Choice within limits. How forced relocation affects residents’ dwelling searches and trade-offs in dwelling choice
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Abstract

Each year, thousands of Dutch social renters have to deal with forced relocation from their dwellings slated for demolition. This is an essential part of Dutch urban restructuring policy in early post-war neighbourhoods. Usually, these relocatees have to find a new dwelling by themselves, facilitated with a priority status and an allowance for relocation costs. Their search process is quite different from regular house seekers in the social rented sector. On the one hand, the initial trigger is a top down force (i.e. a pending notice to quit by the housing association), although these residents may already have latent moving intentions. On the other hand, the priority status and other legal compensatory mechanisms may strongly favour their position on the housing market above regular, non-urgent house seekers. Additionally, several specific regulations further affect relocatees’ search process and outcomes in ways that are (potentially) different from regular house seekers.

It is much debated whether the specific situation of forced relocatees affects their dwelling search in a primarily positive or negative way. Earlier studies on forced relocation mainly focused on either positive or negative outcomes of the search process. Moreover, most studies are of a quantitative nature, and the available qualitative research is often very small-scale. As such, the search process itself and relocatees’ personal experiences in this context are still under-examined. This especially applies to the trade-offs between opportunities and constraints with regard to dwellings and neighbourhoods.

In this paper, we aim to reveal how the specific context and regulations of forced relocation (in urban restructuring) affect relocatees’ search process, choices and their perceptions of this process. We draw from a Dutch dataset of 150 in-depth interviews with relocatees in five cities. The interviews focus primarily on respondents’ relocation choices and the perceived opportunities and constraints.
Introduction

Until recently, thousands of Dutch social renters per year had to deal with forced relocation from their dwellings slated for demolition. This has been an essential part of Dutch urban restructuring policy in post-war neighbourhoods (see e.g. Kleinhaus & Van der Laan Bouma-Doff, 2008; Bolt & Van Kempen, 2010; Kleinhaus & Varady, 2010). Usually, these relocatees have to find a new dwelling by themselves, facilitated by a priority status and an allowance for relocation costs. Their search process is quite different from regular house seekers in the social rented sector. On the one hand, the initial trigger is a top down force: a pending notice to quit by the housing association, although these residents may already have latent moving intentions. On the other hand, the priority status and other legal compensatory mechanisms may strongly favour their position on the housing market above regular, non-urgent house seekers. Additionally, several specific regulations further affect relocatees’ search process and outcomes in ways that are (potentially) different from regular house seekers, especially those active on the market for social housing.

It is much debated whether the specific situation of forced relocatees affects their dwelling search in a primarily positive or negative way. Previous studies on forced relocation mainly focused on either positive or negative outcomes of the search process. Outcomes are defined in terms of dwelling and neighbourhood quality (compared to the pre-relocation situation), satisfaction, social ties, utility costs and other issues. While informative about the benefits and costs of relocation, this body of evidence does not delve into the choice process underlying the relocation. Moreover, most studies are quantitative nature, and the available qualitative research is often very small-scale. As such, the search process itself and relocatees’ personal experiences in this context are still under-examined (see also Bolt et al., 2009, p. 515; Clampet-Lundquist, 2004, p. 422; Kleit & Manzo, 2006). This especially applies to the trade-offs between opportunities and constraints with regard to dwellings and neighbourhoods.

In this paper, we aim to reveal how the specific context and regulations of forced relocation (in urban restructuring) affect relocatees’ search process and choices. We draw from a Dutch dataset of almost 150 in-depth interviews with forced relocatees in five cities. The interviews focus primarily on respondents’ perceived opportunities and constraints, details of their search process and their final relocation choices.

The next section presents an overview of forced relocation and residential mobility theories. Section three and four elaborate upon the dwelling and neighbourhood outcomes of involuntary mobility programs and trade-offs in housing choices of forced relocation. The fifth section describes the methodology used and section six explains the Dutch institutional context of forced relocation. Section seven discusses the results from the interview analyses. Finally, some concluding remarks are made.

Forced Relocation and Residential Mobility Theory

Many residential moves can be related to various events in life course trajectories, such as changes in household composition, socioeconomic situation (education, income, and job) and changes in residents’ local environments (e.g. Clark et al., 2006; Mulder & Hooimeijer, 1999). An important trigger is an increase of residential stress due to a ‘mismatch’ between a household’s residential needs and preferences and the characteristics of its current housing and neighbourhood (e.g. Lu, 1998, p. 1474; Speare et al., 1975). Households make trade-offs encompassing various considerations, such as dwelling type, neighbourhood quality, safety, access to education and work, and transportation, based upon their understanding of (macro level) constraints and opportunities.

‘Traditional’ models of residential mobility often presuppose that a certain adjustment will occur if satisfaction with the housing situation falls below an acceptable level or threshold value. Popp’s theoretical model (1976) was one of the first to explicitly incorporate various involuntary moving reasons, such as fire, divorce, a sudden income decrease, and demolition. The latter is crucial in the context of urban restructuring and demolition. Popp also rightly acknowledged that households can
react in various ways to this external trigger. Het distinguished five variants in the decision-making process (pp. 302-304):

1. The household is forced to leave but is simultaneously offered another dwelling, accepts this dwelling and moves
2. The household is forced to leave, initiates a search for another dwelling and moves to an available dwelling of their choice
3. The household is offered a dwelling and subsequently decides to move
4. The household has a strong desire to move, is then offered a dwelling and decides to move to this dwelling
5. The household has a strong desire to move, initiates a search for another dwelling and moves to an available dwelling of their choice.

