

# Markets & Its Development Post-Earthquake;

## *A Portrayal of Traditional Market Space Distribution Inequality in Padang, West Sumatra*

Zusmelia

Department of History Education  
Sekolah Tinggi Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan (STKIP)  
PGRI Sumatera Barat  
Padang, Indonesia

Firdaus

Department of Sociology Education  
Sekolah Tinggi Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan (STKIP)  
PGRI Sumatera Barat  
Padang, Indonesia

**Abstract**— *In recent years, social and economic researchers have spent considerable efforts on investigating the impact of Sumatera Earthquake to socio-economic climate in Pasar Raya Padang. They try to find out the development policy of Padang city government where it is the prime resources giving the impact the socio-economic climate. Rehabilitation and reconstruction policy after quake reflect to the injustice of market economic space for traders. The impact is the economic space becoming uncertainty for traders who trade in the old market. The impact of economic space uncertainty is cluttering the market space and inability of traders to survive on their economic and fulfill the family needs. This study finds out the increasing of market space distribution inequality in Pasar Raya Padang that is caused by development policy of city government. The result is the inequality of economic space distribution has been continuing to rise up since the quake*

**Keywords**— *Development Policy, Market Place, Inequality*

### I. INTRODUCTION

*Pasar Raya Padang* is one of the fifteen markets in Padang city. By locating 71.375m<sup>2</sup> areas, *Pasar Raya Padang* is the largest market<sup>1</sup> and highest economic value as well with the price of the land 5,000,000 IDR/meter. Having the highest land price and most strategic location in downtown, *Pasar Raya Padang* turns into an interesting place for business and economics interest. Therefore, it becomes a competition object for many economical interests by the economic agents. It is undoubtful that the tenseness in the market is very high after quake in 2009. It is because; the more people or groups want to access the same room, the more its tenseness faces the room (Basundoro, 2013). By utilizing the quake impacts in 2009 as the momentum, *Pasar Raya Padang* development processes

<sup>1</sup> 15 markets in Padang city are 1. *Pasar Raya Padang* is in Padang Barat district (71.376 m<sup>2</sup>), 2. *Pasar Alai* is in Padang Utara district (13.650 m<sup>2</sup>), 3. *Pasar Simpang Haru* is in Padang Timur district (5800 m<sup>2</sup>), 4. *Pasar Siteba* is in Nanggalo district (1 ha), 5. *Pasar Lubuk Buaya* is in Koto Tengah district (23.600 m<sup>2</sup>), 6. *Pasar Ulak Karang* is in Padang Utara district (6.400 m<sup>2</sup>), 7. *Pasar Bandar Buat* is in Lubuk Kilangan district (25.300 m<sup>2</sup>), 8. *Pasar Belimbing* is in Kuranji (4.275 m<sup>2</sup>), 9. *Pasar Tanah Kongsi* is in Padang Barat (6.000 m<sup>2</sup>), 10. *Pasar Teluk Kabung* is in Bungus Teluk Kabung (24.000 m<sup>2</sup>), 11. *Pasar Tabing* is in Koto Tengah (800 m<sup>2</sup>), 12. *Pasar Kelawi* is in Kuranji (- m), 13. *Pasar Gaung* is in Mata Air of Padang Selatan district (1.5 Ha), 14. *Pasar Balai Gadang* is in Koto Tengah district (250 m<sup>2</sup>), 15. *Pasar Indarung* is in Lubuk Kilangan district (1.200 m<sup>2</sup>) ([http://bpmp2t.padang.go.id/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=197&lang=id](http://bpmp2t.padang.go.id/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=197&lang=id) accessed on June 15<sup>th</sup> 2014).

have been marked by irregularities creating the tension between the government and traders. The same processes have also been running for a long time, where the fire incidents engulfing some markets in Padang are used as the entrance to the next market development (Colombijn, 2006).

As in the Colonial era, the economical, cultural, social and political lives as well as mutual relations of island community were dominated by colonial interests and policies (Lane, 2014). Re-establishing of *Pasar Raya Padang* after quake was also related to the policy for the certain colonies. The difference was if the European nations set the policies in Colonial era, in Independence era, groups of Indonesian citizen set for themselves. They were the owners of capital who wanted to dominate the city economic space for their economic and colony business interests. The city government, with all of its authority, issued the policies in line with the needs of the colony. Therefore, there were many imbalances appearing in the re-establishing process of *Pasar Raya Padang* after quake in 2009. Because of it, the traders made a movement to oppose the policy.

