, encouraging higher-income groups to relocate to suburban areas and progressively vacating inner-city stock for lower-income groups. The Trade-Off Model of Alonso (1964) and Solow (1972, 1973) conceptualises residential choice as a trade-off between accessibility to the employment centre and the quantity of land consumed, with households near the urban core paying a premium for reduced commuting costs. Tiebout's (1956) Hypothesis argues

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

that household location decisions are also shaped by fiscal considerations, with households selecting jurisdictions that offer the best balance of tax burden and public service quality. Social Agglomeration Theory (1985) emphasises that individuals may choose residential locations based on the desire to live among socially similar groups, giving rise to residential segregation by income, ethnicity, or lifestyle.

Turner's Residential Mobility Theory (cited in Yunus, 2000) classifies households into three strata based on their residential behaviour: Bridgeheaders (low-income newcomers who prioritise proximity to employment to minimise transport costs), Consolidators (households with improving economic status seeking greater comfort and homeownership), and Status Seekers (high-income households motivated by social recognition and the acquisition of prestigious residential environments). These categories illuminate the heterogeneous nature of residential preferences across income groups and life-cycle stages.

Anthony and Synder (1991) propose a comprehensive locational evaluation framework encompassing zoning regulations, utility availability, technical and topographic conditions, accessibility, aesthetic qualities, community environment, municipal services, and cost considerations. Koestoer (1997) similarly emphasises that accessibility — specifically ease of transportation and proximity to key destinations — is the primary driver of residential location decisions, though kinship ties and social networks also exercise non-trivial influence.

The Effect of Accessibility on Purchase Decision

Accessibility (X_1) refers to the ease with which residents can reach the housing estate from various directions and access surrounding public facilities, measured by perceived distance to the city centre, workplace/school, and healthcare facilities. Taufiq and Tandelilin (2007) established that greater locational convenience is associated with higher housing demand. Accordingly:

H_1: Accessibility exerts a positive and significant effect on housing location choice.

The Effect of Infrastructure and Facilities on Purchase Decision

Infrastructure and Facilities (X_2) encompasses the availability and quality of basic services such as roads, clean water supply, electricity, drainage, and social facilities including schools, places of worship, and open spaces. Komarudin (1997) argued that adequate infrastructure is fundamental to residential liveability and consumer satisfaction. Accordingly:

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

H_2: Infrastructure and facilities exert a positive and significant effect on housing location choice.

The Effect of Price on Purchase Decision

Price (X_3) captures consumer perceptions of affordability, price fairness relative to quality, and consistency between stated price and actual product attributes. In accordance with the law of demand, higher relative prices are expected to reduce the probability of purchase (Sukirno, 2008; Taufiq & Tandelilin, 2007). Accordingly:

H_3: Price exerts a negative and significant effect on housing location choice.

The Effect of Environmental Condition on Purchase Decision

Environmental Condition (X_4) refers to the physical and social quality of the surrounding residential environment, including cleanliness, safety, noise levels, flood risk, and social cohesion. Soemarwoto (2001) contended that a clean, safe, and harmonious environment is integral to resident well-being. Accordingly:

H_4: Environmental condition exerts a positive and significant effect on housing location choice.

The Effect of Building Quality on Purchase Decision

Building Quality (X_5) denotes the degree to which a dwelling's construction meets technical, comfort, and safety standards expected by residents, encompassing structural strength, design appeal, and garage space. Juran (1992) defined quality as 'fitness for use,' and in the housing context this translates into durability, habitability, and aesthetic value. Accordingly:

H_5: Building quality exerts a positive and significant effect on housing location choice.

The Effect of Down Payment on Purchase Decision

Down Payment (X_6) represents the required initial payment as a proportion of total house price, operationalised as perceived affordability of the down payment, ease of payment, and its influence on willingness to purchase. Mills and Hamilton (1994) argued that housing affordability is substantially determined by the ability to meet upfront costs. Accordingly:

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

H_6: Down payment exerts a positive and significant effect on housing location choice.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a quantitative descriptive approach, combining statistical description with inferential analysis to characterise the factors shaping residential location decisions in Labuapi District (Sugiyono, 2013). The study area was selected because of its designation as a major residential development zone under the West Lombok RTRW and its role as a peri-urban buffer for the City of Mataram. Data collection was conducted between January and March 2026.

The sampling of respondents in this study was conducted using proportionate random sampling. This technique was chosen because the study population consisted of several formal housing complexes in Labuapi District, each with a different number of households. Therefore, the sample size for each housing complex was determined proportionally based on its population.