In the context of forced relocation due to demolition, all these variants may be applicable. On the one hand, the word ‘choice’ is somewhat misleading (Goetz, 2002). Obviously, the initial decision to move is not made by households themselves but by the owner of the building, usually a housing association, social housing landlord or public housing authority. Thus, a choice for a new dwelling is tied to a top-down pressure to relocate. On the other hand, Popp’s model implies that relocation in a demolition context may not be experienced as an involuntary matter. Residents who intended to move before they actually received a notice to quit due to demolition may react quite differently. Finally, Popp’s model is relevant in its recognition that households in dwellings slated for demolition may not always have to find an alternative themselves, but may be offered a dwelling by a housing provider. Like regular movers, forced movers have to deal with certain opportunities and constraints on the housing market, taking into account their own resources, preferences and restrictions (Mulder & Hooimeijer, 1999). It goes without saying that choice on the housing market is often limited. The work of Murie (1974, 1986) is particularly informing in this respect. He states that various barriers (filters) limit the available options for residents in search of a new dwelling. Filters may include financial situation, lifestyle, house seeking strategies, how residents acquire information, eligibility criteria (for rented housing), and availability of the desirable housing option. The filters also apply to forced relocation, especially with regard to formal and informal allocation criteria of social housing providers (Murie, 1974). While filters usually limit choice options, this does not necessarily imply a negative impact on post-relocation satisfaction. Institutional arrangements may give certain groups of house seekers (e.g. in the rental sector) priority over other groups. This may be grounded in fundamental concerns with their ability to acquire and maintain an independent housing situation or as compensating mechanism in cases of forced relocation due to demolition. Further on, we will return to the Dutch institutional specifics of forced relocation. But first, we briefly review the literature on various outcomes.

Dwelling and Neighbourhood Outcomes of Forced Relocation

Since the 1960s, a substantial body of evidence has been built up around outcomes of forced relocation processes. Seminal work has been done by the American psychologist Marc Fried in the West End in Boston. According to Fried, involuntarily relocated people who find it difficult to adapt to a new housing situation can suffer from affliction. Affliction refers to feelings of a painful loss, homesickness and inclination to idealise the previous housing situation (Fried, 1963, 1967). Apart from its physical amenities, the dwelling is an important foundation for security and trust, and it helps shaping the identity of its residents (Ekström, 1994; Mallett, 2004). Forced relocation violates all these features; hence, forced movers are much more likely to report affliction than other movers. Research shows that forced relocation (in urban renewal contexts) presents significant risks for residential satisfaction and social ties in movers’ former neighbourhoods (e.g. Curley, 2009; Fried, 1967; Gans, 1991; Goetz, 2002; Kleit & Manzo, 2006). As the sense of belonging to the area is stronger, the risk of post-relocation affliction is higher (Fried, 1963).
Dwelling outcomes

Despite potentially negative socio-psychological impacts, there is substantial evidence of forced relocation being used as a chance to improve the quality of the dwelling in which disadvantaged residents live (e.g. Baker & Arthurson, 2006; Kleinhans, 2003; Kleit & Manzo, 2006). Basically, this is not a big surprise. The HOPE VI program (Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere) was established in 1993 to redevelop the ‘most severely distressed’ public housing projects in the US (Goetz, 2003; Popkin et al., 2004). Notwithstanding fundamental context differences, the Dutch urban restructuring policy has a more or less similar approach (Bolt & Van Kempen, 2010; Kleinhans & Varady, 2011). On both sides of the Atlantic, many relocatees move to larger, better isolated and better maintained housing and of a more valued dwelling type (Buron et al., 2002; Varady & Walker, 2000; Kleinhans, 2003; Kleinhans & Van der Laan Bouma-Doff, 2008). This usually has a positive impact on dwelling satisfaction compared to the pre-move situation. Negative outcomes have also been recorded; sometimes even homelessness due to a lack of replacement housing (Crump, 2002).

Neighbourhood outcomes

With regard to the new neighbourhood of relocatees, findings are more ambivalent. On the one hand, there is strong evidence for improvements in neighbourhood safety (Buron et al., 2002; Goetz & Chapple, 2010; Varady & Walker, 2003) and moves to neighbourhoods with lower poverty rates than the original areas (Clampet-Lundquist, 2004; Goetz, 2003; Goetz & Chapple, 2010; Hartung & Henig, 1997; Kingsley et al., 2003; Pendall, 2000; Popkin et al., 2004; Varady & Walker, 2000; for the Netherlands, see Bolt et al. 2009). Also, “the neighborhoods to which displaced families move also tend to have lower rates of unemployment and public assistance participation” (Goetz & Chapple, 2010, p. 215; Clampet-Lundquist 2004).

On the other hand, many of the same sources indicate that poverty rates in relocatees’ destination neighbourhoods are still above the city average. These findings appear partly related to moving distance. Many forced moves are short-distance, usually even within the central city (see Goetz & Chapple, 2010, p. 214-215 for an overview). Kingsley and colleagues (2003) showed that, “in the HOPE VI program, relocatees who stayed closer to their original sites did not experience as great a reduction in neighborhood poverty rates as those who moved farther away” (cited in Kleit & Galvez, 2011, p. 3).

Another striking feature is the apparent failure of racial de-concentration objectives connected to involuntary mobility programs. Most public housing relocatees end up in census tracts with primarily minority groups (Oakley & Burchfield, 2009; Popkin et al. 2004; Varady & Walker, 2000), although slight improvements in levels of racial segregation are also reported (Burton et al., 2002; Goetz & Chapple, 2010). Reflecting upon the reasons why HOPE VI movers relocate to high-poverty, racially segregated neighbourhoods, Turner and colleagues (2000) identified five crucial factors: lack of affordable housing, especially beyond of the inner city, discrimination by landlords, administrative barriers that reduce voucher portability, lack of housing for the ‘hard to house’ residents, and benefits of the immediate surrounding area. The latter aspect primarily concerns established social support networks and access to services and public transportation. Moreover, Kingsley and colleagues (2003) observe that it is unrealistic to expect HOPE VI to relocate all residents to low-poverty neighbourhoods. Not only are residents exercising their own location choices, local housing officials generally do not encourage daring moves.

Despite the fundamental context differences, Dutch studies have shown roughly comparable patterns. Using national Housing Demand Survey data, Bolt et al. (2009) showed that forced movers (from restructuring sites) are less likely to move to neighbourhoods with a lower share of low-income households or minority ethnic groups (see also Bolt & Van Kempen, 2010). These findings were echoed by Doff and Kleinhans (2011). In their study of 658 forced relocatees in The Hague, ethnic minorities reported neighbourhood improvement less often and were more likely to stay within or move to other ethnically concentrated neighbourhoods than native Dutch relocatees. These differences were not fully explained by differences in individual characteristics, resources, pre-relocation preferences, institutional factors, and other relocation outcomes.
In sum, there is plenty of research showing where relocatees end up, but the reasons why they end up where there do, are less understood (Kleit & Galvez, 2011, p. 4).