Various forms of protest signing out of refusal by traders have been going on since the first time of disaster management policy carried out by the city government. The emergency kiosk development and re-establishing policy of *Pasar Inpres I, II, III* and *Pasar Fase VII* that did not correspond to the needs of traders become the factor of rising up the protest from traders. Besides of uncorrelated to the needs, the development scheme using investment pattern is not in accordance with Law No. 24 of 2007 on disaster (Firdaus, 2014). By using investment schemes in implementing the rehabilitation and reconstruction after quake, the traders must pay to get their falling kiosks back because of the quake. This was also unrelated to the disaster management rules as stipulated by laws and its derivative rules. On the other hand, the city government kept going to implement the development by using the investment scheme and also overthrowing the undestroyed and usable building to re-establish.

Although the development policy of *Pasar Raya Padang* got rejection from traders because of its irrelevance to their rules and need, the city government still carried out the development based on the approved policy. The policy was to build emergency kiosks for 1,100 units exceeding the victims on collapsed *Pasar Inpres I*, to urge the demolition of *Pasar*

*Inpres II, Pasar Inpres III, Pasar Inpres IV* buildings and shopping complex of *Fase VII* to be re-established with new buildings. After the re-establishing with the new building, the old traders were required to buy the new kiosks and shops after being re-established. For the traders, the scheme showed disadvantages for the traders who had been trading for a long time on the place. The policy was also contradictory to the Laws of disaster management. Obviously, the issued policy by city Government became the cause of injustice for space utilizing in Pasar Raya Padang. The research results will analyze the rehabilitation and reconstruction policy of Pasar Raya Padang after quake in which it becomes the source of the inequity. It also elaborates the spatial distribution of economic injustice in Pasar Raya Padang after quake in 2009.

## II. METHOD

This paper had been written on the results of qualitative research conducted in Pasar Raya Padang since 2014 until the article written. Data were collected through interviews, observation and document analysis. Data were analyzed through the stages of data reduction, data display and conclusion (Miles & Huberman, 1992). The results of the data analysis presenting on the paper is descriptive. Document analysis on the study are more reliant on advocacy documents owned by The Indonesian Legal Aid and Human Right Association of West Sumatera (PBHI Sumbar) as the legal representative traders after quake in 2009 in order to fulfill their rights as victims.

## III. FINDING

### A. *markets and Space Injustice; A Portrait of Traditional Economic Space in Indonesia*

Joel Kotkin, a historian, argues that urban areas have three basic functions in which the real initial functions are: the creation of sacred space, the provision of security, and determination of the market space (Bracken & Solomon, 2013). Market is a medium where exchanges can take a place (Root, 2007). As a medium for meetings and exchanging of goods, market is a space that has an economical value. Market is also becoming one of the major capitals in the trading system. Therefore, market becomes the struggling object. The space struggling, in a matter of market, can be understood as a production material competition between bourgeois and proletarians (Basundoro, 2013). Thus, the market development is inseparable from the struggle for the inside available space.

Economic inequality in society is essentially a product of the development process (Tadjoeddin et al., 2015). Space Injustice in the development process has been a major problem in developing countries. In Indonesia, the development and management of space, especially markets, do not represent the alignments to the general public, but it is more concerned with the needs of big investors. The development permittances for intensive capital modern market are more easily issued than traditional market development. A study of Suryawan about developing the *Gelael Jayapura* market shows it up. In his writing, he mentions that how pain and struggle it is for

mothers, also known as *mama-mama*, in Papua ask the Jayapura city government to build the *Gelael* market. On the way of the fighting for having traditional markets, *Gelael* supermarkets and KFC had already stood and government employees even spent more of their time to shop there. In fact, after the city government formed a special committee to discuss the development of the market, the city government claimed that it did not have a budget for market development and explained that the *Gelael* market development was fully authorized by the provincial government (Suryawan, 2011).