Table 1. Sampling and Data Collection

No.	Housing Estate	Households (N)	Sample (n)
1	Griya Sehati	70	21
2	LA Resort	66	20
3	Jogot Madani	51	15
4	Kila Rengganis 2	20	6
5	Vila Harmoni	28	8
Total		**235**	**70**

Source: West Lombok Housing and Settlement Agency database; primary data, 2026.

Based on the table, the study population comprised all households residing in five formally registered housing estates in Labuapi District, as listed in the database of the West Lombok Housing and Settlement Agency. Five estates were purposively selected to represent a range of price segments, locations, and developer scales: Griya Sehati, LA

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Resort, Jogot Madani, Kila Rengganis 2, and Vila Harmoni. The sample size was determined using the Slovin formula at a 10 per cent margin of error, yielding a minimum of 70 respondents distributed proportionately across estates using proportionate random sampling.

Respondents were required to be household heads or family members directly involved in the housing purchase decision and to have resided in the estate for at least one year. Questionnaires were administered both face-to-face and online. Supplementary in-depth interviews were conducted with selected respondents to contextualise quantitative findings.

RESULT

Validity and Reliability Results

All 22 questionnaire items returned r-values substantially exceeding the critical r-table value of 0.2352 (df = 68, two-tailed, α = 0.05), confirming construct validity across all items (Table 3). Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranged from 0.618 (purchase decision) to 0.927 (down payment sub-item), all exceeding the threshold of 0.60, indicating adequate to good internal consistency reliability for all scales (Table 4).

Table 3. Summary of validity test results

Item	r-value	r-table (df=68)	Result
P1	0.839	0.2352	Valid
P2	0.879	0.2352	Valid
P3	0.792	0.2352	Valid
P4	0.828	0.2352	Valid
P5	0.819	0.2352	Valid
P6	0.863	0.2352	Valid
P7	0.840	0.2352	Valid
P8	0.882	0.2352	Valid
P9	0.881	0.2352	Valid
P10	0.850	0.2352	Valid

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

P11	0.825	0.2352	Valid
P12	0.873	0.2352	Valid
P13	0.833	0.2352	Valid
P14	0.873	0.2352	Valid
P15	0.886	0.2352	Valid
P16	0.901	0.2352	Valid
P17	0.869	0.2352	Valid
P18	0.927	0.2352	Valid
P19	0.838	0.2352	Valid
P20	0.514	0.2352	Valid
P21	0.910	0.2352	Valid
P22	0.813	0.2352	Valid

Source: Primary data processed with SPSS 25, 2026.

Table 4. Summary of reliability test results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Result
Accessibility	0.787	Reliable
Infrastructure & Facilities	0.854	Reliable
Price	0.841	Reliable
Environmental Condition	0.796	Reliable
Building Quality	0.863	Reliable
Down Payment	0.850	Reliable

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Purchase Decision	0.618	Reliable

Source: Primary data processed with SPSS 25, 2026.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

The multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to examine the influence of six independent variables — accessibility (X1), facilities and infrastructure (X2), price (X3), environmental conditions (X4), building quality (X5), and down payment (X6) — on housing purchase decisions (Y). The regression coefficients derived from the analysis are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Multiple regression results

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	11.641	.181		64.471	.000
	Accessibility	.041	.016	.223	2.478	.016
	Infrastructure & Facilities	.069	.017	.462	4.030	.000
	Price	-.199	.019	-1.081	-10.421	.000
	Environmental Condition	-.055	.020	-.280	-2.759	.008
	Building Quality	.128	.023	.682	5.662	.000
	Down Payment	.028	.019	.146	1.449	.152

Source: Primary data processed with SPSS 25, 2026.

Based on the results of the multiple linear regression analysis, the following equation was obtained:

$$Y = 11.641 + 0.041X_1 + 0.069X_2 - 0.199X_3 - 0.055X_4 + 0.128X_5 + 0.028X_6$$

The constant value of 11.641 indicates that when all independent variables are held constant at zero, the baseline level of housing purchase decision scores 11.641 units, reflecting the inherent propensity toward housing purchase in the absence of any measured predictor influence.

The regression coefficient of 0.041 (p = .016) indicates that a one-unit improvement in accessibility is associated with a 0.041-unit increase in housing purchase

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

decisions, ceteris paribus. This positive and statistically significant relationship suggests that ease of access to a residential location is a meaningful determinant of buyer intent.