Trade-offs and Housing Choices in Forced Moves

As mentioned earlier, through the dominance of quantitative research on housing mobility, including forced relocation, “we tend to know quite a bit about outcomes and precious little about process” (Clampet-Lundquist, 2004, p. 422). Quantitative modelling of neighbourhood location choices under involuntary relocation is also scarce: the work of Kleit & Galvez (2011) is a first attempt to do so for HOPE VI relocatees, using discrete choice methods. In this section, we review evidence from qualitative studies on the experiences of forced movers, with a focus on the trade-offs they made during their search for a new house.

Availability of housing, market pressures, and time constraints

Smith and colleagues (2002) have analysed the housing choices of HOPE VI relocatees from four cities. They found that availability of housing and time constraints were the main influences on housing choice for both those families who stayed close to their original public housing developments and those who moved farther away. Most respondents were more concerned about finding an available and acceptable unit in a place that met their minimum community standards for safety and basic amenities than about moving to a neighbourhood that might offer increased amenities and economic opportunity (see also Manzo et al., 2008). Smith et al. found that “in many areas an already inadequate supply of affordable housing lessened availability. Furthermore, the flood of relocatees on the market at the same time increased the competition for units. Relocatees were very aware of the local pressures in their housing market and anxious about their ability to find a place to live” (ibid., p. 21). Hence, “the longer a person searched without satisfactory results, the more nervous they became and the more willing they were to settle for any available unit” (ibid., p. 23). This shows how relocatees’ trade-offs were dominated by concerns to become evicted without a place to live.

In England, Cole and Flint (2007) conducted a small exploratory study into relocation experiences from the Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder Areas. For most of the residents in their sample, tenure and affordability were more important than property type and location. Availability of housing was further constrained by search area: “Many residents have a strong desire for very local moves, and often confine the locations they will consider being relocated in to very narrowly defined areas adjacent to their existing neighbourhoods which are subject to clearance” (ibid., p. 19).

Dutch policymakers have been worrying that the legal compensation mechanisms for relocatees increase the strong pressure on urban housing markets. However, the evidence is ambivalent. Whereas quantitative data on shows consistently high chances of ‘successful’ relocation within 1.5 years (Kleinhans & Van der Laan Bouma Doff, 2008), qualitative research has found that relocatees accepted the first real option fearing competition from other relocatees (e.g. Kleinhans, 2003; Posthumus et al., 2011; Van der Zwaard & De Wilde, 2008). Thus, trade-offs were dominated by the fear to lose out from other relocatees.

Dwelling as a top priority

With the exception of neighbourhood safety as a housing-search criterion, relocatees report that unit characteristics were more significant than neighbourhood characteristics in housing choice due to their experiences of poor maintenance in public housing (Manzo et al., 2008; Smith et al., 2002; see also Cole & Flint, 2007).
Daily routines

Smith’s 2022 work emphasises (macro) constraints on relocates’ decisions. To the extent that relocates can choose a location, they emphasise safety and amenities such as schools, shopping, and transportation (see also Turner et al., 2000). The proximity of social services does not appear to be an important determinant (Smith et al., 2002). Clampet-Lundquist (2004) has shown that even if relocates strongly believed that moving into the private sector (with a Section 8 voucher), they largely based their choice on neighbourhoods that would fit their current daily routine rather than on future possibilities for social mobility (ibid., p. 441).

Privacy and anonymity

As part of a bigger tracking study among HOPE VI relocatees, Buron et al. conducted in-depth interviews with relocatees using a voucher to move to the private sector. Whereas many of them complained about their housing, they still preferred a voucher to public housing. “Their main reasons were the increased flexibility in choosing where to live and the greater privacy or anonymity inherent in a private market unit compared with a public housing development” (Buron et al., 2002, p. iv). Likewise, in her study of changes in social ties of public housing moves in Boston, Curley (2009) distinguished supportive, leveraging and draining social ties. Curley defines the latter category as relationships to people that drain one’s household of resources through frequent requests for assistance with food, money, or other assistance that is not reciprocated, as well as ties to people that bring one down emotionally with constant complaining or involvement in their problems (2009, p. 237). Several women in this study experienced positive changes in their networks by moving away from draining social ties.

Data and Methods

As mentioned in the Introduction, the dataset consists of almost 150 in-depth interviews with restructuring relocatees in five Dutch cities: Rotterdam, The Hague, Breda, Groningen and Ede. The first two are the second and third biggest city in the Netherlands. The other three are middle-sized cities in the southern, northern and eastern part of the Netherlands. The respondents were recruited through a survey among much larger group of restructuring relocatees in these cities1 (for an overview, see Posthumus et al., 2011). This survey was primarily aimed at collecting data about the previous and current neighbourhood of relocatees, and their socioeconomic characteristics.

In the second wave of the research, we contacted respondents who had indicated in their survey to be interested in a follow-up interview. The interviewers used a semi-structured instrument with open-ended questions. These questions covered a range of topics related to perceived opportunities and limitations with regard to the search for a new dwelling, the nature of and satisfaction with the offered relocation counselling, pre-move preferences for dwelling and neighbourhood characteristics, trade-offs made in the choice process, and, finally, length of the search process and satisfaction with the new situation.

The interviews were conducted by phone and lasted from approximately 15 to 20 minutes. Interviews were recorded digitally and fully transcribed, yielding 146 usable transcripts. The analysis in this paper is based on two main blocks of questions and answers in the interview schedule. The questions deal with perceived opportunities and constraints in the housing search, and trade-offs between various dwelling and neighbourhood characteristics in the (final) choice.

Our analysis was both deductive and inductive. We initially coded for the general topics and questions represented in the interview guide. Yet, the merits of qualitative data analysis party lie in identifying (sub) codes that we did not initially anticipate (cf. Strauss and Corbin 1990). This inductive analysis

---

1 The data in this paper are part of the data collection in the research ‘spatial log on effects of urban renewal’ that is implemented by the Nicis Institute, Coprovenista, Utrecht University, OTB Delft and the municipalities Breda, Ede, Groningen, Rotterdam and The Hague.
revealed some of the issues described further on. Before we present our research findings, we briefly explain important institutional arrangements concerning forced relocation in Dutch cities. As mentioned in the Introduction, we assume that this has a significant impact upon their dwelling search, perceived freedom of choice and trade-offs in the decision process.