In Surabaya's city, half of city spaces have become extensions of operating the capitalism system in a wider scale. It can be seen from the existences of some spaces that are intentionally arranged, created, formed, restructured, designed back to pass off the activities of capital owners. There are spaces turned into a green opened-space. There are spaces changed into residences. There are public spaces modified as private spaces. Surabaya city government is a representative of capitalist system managing and rasonalizing spaces for economic social spaces both production and reproduction. Space domination in Surabaya city follows the existing capital circuit flow (primary, secondary, and tertiary). These circuits are seen as the domination of capitalist/investor class both in a direct production domain and consumption, capital forming domain, regular consumption and consumption domain. Capital circuits cause imbalance domination proportion among the three actors in spatial space practices. Then, Surabaya city government also guarrantes the establishment of institutional plan supporting the existence of capitalist power that keeps accumulating the capital through spatial policies decided in a political process (Aminah, 2015).

In *Babat* district, *Lamongan* regency, *Babat* market revitalization for being a modern market got resistance from its traders because of the expensive hiring cost. Although there were subsidies for the traders who were once trading in traditional markets by 20 percent, the stand prices for trading rising up for 123% of the initial price (Zunaidi, 2013: 56). The developing process of *Babat* modern market, according to Zunaidi, was performed by investors. By handing over the market development to investors, in a matter of logic of development, the city government did not give a justice space for the traditional traders who had already traded in the market. Investors were certainly taking advantage of the development process of the modern market by rising up the kiosks prices very high. The kiosk price for 11 x 9 meters is Rp 67 million IDR for the normal price, but in *Babat* market, it is sold 130 million IDR. It is up to 93.6 percent. The kiosk for 6.04 m<sup>2</sup>, with the normal price i.e 12 million IDR, jumps into 27 million IDR or up to 123 percent (Zunaidi, 2013).

The three studies described above show how injustice of market economy space occurs in various cities in Indonesia. The main actor causing the space injustice is the government with the authority of making policies that they have. The epicenter of the injustice of economic space in the city appears

from institutional policy that should be more taking a side for people who have already given them a mandate. There is no exception even in the city of Padang. The space injustice for Pasar Raya is also caused by the policies of rehabilitation and reconstruction after quake in 2009. In this case, the city government has used their authorities on making the policies that are not in favor for traders.

#### *B. Dynamics of Pasar Raya Padang; From the Colonial to Reformation Era*

Pasar Raya Padang has experienced for a long dynamics since the colonial to reformation era. In the colonial era, Pasar Raya Padang, as written by Colombijn, was one of the four markets, i.e. *Pasar Gadang, Tanah Kongs, Belakang Tangsi, and Kampong Jawa or Pasar Raya Padang*, competing in the city of Padang in the mid-19th century. All of these markets were public property. Because of it was close to monopoly term, high rents and neglecting the aspect of cleanliness, Padang city government took over the market for general interest and bought the biggest share of NV Goan Hoat market and simultaneously bought the surrounding land for development in 1917. Pasar Raya Padang design was a design of Thomas Karsten in 1933. The design was to make large blocks with kiosks in the markets and shops along the road as well as the city hall on the east of market completed by public transport terminal on the west side of the market. He accomplished the details of the plan in 1941 (Colombijn, 2006).

After the main market was burned in 1955, PRRI decided to rebuild and its expansion and improvement work continued without a hitch. Once, during the process, the name of *Pasar Jawa* turned into Pasar Raya. The work for replacing the old building with the new blocks in two floors was implemented in seven phases. Phase I-III were started in 1959 and phase IV-VII were started in 1971. Block A was built in 1973. The food market was placed in *Pasar Raya Timur*. It was built in three phases between 1978 and 1983; the second floor was added in 1987. The other block was built in 1985 in the western part of the public transport terminal. In 1988 and 1989, a private company changed the phase VII into *Duta Plaza*; the third floor was added and the second floor and third floor were renewed by completing with air conditioning (AC), escalators, and white tiles and the front one was put a black glass mirror. That Pasar Raya Barat blocks had been made during the colonial era had gradually damaged by the time, and it was turned down in 1990 and replaced with new buildings made by white tile floors with shops and parking lots. Some of the other blocks with shops were built around the market. It was in line with the idea of Thomas Karten. The blocks of the new market were partially funded by a Presidential Decree i.e. development funds provided by the central government (Zusmelia & Firdaus, 2015).

