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Abstract

Displacement policies are not always welcomed by residents, even though they are usually implemented to improve their living conditions. Focusing on procedural fairness and place attachment (project- and place-related factors, respectively), this study explores residents’ concern underlying their opposition to a displacement policy. A field survey of 250 riverbank settlers in Jakarta, Indonesia was conducted. Residents’ perceptions of procedural fairness significantly affected their degree of acceptance of displacement. Also, perceived procedural fairness predicted residents’ participation in a class action lawsuit against the government’s displacement proposal. This study showed that the degree of control that residents felt they had while the displacement policy was being designed, and their trust in the sincerity of the government, predicted the perceived procedural fairness.
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1. Introduction

The need to gain the acceptance of residents is one of the main challenges to the implementation of residential displacement schemes, as part of urban renewal policies. Although displacement of residents may be deemed necessary for industrial development, slum clearance or disaster prevention, it is not always welcomed by the affected residents, especially if they are forced to seek new livelihoods (McDonald-Wilmsen & Webber, 2010; Mehta, 2005). Proposals for displacement issued by a government, including voluntary and involuntary (“forced”) programs, may not be carried out if there is strong opposition from residents. For example, the Sadar Sarovar project in India, a dam construction project that resulted in the displacement of hundreds of thousands of indigenous people, was delayed by more than 5 years before the final approval due to vigorous protests from residents (Mehta, 2005). Furthermore, some disputes can escalate into lawsuits, such as the famous case of the Gautreaux Assisted Housing Program where local residents filed a class action lawsuit against authorities, alleging that their public housing policy involved racial segregation (Rubinowitz & Rosenbaum, 2000).

Gaining acceptance from affected residents is critical for effective implementation of displacement programs. One way for policy-makers to achieve this may be to emphasize the possible benefits of displacement on residents’ lives, and deemphasize the negative outcomes of relocation. Most literature on the consequences of displacement policy has tended to emphasize the negative effects, such as the loss of homes, financial burden, stress and the potential loss of social networks, rather than possible benefits such as improved housing quality and amenities
It is particularly important for governmental authorities to mitigate the suffering of displaced residents caused by a change in domicile, by providing an allowance covering relocation expenses and other forms of assistance (e.g., help with completing documents, provision of relocation options, mental health support, etc.).

Recent studies suggest that affected residents are not only concerned about the consequences of being displaced (Kleit & Galvez, 2011; Ruel, Oakley, Ward, Alston, & Reid, 2013). This has led to several cases where refusal to leave among residents, despite governmental efforts to mitigate any hardship through the provision of compensation, and measures aimed at improving their quality of life in the new area. For example, in a case study of displacement due to a dam construction project in Sudan, many residents resisted moving even though the government offered monetary and in-kind compensation for loss of housing, land, and other productive assets (Dirar, Moghraby, & Hashim, 2015). Regarding the slum displacement project in Jakarta, there are some areas where residents are opposed to displacement, even though the project is intended to improve their living conditions through the development of resettlement sites (c.f. Sholihah & Shaojun, 2018). These cases indicate that resident acceptance of displacement may depend on complex concerns that are at least somewhat independent of the consequences.

1.1 Psychological Factors Associated with Acceptance

Two psychological factors identified in the field of social psychology may explain such “non-consequentialist reactions” in residents: procedural fairness and place attachment (project- and place-related factors, respectively). First, since the pioneering work of Thibaut and Walker (1975), who first presented the idea of procedural fairness, a large body of literature has demonstrated the predictive power of people’s perceptions of procedural fairness with respect to policy acceptance (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler, Boekman, Smith, & Huo, 1997). The term procedural fairness is defined as the fairness of procedures used to determine policy outcomes (Lind & Tyler, 1988). This is different from the concept of outcome fairness, which relates to the distribution of costs and benefits within society (Tyler & Bies, 1990). Although few studies have focused directly on the concept of procedural fairness in the context of displacement policy, the relevance of this concept for understanding resident acceptance of policies has been implied in some case studies. For example, in the case in Sudan mentioned above, 82% of affected residents were concerned about procedural matters, citing a lack of transparency, consultation and participation in the planning and implementation of the displacement plan as issues (Dirar et al., 2015). Moreover, recent participatory approaches for developing displacement policies showed that including residents in decision-making processes has the potential to increase acceptance of displacement plans (Abebe & Hesselberg, 2015; Viratkapan & Perera, 2006).