**Institutional specifics of forced relocation in the Netherlands**

In the Netherlands, almost all housing slated for demolition is social housing. Whereas housing associations are legally allowed to relocate tenants if this is necessary for demolition, those tenants are legally entitled to various forms of compensation: a replacement dwelling comparable in size, type and tenure; a reasonable allowance (which is indexed yearly) for their relocation expenses; and, finally, additional assistance from the housing association, such as counselling related to the search for a suitable dwelling.

**Choice-based letting and priority status**

Forced relocation is framed within local housing allocation policy (for a full overview, see Kleinhans and Van der Laan Bouma-Doff, 2008; Bolt et al., 2009). Most common is the choice-based letting system, also known as the ‘Delft model’ (Kullberg, 2002), which requires house seekers to actively respond to weekly advertisements and meet the eligibility criteria for social housing. Eligibility criteria for the social rented sector usually involve household size, age and household income. Initially, forced relocatees need to search for a suitable alternative themselves. To give them a head start, they receive a priority status which gives them priority over regular house seekers in the local social housing sector. They still have to meet eligibility criteria such as income level, age and household size. Also, the priority advantage is often limited to a comparable dwelling, mostly in terms of type, size (number of rooms), and sometimes rent price. This is the comparability criterion. A certificate of urgency is generally valid for one year and within, although the validity can be extended. If several house seekers with a certificate of urgency apply for the same dwelling, it is allocated to the applicant whose certificate was previously extended or has the nearest expiration date.

**Options profile**

As mentioned, the priority advantage has its limits (especially comparability criterion), which are established by housing associations in the options profile. This profile takes household size into account. Naturally, applying for dwellings beyond the limits of the options profile is allowed and possible. Then, the certificate of urgency is not the main eligibility criterion, because it is not valid. In those cases, relocated have to compete with regular house seekers without a priority status: the decisive criterion is the waiting period. The priority status is intended to speed up the relocation process. However, prospective relocatees not always succeed in finding a new dwelling themselves. Then, housing associations usually conduct intensive counselling and make direct offers of suitable dwellings to facilitate relocation.

**Local variations**

Four of the five cities under study have a choice-based letting system at the basis of the relocation procedure and embrace the comparability criterion mentioned above. However, there are local deviations in the extent of the comparability criterion. For example, in The Hague, households with two or more children or elderly people currently living in multi-family housing can apply for single-family dwellings. In Groningen, all relocatees are allowed to move to dwellings of a different type, but they are restricted to dwellings of a comparable size, number of rooms, quality, and rent. In Ede, the
extent of the priority status depends on length of residence in the current dwelling (slated for demolition)\(^2\).

The one exception to the choice-based letting system is Breda, which employs a so-called ‘option model’ for social housing\(^3\). In this model, households who have to move can indicate to what kind of social rented dwelling and to which neighbourhood they prefer to move. There are no restrictions attached to their preferences. Next, the housing association will offer a dwelling that matches the options indicated, as soon as such a dwelling is available. Relocatees from demolition dwellings are always prioritised over regular house seekers. However, when the offer is turned down, the priority status expires.

Results

This section presents our qualitative analysis of the respondents’ perceived constraints and opportunities while searching for a new dwelling. We will also indicate the importance of various dwelling and neighbourhood aspects in the search process, as well as the decisive characteristics of the dwelling and neighbourhood in the final choice made by the relocatees. As such, we will analyse the trade-offs in the final relocation decisions.

Perceived constraints: the options profile

We already mentioned above that the priority status in the choice-based letting system is often limited to certain types of (comparable) dwellings. Surprisingly, almost half of the respondents stated that the housing association did not impose any restrictions at all on their search process. Other respondents recognized the limits of the options profile and applied for dwelling types that were actually comparable to their old dwelling.

“I did not search for a single-family dwelling, since I did not get a priority status for those types of dwellings.”

“I could react on flats but not on a single family dwelling or something like that; it should be comparable to the dwelling you left.”

“I had a large dwelling on the first floor. If I wanted to go to a dwelling on the ground floor then I had to give in some space. […] I could go downstairs but then with fewer rooms”

The last quote clearly indicates that a first floor apartment dwelling is considered as a different dwelling type than a (smaller) ground floor dwelling, for which the respondent was not eligible by default. It is also a confirmation that the number of rooms may be part of the comparability criterion as well.

“When I applied, I could only apply for a three-room flat.”

“I now have as many bedrooms as in my old house; I was eligible for two bedrooms.”

Related to this aspect is the household size. In the options profile, household size is taken into account.

---

\(^2\) To be more precise: When a household has lived less than 7 years in the dwelling, it receives a priority status for a similar type of dwelling. When a household has lived between 7 and 12 years in the dwelling, it receives a priority status for a single-family dwelling in some (but not all) neighbourhoods in Ede. Finally, when a household has lived over 12 years in the dwelling to be demolished, it receives a priority status for all (social rented) single-family dwellings in the city.

\(^3\) Recently housing associations in Breda changed the option model into a choice based letting system, like the other cities. Our data were gathered at the time when the housing associations still used the option model.
It thus strongly interacts with dwelling size and type, as single-family dwellings are, on average, more likely to have three, four or more bedrooms than apartments.

“You can only react on a single-family dwelling if you have a family.”

“I am single so I could not react on dwellings where three or four people can live.”

In the latter quote, it is likely that the resident overestimates the limitations imposed by the options profile. In general, and regardless of the question whether a priority status is present, singles are not allowed to move to social rented dwellings which can accommodate three- or four-person households (usually couples with one or more children at home). Not everyone could muster understanding for this constraint, as is expressed by the following quote:

“I could react on three or two room dwellings. [...] I said to the lady of the housing association: ‘I cannot keep on moving, because I am single now, but maybe I will meet a woman with three children tomorrow and then I have to move again.’ Although I am single, I think I should have the possibility to react on four room apartments.”

Fewer relocatees stated that they were ‘restricted’ in their neighbourhood choice. These respondents were all located in Breda. In section 6, we explained the option model which used to be in force in Breda. That is, households who had to move could indicate to what kind of social rented dwelling and to which neighbourhood they preferred to go. Formally, there are no restrictions attached to their preferences. Next, the housing association will offer a dwelling that matches the options indicated, as soon as such a dwelling is available.

“I could give my preference to five neighbourhoods where I would like to live.”