In the 1990s, Pasar Raya Padang was a city display window and became a pilot of market management in the region of Sumatra. The shops from Phase I to Phase VII were equipped by a large vehicle parking lot in front of the shops. In front of the building of *Inpres III*, there was also a large parking area as well as a main road. At that time, Pasar Raya

Padang became the centers of shopping and people's recreational purposes from various areas in West Sumatra and Pekanbaru city. Market governance was implemented by the city government through an assigned Regional Work Unit (SKPD).

After reformation, along with the lack of control by the government, spaces were originally a place for shopping complex began to be placed to trade by traders who did not own the shop by selling the goods on mats and table. The majority of goods types were textiles, clothing, shoes and bags. The types of goods were similar and even the same with the type of goods sold by traders in the shopping complex of Phase VII. These traders were lately familiar with *Pedagang Kaki Lima (PKL)*. Time by time, the amount of them was rising a lot because there was not any official action against them. Some of the government unscrupulous officials- especially for market and transportation department- started to do illegal action by asking the rents to the small traders. Their number continued to grow along the way of Pasar Raya from the end of fountain roundabout in front of Muhammadiyah mosque until the T junction of *Permind* road. Not only in the shopping complex of Phase I until Phase VII, they also occupied the road on both sides of Pasar Raya. Such condition made the Pasar Raya jam, especially if it is crossed by four-wheeled vehicles. In addition to the road of Pasar Raya, Pasar Baru road, in front of the *Pasar Inpres III*, was also inhabited by traders of vegetables and groceries food needs.

An earthquake measuring 7.9 magnitudes shook the Pasar Raya Padang in 2009 along with several areas in West Sumatra. The quake knocked down entirely the first and second floor of *Pasar Inpres I*. The buildings were collapsed and flush with the ground. The second floor of *Pasar Inpres II* buildings were collapsed, but the first floor did not show any fatal damage. *Inpres III* and *IV* buildings only had cracks on the surface of the wall and drainage channels. Outside the two buildings, there were no buildings were badly damaged and requiring to be turned down and rebuilt. Only the third floor of Phase VII got the damage because the construction was an addition that was built in 1988-1989. The damage was increased because the city government immediately opened the roof of the building on the third floor. The impact was the rain seeped and disrupted the first floor of the Phase VII building in which it actually did not have any damage.

After quake, Pasar Raya condition had no longer a space certainty because the development policy that don't correspond to the needs of traders. The city government wanted that all buildings were fully demolished and built with a new building. All traders owning kiosks, stalls and stores were required to leave it and then they must pay back with the new price in order to get their demolishing kiosks, stalls and stores. The policy contract got resistance from the traders because they thought that they were aggrieved by the policy. As the victims, they argued that they did not have to pay if the market were rebuilt. If they must pay, they actually prefer the market not to be turned down and to be built a new building. It is because the existing building was more than enough and it did not have a significant damage.

### *C. From Intimidation to Violence; the Space Injustice Portrait in Pasar Raya Padang*

The development is actually the activity of natural and human resources as well as the interaction between both of it. In this case, the processing of natural resources explicitly meeting the human needs must pay attention to the interaction of natural and human resources in order to be used as long as possible (Poerwanto, 2005). However, the implementation of development dominated by the government with a top-down approach, in fact, many of them are not in accordance to the situation and the living conditions of society in which the development is implemented. As a result, the development does not change for a better thing i.e. as its original goal, but it gives an injustice to the society. The development after quake in Pasar Raya Padang showed on symptoms of injustice for traditional traders in which it was actually the largest entity associated to the market. The symptoms of injustice could be seen from the policy and orientation of development issued by the Padang city government after the disaster.

By utilizing the momentum of the quake, Padang city government decided to make rehabilitation and reconstruction policies by building 1,100 emergency kiosks up along the roads of *Sandang Pangan* and *Pasar Baru Pasar Raya* on the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of the quake. Emergency kiosks were built, according to the city government's aim, to accommodate the disaster victims traders of the collapsed and destroyed *Pasar Inpres I*. However, the number of built kiosks by the government was twice of the number of traders who were becoming victims of disasters in *Pasar Inpres I* building i.e. 445 people (Firdaus, 2014). If the purpose of the emergency kiosk development indeed to accommodate the disaster victims traders, the number of built kiosk should be constructed in accordance to the number of traders who were becoming of the disaster victims. As if it were built for more, the number should not be twice more than it should be.