The coefficient of 0.069 (p = .000) demonstrates a positive and highly significant effect on purchase decisions. For every unit increase in the provision of supporting infrastructure and public amenities, consumer demand for housing rises by 0.069 units, confirming the pivotal role of community facilities in shaping residential preferences.

With a coefficient of −0.199 (p = .000), price exerts the strongest inhibitory effect among all predictors. Each unit increase in property price is associated with a 0.199-unit decline in purchase decisions, underscoring the price sensitivity of prospective homebuyers and the central role of affordability in housing market dynamics.

The negative coefficient of −0.055 (p = .008) is statistically significant, indicating that, within the specific context of this study, certain environmental condition parameters were inversely associated with purchase decisions. This finding warrants further contextual investigation, as environmental quality is typically associated with higher residential appeal.

The largest positive standardised coefficient (β = .682) and an unstandardised coefficient of 0.128 (p = .000) confirm that building quality is the most influential positive predictor in the model. A one-unit improvement in perceived construction quality raises the likelihood of a purchase decision by 0.128 units, reflecting buyer emphasis on structural integrity and material standards.

Although the coefficient of 0.028 is positive in direction, it fails to reach statistical significance (p = .152 > .05). Accordingly, down payment requirements are not a statistically meaningful predictor of housing purchase decisions within this sample, suggesting that other financial and non-financial factors carry greater explanatory weight.

Hypothesis Testing

Table 6. Summary of hypothesis testing results

Relationship	t-calculated	t-table	p-value	Result
Accessibility → Housing location decision	2.478	1.998	0.016	Supported
Infrastructure & Facilities → Housing location decision	4.030	1.998	0.000	Supported

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Price → Housing location decision	-10.421	1.998	0.000	Supported
Environmental Condition → Housing location decision	-2.759	1.998	0.008	Supported
Building Quality → Housing location decision	5.662	1.998	0.000	Supported
Down Payment → Housing location decision	1.449	1.998	0.152	Not Supported

Source: Primary data processed with SPSS 25, 2026.

Statistical tests were conducted to evaluate the distinct effects of each independent variable, Service Quality (X_1), Facilities (X_2), and Price (X_3) on the dependent variable, Customer Satisfaction (Y). This analysis utilized a t-test with a predetermined significance threshold of α = 0.05. The outcomes of this statistical evaluation are detailed below:

1. Accessibility significantly affects housing purchase decisions (t = 2.478; p = 0.016 < 0.05). Better accessibility and transportation connectivity increase consumers' likelihood of purchasing housing.
2. Infrastructure and facilities have a significant positive effect on housing purchase decisions (t = 4.030; p = 0.000 < 0.05). The availability of public amenities and supporting infrastructure increases residential attractiveness.
3. Price has the strongest and significant negative effect on purchase decisions (t = −10.421; p = 0.000 < 0.05). This finding confirms that higher housing prices reduce consumers' purchasing interest.
4. Environmental conditions significantly influence housing purchase decisions (t = −2.759; p = 0.008 < 0.05). The negative coefficient indicates that unfavorable environmental characteristics may reduce residential desirability.
5. Building quality significantly and positively affects housing purchase decisions (t = 5.662; p = 0.000 < 0.05). Consumers highly consider structural quality and construction standards when purchasing housing.
6. Down payment does not significantly affect housing purchase decisions (t = 1.449; p = 0.152 > 0.05). This suggests that initial payment requirements are not a major determinant of consumers' purchasing decisions.

Simultaneous Test (F Test)

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Table 7. Summary of hypothesis testing results

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	6.108	6	1.018	7.108	.000b
	Residual	9.023	63	.143		
	Total	15.131	69			

Source: Primary data processed with SPSS 25, 2026.

The simultaneous test (F-test) results show that the regression model is statistically significant. The calculated F-value of 7.108 is greater than the F-table value, and the significance level of 0.000 is below 0.05, indicating that the null hypothesis is rejected. This finding demonstrates that accessibility, infrastructure and facilities, price, environmental conditions, building quality, and down payment simultaneously influence housing location selection decisions. Therefore, the regression model is considered valid and appropriate for explaining purchasing decisions.

Coefficient of Determination (R2) Test

Table 8. Summary of hypothesis testing results

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.851a	.724	.698	.25725

Source: Primary data processed with SPSS 25, 2026.

The coefficient of determination (Adjusted R^2) value is 0.347, indicating that 69.8% of the variation in housing purchase decisions can be explained jointly by accessibility, infrastructure and facilities, price, environmental conditions, building quality, and down payment variables. Meanwhile, the remaining 30.2% is influenced by other factors outside the model. These results suggest that the independent variables have a moderate explanatory power in predicting housing purchase decisions.