“Looking at the neighbourhood I could not react on dwellings everywhere. I mean I could react on all neighbourhoods, but there were neighbourhoods for which I did not get a priority status.”

That is, taking an option on certain neighbourhoods means that other neighbourhoods are excluded from the option (and priority status) by default. In sum, the restriction perceived by the last above quote is not a top-down imposed constraint, but the result of indicating a certain neighbourhood preference in the option model.

The majority of the respondents only reacted on dwellings for which their priority status was valid, i.e. which fell within their options profile. A small group of relocatees tried to apply for dwellings beyond their options profile, while being well aware of the invalidity of the priority status for these dwellings:

“I wanted to see whether I would have a chance.”

“We mainly looked at single family dwellings which were a bit larger than our old dwelling. We did not have a priority status for these houses, but we succeeded to get one of them.”

As mentioned in section 6, the case of Ede stands out in the sense that the extents of the priority status and options profile depend on length of residence in the dwelling which will be demolished. Consequently, some respondents in Ede who had lived for many years in their current dwelling had much to choose from:

“We reacted on a newly built dwelling. [...] We built up so many living years
that we immediately got the dwelling.”

“We got one hundred points and for this amount of points we could choose any dwelling that was available.”

Most relocatees see the restrictions of the housing associations as something that hinders their search process. The simple fact that another party requires them to leave, raises a call for justification and proper compensation without any *a priori* limitations on dwelling type, size or location (see also Kleinhans & Kruythoff, 2002; Van der Zwaard & De Wilde, 2008):

“The housing association wants to demolish my house, so if they want me out then they have to get me a new house and make sure that I am satisfied with it”

“I told the housing association: ‘I want to live in that street and if you don’t have a dwelling in that street I will not leave my old dwelling.’”

In the end, of course, these relocatees stand no chance against the housing association, as it is legally allowed to relocate its tenants in case of restructuring, provided that compensation is given in various forms (see section 6). But it is the respondents’ perception of a right to compensation and equal satisfaction (compared to the previous situation) that dominates these quotes. Other relocatees are more inclined to see the potential advantages of their priority status, especially when it comes to acquiring a better dwelling. They are keen to take full advantage of the situation they are in:

“I filtered dwellings on location, the environment, the size of the dwelling. […] Getting the maximum out of it.”

Generally, but also in relocation contexts, dispositional optimists act to achieve beneficial outcomes, even in the face of difficult circumstances (Scheier & Carver 1987; Ekström, 1994). The quote below is a clear illustration.

“Because of personal circumstances we already wanted to move. Now we got a priority status we had a better chance to find a better dwelling. […] We even received a relocation allowance.”

Earlier research has shown that the extent to which people have already been planning a move and the preparedness for change heavily influence movers’ opinions on the relocation process and changed housing situation (Fried, 1963, 1967; Kleinhans, 2003; Kleinhans & Van der Laan Bouma-Doff, 2008; Kleit & Manzo, 2006; Leveling & Vos, 2004). These perceptions can differ quit substantially from households who prefer to stay put.

In sum, whereas many relocatees feel constrained in their search processes, others succeed in acquiring a dwelling for which they did not have a priority status, or were otherwise able to take advantage of the situation. Those who felt constrained, perceived the limitations connected to the options profile (and maybe also of regular eligibility criteria) as a form of injustice in the perspective of the impending move. Now, we will turn to the preferences and trade-offs of relocatees, in particular the weighting of dwelling versus neighbourhood characteristics in their final choices.

The importance of the dwelling versus the neighbourhood

Looking at what relocatees find most important - the dwelling or the neighbourhood – it is striking that the share of relocatees who stress that the dwelling was of prime importance in their search process
(about 40\%) roughly equals the share of relocatees who argue that the neighbourhood is most important. For regular movers it has been found that the new dwelling is more important than the new neighbourhood (Clark et al., 2006). The same applies to the forced relocation researchers of Manzo et al. (2008) and Smith et al. (2002), indicating that dwelling characteristics are more significant than neighbourhood characteristics. On the other hand, it could be argued that, since the quality of social housing varies on average less than in the private housing sector – private rental as well as owner-occupied dwellings - the importance of the neighbourhood increases.

Relocatees that prefer the neighbourhood over the dwelling have positive as well as negative reasons for this. Some motivations have to do with sense of belonging:

“I prefer my neighbourhood. I mean, I was raised here in the neighbourhood and whole my family lives here. Then you actually become part of the furniture of the neighbourhood.”

Other relocatees are more practical:

“For me the neighbourhood is most important. I mean you can adapt the dwelling to your own taste and style ideas but the neighbourhood you can not change so much.”

Thirdly, there are also negative motivations to prefer a neighbourhood over the dwelling:

“I did not feel like to live between Turks and Moroccans. I do not hate migrants - my girlfriend is Surinamese, so I cannot hate migrants - but when I see the criminal activities in those neighbourhood I’ll say: ‘I do not want this’. I will not say that no migrants live in my current neighbourhood, but I do not have problems with them. I do have problems when they accumulate. You see that in the big cities and that is what happens here too, things get a bit ghetto-like.”

For some relocatees certain characteristics of their new dwelling were so important that these overruled all other preferences, including the neighbourhood. Crucial characteristics are: the rent price of the dwelling, its size, and a dwelling on the ground floor. For others, no specific characteristics are important, but the necessity to have a roof over their heads, as they are frightened to be evicted when the validity of the priority status has expired. This is an example of tragic misunderstanding of the relocation policies, as housing associations can never evict a tenant without having offered several relocations options, and, subsequently, a court order (Kleinhans, 2003). These types of relocatees, who can be described as ‘panicers’ (see Posthumus et al., 2011), take any option that they can successfully apply for or which is offered to them.

“I just wanted to have a dwelling – I do not care whether it is an old dwelling or a dwelling that is nominated for demolition – as long as it was written on paper that I was the renter.”

Other relocatees appear to be not very interested in their new neighbourhood.

“When they would put me in a house on a grave yard, that is fine by me. I do not care. Really, I don’t care”

“When you work full-time, you’re not home that much. That is why I prefer the dwelling over the neighbourhood”

\(^4\) Of the 105 respondents who answered this question.
There is also a smaller group of relocatees – approximately 20% in our response group - stating that
dwelling and neighbourhood are equally important.

“It is actually a fifty-fifty story; I would not choose a very beautiful dwelling
in an awful neighbourhood and vice versa.”