In addition to the number of built kiosks units for twice of the disaster victim trader number, the existence of emergency kiosks covered the access from and to the *Pasar Inpres II, III* and *IV* that were not damaged and still being used by traders to trade. It was caused by the existence of emergency kiosks surrounding the building of *Pasar Inpres II, III* and *IV*. The Impact was the buyers did not shop in the markets covered by the emergency kiosks. Buyers tended to shop with the traders in the emergency kiosks in which they were new traders and not the directly-affected traders. The traders occupied the emergency kiosks by using a renting system. The disaster victim traders in *Pasar Inpres I* itself refused to occupy the kiosks because of out of the number and covering the access to *Pasar Inpres II, III* and *IV*. These conditions showed how the development of the market after the disaster did not indicate the interest of traders who were the victims of disaster. The impact was the *Pasar Inpres I* traders, who became the victims, did not get spaces to trade. Most of them stopped trading because they did not have the space. As the victims, they should be prioritized in the provision of trade space after the disaster.

Beside of developing the emergency kiosks exceeding the number of affected traders, the rehabilitation policy of *Pasar Inpres II* building that was only damaged on the second floor and *Pasar Inpres III* that was only having cracks in the outside wall surface and *Pasar Inpres IV* that was not damaged at all by the mechanism of fully-demolished and rebuilt with the new building, was a form of development policy representing of injustice. The policy was regarded unfair because the redevelopment of the market was carried out by the investment scheme. The traders who were initially trading in the markets were sent out of where they should be. Then, the new buildings were built. Finally, the traders were required to pay with a certain price. As the victims, in accordance to the Law No. 24 of 2007, they are not supposed to pay for the redevelopment because the rehabilitation and reconstruction should use the Indonesian Budget (APBN) and Regional Government Budget (APBD).

Instead of using the Indonesian Budget (APBN) and Regional Government Budget (APBD), the city government even used an investment approach in the development process. The traders, who were initially trading, were required to pay to get a new kiosk or store. They had previously lost their kiosk for a long time long since it was turned and rebuilt a new building. In addition, the available kiosk and store size were smaller than it was before the disaster. According to the city government, building up a smaller kiosk and store than its original size was in order to get more numbers and also to get benefit of it. This mechanism was clearly using an investment approach. In business logic, of course, the concerned investors get the advantages in their businesses. In this context, the city government took a side to investors by providing the development projects. Meanwhile for the traders, they had lost of their previous economic space and been required to pay in order to get a new economic space.

The same pattern was also carried out by the city government in the process of rehabilitation of Phase VII shops that were damaged on the second floor. According to the city government, Phase VII shopping complex building should be broken down overall in order to rebuild a new building because the building on the second floor was damaged. On the other hand, building on the first floor was not damaged by the quake. The damage on the first floor was precisely because the roof of the second floor building was demolished by the city government and it was not immediately fixed, so that the rain water seeped into the building of the first floor and damaged the building walls. "In the rainy season, we are like taking cover under a tree, the water drips and seeps from everywhere" (*data interview with a male trader, October 2015*). Whenever the rain fell, the traders used various plastic materials to get covered from the seepage of rain. Some of the goods majorities, like textiles and clothings, were wet because of the seepage of rain. In fact, some traders used plastic to cover up the ceiling of the shop. The ignorance of the building condition without having a roof in Phase VII shopping complex lasted until the mid 2015. The city government was seemingly allowing such condition in order to make the trader felt uncomfortable on trading.

In the implementation of development policies after the quake in which it was not in favor of the needs of traders, the city government tend to use violence by using the Civil Service Police Unit (Satpol PP), Police and Military. It was uncounted in which the traders Civil Service Police Unit (Satpol PP) faced to face up to the violence in the implementation of development policies. The peak of it occurred on August 31, 2011 in which the violence was committed by government officials (Civil Service Police Unit (Satpol PP), Police and Military) by beating, dragging, kicking and firing the lachymatory gas at traders who refused fencing the market. Some traders had contusions, bruises, sprains, and shortness of breath. On the event, which coincided with the Muslims red-letter day, the city government forced the demolition of the Pasar Inpres II, III and IV to be rebuilt with an investment scheme. The traders refused the development policy by investment patterns.