DISCUSSION

Accessibility and Housing Location Choice

Accessibility emerges as a significant positive predictor of housing location choice ($\beta = 0.041$, $t = 2.478$, $p = 0.016$), confirming H_1. This finding is consistent with Trade-Off

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Model predictions (Alonso, 1964) and with empirical evidence from Rahman (2019), who similarly documented a significant positive relationship between accessibility and purchase decisions in the Indonesian residential market. In Labuapi, where road connectivity to Mataram has improved substantially in recent years, residents place considerable value on reducing daily commuting time and transport costs. Accessibility to workplaces, schools, and healthcare facilities acts as a critical efficiency variable, particularly for the predominant age cohort of 20–30 year olds who are likely to commute regularly. These findings carry important implications for developers, who should carefully consider proximity to transport corridors and intermodal hubs when selecting sites for new housing projects.

Infrastructure and Facilities

Infrastructure and facilities is the strongest statistically significant positive predictor in the model ($\beta = 0.069$, $t = 4.030$, $p < 0.001$), lending strong support to H_2. This result is theoretically consistent with Kotler and Keller's (2016) value proposition framework, which positions product attributes — including supporting facilities — as primary drivers of consumer evaluation and purchase decisions. It also aligns with Nizar et al. (2019), who demonstrated that the availability of public utilities such as roads, drainage, clean water, and electricity has a positive and significant effect on housing value and demand. In the Labuapi context, where access to reliable water supply, adequate drainage, and nearby social amenities (schools, places of worship, markets) varies considerably across estates, residents reward housing developments that offer comprehensive infrastructure packages. Developers who invest in complete infrastructure provision are therefore likely to gain a significant competitive advantage in this market.

Price

Price exhibits the largest absolute coefficient in the model ($\beta = –0.199$, $t = –10.421$, $p < 0.001$), confirming H_3 with a negative direction as anticipated by the law of demand. Each unit increase in the perceived price score is associated with a 0.199-unit decrease in the housing location decision score, holding all other variables constant. This finding is consistent with Taufiq and Tandelilin (2007) and with Sukirno's (2008) foundational articulation of the inverse price–demand relationship. Given that the majority of respondents earn between IDR 4–5 million per month, affordability is a binding constraint. As house prices rise, a portion of consumers delay purchase or redirect demand toward lower-priced alternatives. The magnitude of this coefficient relative to others in the model

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

suggests that price sensitivity is particularly acute in this market segment, reinforcing the policy importance of subsidy programmes and competitive pricing strategies.

Environmental Condition

Environmental condition is significant and negatively signed (β = –0.055, t = –2.759, p = 0.008). While H_4 was originally specified in a positive direction — anticipating that a better environment would increase the probability of purchase — the obtained negative coefficient merits careful contextual interpretation. Field observations reveal that several estates in the sample, particularly Griya Sehati and LA Resort, are susceptible to flooding during periods of heavy rainfall, a consequence of suboptimal drainage infrastructure. Additionally, their proximity to major arterial roads results in significant traffic noise, particularly during peak hours. These conditions imply a gap between the environmental quality marketed by developers and the conditions experienced by residents post-occupation. The negative coefficient thus reflects consumers' rational downward revision of purchasing intentions when environmental quality falls below expectation — a finding congruent with Soemarwoto (2001) and Ratni, Purnamata, and Sasongko (2020), who showed that unmet environmental expectations reduce residential attachment and purchase willingness in peri-urban Mataram. Developers and local governments must address drainage, flood mitigation, and noise buffering as baseline requirements rather than optional amenities.

Building Quality

Building quality is a highly significant positive predictor (β = 0.128, t = 5.662, p < 0.001), confirming H_5. This result is congruent with Juran's (1992) 'fitness for use' quality concept and with Kotler and Keller's (2016) product quality framework, which positions durability, reliability, and design appeal as central to consumer evaluation. In the housing context, structural integrity, material quality, and design attractiveness are long-term investment considerations that consumers weigh carefully given the magnitude and permanence of the purchase. Putra and Handayani (2019) similarly documented a significant positive effect of building quality on purchase decisions among Indonesian home buyers. Building quality ranked second in explanatory power among the positive predictors in this study, suggesting that consumers in Labuapi — a market with relatively high educational attainment and stable incomes — apply discerning quality standards. Developers are therefore advised to maintain transparent quality assurance processes

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

and avoid the cost-cutting material substitutions that can undermine post-occupancy satisfaction and brand reputation.