“For me it was important to have a big and beautiful dwelling. Since I have
pets I also want to live in a green environment […] both factors are thus
equally important.”

In sum, the balance between the importance of dwelling versus neighbourhood can shift significantly
among relocatees. The underlying factors vary from specific preferences based on practical or
emotional grounds to indifference or even fear for something which is perceived as the potentially
most negative outcome. In the next two subsections we will investigate the decisive characteristics of
the dwelling and the neighbourhood.

Decisive characteristics of dwelling

It is important to emphasise that we asked the respondents ex post about pre-move preferences. That
is, we apply a stated references approach here. Further on, we will look at the revealed preferences.
Looking at the reported characteristics of the dwelling, multiple decisive characteristics can be
distinguished. Table 1 gives an overview of these aspects. It shows that various characteristics make
up about thirty percent of the decisive characteristics. Examples are: the availability of an elevator,
having a sunny dwelling, having a child friendly dwelling etc.

Table 1. Decisive characteristics of the dwelling according to relocatees (N=44)5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>No. interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various other characteristics</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size dwelling and number of rooms</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden and living on ground floor</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price dwelling</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation dwelling</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: interviews, 2010

Apart from the ‘various’ category, the size of the dwelling and/or the number of rooms is the most
often mentioned homogeneous decisive characteristic. According to the relocatees this is necessary to
have enough space, privacy and that all family members have their own room.
Earlier, we saw that many relocatees feel restricted by the housing association in the number of rooms
or size of the dwelling. This concurs with the finding of the importance of dwelling size and number
of rooms. However, in general they are satisfied with the number of rooms in their new dwelling. This
can be explained by the fact that their old dwellings are often relatively large – three rooms or more –
which entitles the relocatees to receive a new dwelling with the same size (or sometimes even bigger).

“I now have three rooms, that is great. I put the computer in one room, my
bed in the other and the last one is the living room. I can easily keep that
room clean and receive guests.”

“In my old dwelling I had three rooms and I now got a four-room apartment.”

5 In 44 interviews the decisive characteristic of the dwelling is explicitly discussed. However, in most other interviews the
respondent also discussed their decisive dwelling characteristic more implicitly. These results give the same image as Table
1.
Living on the ground floor and/or having a garden is a second decisive characteristic that many relocatees mentioned. These two characteristics are interrelated: people want to live on the ground floor because they then have a garden; or people like to have a garden and thus want to live on the ground floor.

“I wanted to move to a single family dwelling because it has a garden. I like gardening.”

Gardening, sitting in the sun, children and pets being able to play in the garden are clear reasons to choose a dwelling with a garden. Although the garden is the major reason for relocatees to choose a ground-floor dwelling, there are elderly people preferring to live in a ground-floor dwelling, for (future) health and mobility reasons.

“I cannot climb the stairs easily anymore.”

“I preferred to live in a dwelling with three rooms on the ground floor and in a good neighbourhood, but in the price range in which I was looking I could not find such a dwelling. In the end I choose a dwelling on the ground floor with only two rooms. I preferred the ground floor more than to have an extra room.”

Ranked third as decisive characteristic is the price of the dwelling. Many relocatees have a low income and cannot afford dwellings in the higher segment of the social rented sector, even if they are eligible for a housing allowance. A relocatee explains:

“I found the price important, because I stopped working and my income decreased significantly.”

A fourth decisive characteristic is the isolation of the dwelling. Motives behind this characteristic are increasing gross housing costs, i.e. rent plus utility and heating costs:

“You have to look into your wallet. When you put on the heating and the house is not well isolated, then you have to pay a lot more.”

It is not surprising that this element turns up as an important feature of the new dwelling. Many social rented housing slated for demolition is relatively low in construction quality and isolation value. Therefore, this housing needs relatively much energy to be heated properly. With increasing energy costs, this adds significantly to the monthly rent.

Decisive characteristics of neighbourhood

As in the previous subsection, we emphasise that we asked the respondents ex post about pre-move preferences. That is, we apply a stated references approach here. Further on, we will look at the revealed preferences.

Most characteristics of the neighbourhood that relocatees consider as decisive are social characteristics. Table 2 shows the results. The largest group consists of various characteristics that relocatees find most decisive. Examples are: a green environment, proximity of public transport, proximity of the inner city, proximity of the church, contacts with neighbours, social control in the neighbourhood.
Table 2. Decisive characteristics of the neighbourhood according to relocatees (N=40)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>No. interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various other characteristics</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity family members</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying in the old neighbourhood</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity of shops and facilities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: interviews, 2010

Looking at the rest of the decisive aspects, it appears that relocatees emphasize safety and to lesser extent the proximity to shops and services in their new neighbourhood. Safety is ranked as first homogenous decisive neighbourhood characteristic. For regular house seekers, perceived safety is an important issue as well. Our research does not allow a comparison with regular house seekers, but it is safe to say that this decisive criterion is no surprise. When our relocatees talk about safety, they mostly refer to a neighbourhood without nuisance from youngsters and a low level of criminal activities and disorder.

“I do not like youngsters hanging around and when they cause nuisance I do not feel comfortable.”

“I have three children and I want my children to be raised in a good way, so I want to live in a safe neighbourhood with no criminal activities.”

The shared second decisive characteristic is the proximity of family members. This counts for older people as well as younger relocatees. Whereas the ability to be close to each other is often positively framed, having each other on short distance is also considered as a kind of insurance for problems or emergencies, as the following quotes indicate:

“I wanted to live near my daughter as possible. Because I am single and when something would happen it is good that she lives close.”

“My mother is 75 and she lives three streets from my house. I want to live near my mother, because then I can help her when she needs it.”

As important as the former, is to stay in the old neighbourhood. Most relocatees have an emotional motive for this choice.

“I was afraid to move to an unfamiliar neighbourhood. I am very social, but when you live in an unfamiliar neighbourhood you have to get used to it. You don’t know anyone and I didn’t feel like that.”

The neighbourhood gives them a sense of belonging; they feel at home and familiar. A relocatee argues that he chooses to move to a neighbourhood where he lived before because:

“I am now back in the environment in which I grew up; I am just back in a familiar environment.”