Before the peak of violence at the Idul Fitri day, the traders had already been intimidated by the various issues of demolition spread by the government officials staying in the market. Every day, various information about market demolition were always informed to the traders. The demolition issues were secretly informed to be carried out at night, early morning, afternoon, morning and various other times. At the trader's side, the addressed information was an alert for the market. They set the picket schedule to keep the market from demolition by the city government. Every night, they kept it in turns to avoid the demolition undertaken by the city government without having their existence. Beside the picket duty, the other traders were also asked to stay alert to activate their mobile phone to be contacted at any time in case of demolition. The alert had continued every night for several months until the city government mobilized the government officials to forcibly fence the market on the day of Idul Fitri. It was the day where traders carrying out a relationship with their families.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Pasar Raya Padang, in a term of genealogy, was created by a society participation to build a traditional economic space as a place where they exchange goods with money. As a market built by the people, Pasar Raya ownership was closed to the first people on building the market. Although in the subsequent development of Pasar Raya management was taken over by the government, but the ownership of the kiosks, buildings, and stores remained in the hands of the traders building markets. However, the city government, by equivocating the disaster management, makes a policy orienting to the ownership taking over of the kiosks, buildings, and stores from the old traders to the new traders and or to the old traders by buying and selling mechanism. The effect is protesting against the policy coming out from the traders because they feel that they get disadvantages from the policy. Finally, the tenseness appears between government and traders and it triggers an economic space injustice.

The development of Pasar raya, after disaster, keeps continuing unclear and uncertainty. So that traders do not get the assurance of economic space. In fact, they get intimidated in the process of implementation of development policies that do not take a side to them. As a development process, cited from Todaro, the development of Pasar Raya should be investigated as multidimensional proses involving the reorganization and reorientation of all social economic system (Todaro, 1983). Market development orientation should be changed from concerning over business interests to the trader interests as the main entity of system and structure prevailing in the market.

#### REFERENCES

- Aminah, S. (2015). Konflik dan Kontestasi Penataan Ruang Kota Surabaya. *Masyarakat, Jurnal Sosiologi*, 20(80), 59–79.
- Basundoro, P. (2013). *Merebut Ruang Kota; Aksi Rakyat Miskin Kota Surabaya 1900-1960-an*. Tangerang Selatan: Margin Kiri.
- Bracken, G., & Solomon, J. D. (2013). Future Publics : Politics and Space in East Asia 's Cities. *Spring*, 7, 1–6.
- Colombijn, F. (2006). *Paco-Paco (Kota) Padang; Sejarah Sebuah Kota di Indonesia Pada Abad ke-20 dan Penggunaan Ruang Kota*. Yogyakarta: Ombak.
- Firdaus. (2014). Protes Korban Bencana: Studi Konflik Penanggulangan Bencana di Pasar Raya Padang. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Mamangan*, 1(2), 27–39.
- Lane, M. (2014). *Nation: Ingatan Revolusi, Aksi Massa dan Sejarah Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Djaman Baroe.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1992). *Analisis Data Kualitatif: Buku Sumber Tentang Metode-Metode Baru*. Jakarta.: UI Press.
- Poerwanto, H. (2005). *Kebudayaan dan Lingkungan Dalam Perspektif Antropologi*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Root, A. (2007). *Market Citizenship; Experiments in Democracy and Globalization*. London: Sage Publication Ltd.
- Suryawan, I. . N. (2011). Antropologi Gerakan Sosial: Membaca Transformasi Identitas Budaya di kota Manokwari, Papua Barat. *Humaniora*, 23(3), 290–300.
- Tadjoeddin, M. Z., Yumna, A., Gultom, S. E., Rakhmadi, M. F., Hidayat, M. F., & Suryahadi, A. (2015). *Inequality and Stability in Democratic and Decentralized Indonesia* (February 2015). Jakarta.
- Todaro, M. P. (1983). *Pembangunan Ekonomi di Dunia Ketiga*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Zunaidi, M. (2013). Kehidupan Sosial Ekonomi Pedagang Di Pasar Tradisional Pasca Relokasi Dan Pembangunan Pasar Modern, 3(1), 51–64.
- Zusmelia, & Firdaus. (2015). Dinamika ruang ekonomi tradisional di kota padang; (Studi Perubahan Penggunaan Ruang Ekonomi Tradisional di Pasar Raya Padang Pasca Bencana 2009). *Turast: Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengabdian*, 3(2), 181–197.