Down Payment

Contrary to the hypothesis and some prior literature, down payment is not a statistically significant predictor of housing location choice in this sample (β = 0.028, t = 1.449, p = 0.152), leading to the rejection of H_6. Several interpretations may account for this outcome. First, the dominant respondent profile — younger, formally employed, and earning a relatively stable income — suggests a segment that may have pre-arranged mortgage approval or employer housing assistance, effectively decoupling the down payment burden from the location decision. Second, government-backed mortgage programmes (KPR FLPP) prevalent in the Indonesian affordable housing segment typically offer fixed down payment ratios (approximately 1–10 per cent of house price), reducing cross-estate variation in this variable and potentially attenuating its statistical influence. Third, consumers may prioritise tangible location attributes — accessibility, facilities, and building quality — over financing modalities in forming location preferences, with the financial arrangement being determined subsequently. This result resonates with Pratama (2021), who likewise found a non-significant effect of down payment when consumers were primarily driven by locational and quality considerations. Nevertheless, the directional evidence remains consistent with the theoretical expectation: the coefficient, though non-significant, is positive in the full model, suggesting a latent role for down payment flexibility that warrants investigation in larger, more heterogeneous samples.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of multiple linear regression analysis and hypothesis testing, accessibility, infrastructure and public facilities, price, environmental conditions, building quality, and down payment simultaneously influence housing location selection decisions in Labuapi District. These findings indicate that housing selection decisions are shaped by interconnected physical, environmental, and economic factors.

Partially, accessibility, infrastructure and public facilities, and building quality have a positive and significant effect on housing location selection, indicating that better access, adequate facilities, and higher construction quality increase consumer preference for a residential area. Conversely, price and environmental conditions have a negative

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

and significant effect, suggesting that higher housing prices and unfavorable environmental conditions reduce consumers' interest in selecting a housing location.

Meanwhile, the down payment variable has a negative but insignificant effect, implying that initial payment requirements are not the primary factor influencing consumers' final housing decisions.

REFERENCES

Anthony, J., Synder James, C. (1991). *Pengantar arsitektur.* Jakarta : Erlangga.

Awang Firdao. (2005), Analisis pengaruh jarak ke jalan lingkar luar terhadap nilai jual properti perumahan di kecamatan depok sleman yogyakarta, *Jurnal Survey dan Penilaian*, Vol. 001, Jakarta.

Juran, J. M. (1992). *Juran's quality* handbook. McGraw-Hill.

Koestoer, R. H. (2001) Dimensi keruangan kota: Teori dan kasus. UI Press.

Komarudin. (1997). Menelusuri pembangunan perumahan dan pemukiman. Yayasan Realestat Indonesia PT. Rakasindo. Jakarta.

Kotler, Philip & Keller, Kevin Lane. 2016. Marketing Management (15th Edition). Pearson Education, Inc.

Mills, E. S., & Hamilton, B. W. (1994). Urban economics. Harper Collins.

Nizar, A., Siregar, R. T., Damanik, S. E., & Purba, E. (2019). Pengaruh ketersediaan prasarana dan sarana utilitas umum (PSU) terhadap harga jual perumahan dalam pengembangan wilayah Kota Pematangsiantar. Jurnal Regional Planning, 1(2), 108-121.

Putra, A., & Handayani, S. 2019. "Pengaruh Kualitas Bangunan terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Rumah". Jurnal Manajemen Properti, Vol. 7(2), hlm. 55–62.

Rahman, A. 2019. "Pengaruh Lokasi, Harga, dan Aksesibilitas terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Rumah." Jurnal Manajemen Properti, Vol. 8 No. 2.

Ratni, N., Purnamata, W. D., & Sasongko, W. (2020). Preferensi bermukim penghuni perumahan formal di kawasan urban fringe Kota Mataram. Planning for Urban Region and Environment Journal (PURE), 9(1), 171-18

Soemarwoto, O. (2001). Ekologi, lingkungan hidup, dan pembangunan. Jakarta: Djambatan.

Sugiyono. (2013). Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sukirno, S. (2008). Mikroekonomi teori pengantar (Edisi ke-3). Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Taufiq, M., & Tandelilin, E. (2007). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi transaksi rumah sederhana tipe 36 di Kabupaten Boyolali Provinsi Jawa Tengah. Jurnal Ekonomi Bisnis.

Yudohusodo, S. (1991). Rumah untuk seluruh rakyat, Yayasan Padamu Negeri. Jakarta.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.