Another motive – for families with children of school ages - to stay in the old neighbourhood is

---

6 In 40 interviews the decisive characteristic of the neighbourhood is explicitly discussed. However, in most other interviews the respondent also discussed their neighbourhood characteristic more implicitly. These results give the same image as Table 2.
practical. This is also in line with the work of Turner et al. (2000) which shows that proximity to schools is important for relocatees. Clampet-Lundquist’s work (2004) is important for emphasising the wish to maintain daily routines, which of course strongly limits the scope for relocation options.

“There is a very good primary school in the neighbourhood; I am very satisfied with that. My children do not want to move to another school. Here the teachers are also inhabitants of the neighbourhood. […] So my first reason to stay here is for my children.”

The fourth decisive – and only physical - characteristic to choose a certain neighbourhood is its proximity to shops, services and other facilities. Especially older relocatees mark this as neighbourhood important characteristic.

“For me it is important that shops are near. I still drive a car, but I am 83 so I do not know for how long I will be able to do that. And when I can walk […] and still can do my shopping myself, it is also important for my social contacts.”

This is in line with the work of Clampet-Lundquist (2004) and Turner et al. (2000). However, also younger relocatees stress the importance of the proximity of shops and other facilities.

“I like the proximity of shops because I always decide five minutes before closure that I need some products.”

Now that we analysed decisive dwelling and neighbourhood characteristics, it is interesting to see whether these preferences are taken into account when relocatees made their final relocation decision. The next section will provide in this matter.

After the search process and the final decision

In the previous two subsections, we looked at the stated pre-move preferences of our respondents. Now it is time to analyse to what extent they were able to fulfil these preferences. That is, we now switch to a kind of revealed preferences approach.

Almost half of the respondents indicate that their new dwelling does not have all the characteristics that they preferred when they initiated their search process. Examples of the various range of disadvantages the relocatees mentioned – by comparing their new dwelling with their old one – include: noise, bad isolation, small rooms, too expensive, no garden and that they had to renovate the dwelling by themselves. At first glance, this is not a good score. It should however be noted that most of these relocatees do not have fundamental critiques on their new dwelling.

“My dwelling is very good isolated, double glazing, there is no noise. What I also like is that the bedroom is next to the living room. So when one of us is ill, we can still talk to each other and leave the door open. I really like that. However, there are not so many wall sockets and they are too low. That is inconvenient for old people.”

“The only disadvantage of this house is that there is no hall when you enter the house; you’re immediately in the dining room. […] When it is cold and people come in, you can feel the cold air in the living room. That’s a disadvantage, but the rest of the house is good.”

“It would have been nice when the kitchen was a bit larger, but that is the only disadvantage of this house. […] In the end, I achieved my other preferences [dwelling for elderly people, an elevator and four rooms].”
When relocatees accepted dwellings which subsequently appeared to have shortcomings, these respondents tend to stress that the advantages of their new dwelling are greater than the disadvantages. Considering all the advantages and disadvantages of their new dwelling, relocatees claim that their general living situation has improved.

“I could not get used to the central heating here. In my old house I had a fireplace and I could heat my house very well. […] However, I really like the garden in this house. That makes it better than my old house.”

“The only disadvantage it that I went from the ground floor to the first floor, because in my old house I had a garden. However, now I have central heating, which I didn’t have in my old house. […] In general I have been able to improve my living situation.”

These results are in line with previous studies (Burón et al., 2002; Varady & Walker, 2000; Kleinhans, 2003; Kleinhans & Van der Laan Bouma-Doff, 2008), which also show that the satisfaction with the new dwelling is higher compared to the pre-move situation. Although many relocatees thus stress that in the advantages of their new dwelling outweigh the disadvantages, there is a group of people that are less satisfied with their new dwelling. Their motives for choosing their dwelling are important to gain insight in their trade-offs. We can distinguish three types of motives. First, some major disadvantages or serious (technical) shortcomings of the dwelling only appeared in full swing when the relocatee had already moved into the house, being unaware at the moment of application.

“There is one big disadvantage in the living room: no window can be opened. […] I moved in May and then it is not warm yet. But when in June or July it is thirty degrees Celsius, you think: shit, I cannot open a window here. […] I wanted this house because the environment and the neighbourhood appealed to me. […] This house is a little bit smaller than my old one. […] But I am single […] so I have enough space.”

“The reason I choose this house is the view; I do not have other dwellings behind my house. I have a garden and behind that there is a ditch with a field with horses in it. Sometimes I see deer and foxes. […] To see that every day, I really enjoy it. […] But if I beforehand had known that my house was so moist and cold I would have reconsidered whether I would take it.”

Another relocatee had a lot of problems with the sewage, which decreases his satisfaction with the dwelling.

“The drain was clocked four times in the four years I now live in the house. The content of the sewage came up […] my carpet and kitchen, everything was dirty. […] For the rest this is a good house. […] In my old house I had to put all my things in the house. Now I have a basement box in which I can keep many things.”

Secondly, it appears that relocatees sometimes underestimate the disadvantages of their new dwelling. When they choose a certain dwelling they think that the advantages will outweigh the disadvantages, but it sometimes turns out that the disadvantages are more important than they thought beforehand. In a way, this category represents a group of people who, ‘reasonably’, could have foreseen the disadvantages, but their critical vision may have been ‘blinded’ by some positive characteristics, as the quote below clearly illustrates:

“When we took this house, it was already turned down by fourteen other
relocatees because it takes a lot of time to renovate it. In retrospective, I regret that I took the house, but I fell in love with the garden. [...] The condition of these houses is very bad.”

Finally, there is a group of relocatees that stress that they felt limited in their choice because they were forced to move. This category is the opposite of the ‘dispositional optimists’ mentioned earlier in the paper. The force factor derived their minds completely of any sense of choice, as the following quote clearly indicates:

“I did not feel like I could have any preferences. I felt like they took me by my scruff and dropped me in this dwelling. Although I choose this dwelling myself, I was kicked out my old dwelling in an elegant way. [...] When I heard that I had to get out of my old house I panicked. Where do I have to go? [...] You cannot avoid it and you have to submit yourself to it. [...] I now live here for four years and now I feel comfortable in my house, but I it took time to get used to it”

Part of this group felt highly pressured because of time limits. This is in line with the research of Smit et al. (2002). Most respondents just choose a dwelling and neighbourhood without holding onto their preferences. These relocatees can be referred to as ‘panicers’ who often tend to move to deprived neighbourhoods, because they are strongly burdened with perceived time constraints (Posthumus et al., 2011).

“When the final date to leave the old dwelling comes close, you have to choose a new dwelling soon. I just choose this dwelling, because I have to live somewhere and I did not see an ideal dwelling in the supply of the housing association. [...] I felt unhappy in my new house for two years. [...] It was like the house wanted to go left and I wanted to go right. When I came home this feeling hit me in the face. I find it hard to describe but that is also the core of it, I cannot get a grip.”

“When you receive a letter saying that you have to leave within two month, and after a month the housing association has a dwelling than it is easy to make the decision. [...] When I took this dwelling I really needed to get a new dwelling so I did not have preferences.”

“I chose a dwelling which many people had already turned down. Since it was close to the school of my children I took it. Because, who know how long I should have to wait if I turned this dwelling down and who knows where I would end up. [...] I thought that this would be the best and fastest solution and that the children would be happy. But in retrospective, I should not have done it. [...] My old house had a large kitchen and much space. And suddenly you go to a small house with a small kitchen and the street had a bad image.”

Smit et al. (2002) noted that the (lacking) availability of dwellings influences the search process of relocatees. The above mentioned quote also reveals that some respondents felt limited by the supply of the housing association. In a certain time period the number of available social rented dwellings is limited.

“The housing association offers some dwellings, but not so many so the choice is limited. I mean, I can choose in what dwelling I would like to live, but there are not so many dwellings I can choose from.”
Within this limited supply, relocatees thus choose a dwelling which meets their preferences most, but often not all their preferences are met. For instance, the aforementioned relocatee states that his current dwelling has the large bathroom that he wanted, but that the condition of the dwelling was very bad.

“There had not been any maintenance. […] I spent eight weeks scraping all the wood, and that was only scraping…”

Some of the above mentioned quotes already reveal that this third category of relocatees – those stressing that they felt limited in their choice because they were forced to move – suffer from affliction (see also Fried, 1963, 1967).

“We feel uprooted. The emotional attachment to the house, we lost that.”

“I did not feel: ‘this is my house’ when I moved to my new dwelling. […] That took me five years. I am now starting to get used to my new house. […] Where I now live is not bad at all. And I do not want to complain or something, but it was a whole process of getting used to the dwelling.”

For many of these relocatees, the imposed nature of the move is the prime reason for their sense of affliction:

“Our old dwelling felt like home. We lived there during a period when we were powerful and healthy; our son went to a good school. These are all things that bring back memories and emotions. Our healthy years were there, we lived there, and we flourished. My husband got a promotion there, we saw our son starting his own family. So many memories are attached to that dwelling. When they had not demolished our house and when they put an elevator in that house we never would have left.”

Hence, although this section mainly focused on the relocatees that are (partly) unsatisfied with their new dwelling, one should keep in mind that most relocatees are in the end satisfied with their new dwelling. We have seen that the relocatees that are less satisfied with their new dwelling can be divided into two groups. The first group consists of relocatees with only small remarks on their dwelling and who stress that the advantages are larger than the disadvantages. The second group has more fundamental critiques on their dwelling. To some of the relocatees in this group the disadvantages of their new dwellings became only visible after moving; others underestimated the disadvantages. The rest of this group felt limited because they were forced to move. Due to perceived time and supply constraints they were forced to move to a dwelling which did not meet their preferences. This group of relocatees also had trouble getting used to their new dwelling.

Conclusions

As stated in the Introduction, this paper aims to reveal how the specific context and regulations of forced relocation (in urban restructuring) affect relocatees’ search process and choices.

As we saw in the above sections, relocatees are affected by regulations of housing associations. Their priority status does not give priority for all dwellings and the option profile also limits them in their search process. For instance, singles are not given priority to a single family dwelling. Although relocatees are able to react on dwellings and neighbourhoods for which they do not have a priority status, most of them do not have a long enough waiting period to find a suitable dwelling and neighbourhood. Only a small group of relocatees takes advantage of the situation they are in; they put pressure on the housing associations to find them a suitable dwelling in a good neighbourhood. In
general, relocatees thus have to search in the limited supply of dwellings for which they have a priority status.

Within this limited freedom of choice for dwelling and neighbourhood, relocatees do have preferences. They value the size of the dwelling, availability of a garden, the price of the dwelling and the availability of good isolation. Looking at the neighbourhood, relocatees emphasize a safe environment, they like to be proximate to family members, they prefer to stay in their old neighbourhood and they like the proximity of shops. This is in line with previous US based research (Turner et al., 2000). In relocatees’ final relocation decision, however, not all of their dwelling and neighbourhood preferences are met. We can distinguish two groups of relocatees here.

The first group is the majority of the relocatees. Despite the fact that not all their preferences are met, these relocatees are in the end satisfied with their new dwelling and neighbourhood. They weigh the advantages and disadvantages of dwellings and neighbourhoods that are available in their search space – limited by restrictions of housing associations and relocatees’ own restrictions. The trade-offs of these relocatees can thus be considered deliberate.

The second - and much smaller - group of relocatees is less satisfied with their new dwelling and neighbourhood. Most of these relocatees state that the disadvantages of their new dwelling became only visible after moving or that they underestimated the disadvantages of their new dwelling. The mentioned disadvantages vary widely (e.g. windows that cannot open, moist dwelling, problems with sewage). It seems that they are not specifically related to social rented dwellings; many of these disadvantages could also occur in dwellings in other - private rental or owner occupied - dwelling sectors. Hence, the dissatisfaction of these relocatees does not directly relate to their forced relocation.

Within the second group of unsatisfied relocatees, there is a small group that feels affected by the regulations of forced relocation. These relocatees stressed that they felt hindered by the housing association; due to time and supply constraints there was no dwelling available that they preferred. The relocatees thus choose a dwelling that did not satisfied most of their needs. Some of them even panicked and let go all their preferences; they just choose the first dwelling available. A logic consequence is that this group had to deal most with affliction. It took them a lot of time to get used to their new dwelling and environment. Even now they are used to their dwelling; some of the relocatees are still dissatisfied with their situation.

However, it should be emphasized that in the end most relocatees are satisfied with their new dwelling and neighbourhood. Although not all their needs are met, due to the limited freedom of choice because of the regulations of forced relocation, most relocatees improved their living situation.
‘Mixité’: an urban and housing issue?
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