According to Thibaut and Walker (1975), there are two primary factors that enhance procedural fairness: process control (voice) and decision control (choice). The former represents the extent to which residents have an opportunity to express their opinions about a policy, while the latter represents the extent to which they can influence policy decisions (Lind & Tyler, 1988). These two factors relate to two types of judgments of procedural fairness: process- and outcome-oriented accounts (Lind and Tyler, 1988). A process-oriented account is related to the opportunity to express one’s values, while an outcome-oriented account relates to positive outcomes associated with the action. Whereas a process-oriented account is concerned with the effect of process control on perceptions of procedural fairness, an outcome-oriented account is
concerned with the effect of decision control.

Second, some residents’ resistance to displacement can be attributed to their emotional connection with their neighborhood, which is referred to as place attachment. Place attachment is defined as “positively experienced bonds, sometimes occurring without awareness, that are developed over time from the behavioral, affective and cognitive ties between individuals and/or groups and their sociophysical environment” (Brown & Perkins, 1992). Previous research on residential stability emphasized place attachment as an explanation for remaining in an area, showing that residents with strong attachments are less likely to move (Fischer & Malmberg, 2001; Sheng, Gu, & Wu, 2019). This is due to deep roots within a given neighborhood, connectedness to family and friends in the local area, and feelings of security. Accordingly, it is likely that strong attachment to place reduces acceptance of displacement.

1.2 The Present Study

A review of the social-psychological research on public acceptance indicates that resident acceptance of displacement may depend on disparate concerns such as procedural fairness and place attachment, which are somewhat independent of the consequences of displacement. This paper systematically examines the effects of procedural fairness and place attachment, in addition to outcome-related concerns, on the acceptance of displacement policy through a case study of riverbank settlers who faced displacement in Jakarta, Indonesia; some settlers refused to leave and filed a lawsuit against the local government. This study also explored the effects of process control and decision control on the perceived procedural fairness of the displacement policy, to examine the viability of process- and outcome-oriented accounts. In addition, residents’ trust in the government is assessed, as this was reported in recent studies to be an important factor affecting procedural fairness (Brashear, Manolis, & Brooks, 2005; Kim, Schmöcker, Fujii, & Noland, 2013).

The displacement case in Jakarta discussed in this paper is appropriate for the research objective of exploring residents’ concerns, which may lead to opposition to displacement somewhat independent of its consequences. The government of Jakarta has been pursuing plans to remove all slum dwellings from the city, partly to mitigate floods (Sholihah & Shaojun, 2018; Afriyanti, Prakoso, & Srinaga, 2021). The main goal of these plans is to improve the quality of life of slum dwellers, by providing them with public housing and social welfare services including education and health assistance. At the research site, however, many residents refused to be displaced and some launched a legal campaign against the government. In light of the above discussion, the following explanations (E1–E3) are suggested for the residents' reactions.

E1: Residents were still concerned about the negative consequences of displacement and resettlement.

As mentioned above, the plans were intended to improve the quality of life of slum dwellers, but some studies have highlighted that displacement projects can lead to impoverishment of the displaced population (Quetulio-Navarra, Niehof, van der Horst, & van der Vaart, 2014; Sholihah & Shaojun, 2018). Residents concerned about this will likely oppose displacement.

E2: Residents perceived the displacement process as unfair.

In Asian countries, displacement policies tend to be implemented without sufficient involvement of residents, who do not have the opportunity to make their voices heard (see du Plessis, 2005). Residents dissatisfied with these aspects will likely oppose the displacement policy.
Residents had strong attachments to their current residences. A case study of displacement in Jakarta indicated that the place attachment is important for affected residents (Afriyanti, Prakoso, & Srinaga, 2021). Thus, residents’ opposition to displacement policy could be attributed to place attachment. So far, few case studies have dealt with residents’ acceptance of displacement policies in Jakarta. By examining the case study in Jakarta, we investigated which of the above three explanations best accounts for the residents’ opposition. This research contributes to the existing literature in a number of ways. Many studies of public acceptance of, or opposition to, an initially unwelcome development (such as a nuclear facility or a waste disposal site) often described the situation as a NIMBY (“not in my back yard”) issue; they examined the conditions under which residents will accept a policy even in the face of outcome-related concerns, highlighting the role of procedural fairness in enhancing acceptance (e.g., Devine-Wright, 2013; Siegrist, Connor, & Keller, 2012; Vilhunen et al., 2019). In contrast, by focusing on procedural fairness and place attachment, the current study examined the reasons why affected residents oppose displacement even though it is attractive in terms of their outcome-related concerns. Thus, by deepening our understanding of the role of psychological factors in opposition to displacement policies, which cannot be explained only by the consequences thereof, we attempt to gain insight to help address the consensus-building problems associated with displacement policies.

2. Method

2.1 Description of the Study Area

The research site for this study is Bukit Duri, a village (kelurahan) located on the Ciliwung River in South Jakarta (Figure 1). The site covers approximately 1.08 km², and is a densely populated area in which 41,938 people live in one- or two-story dwellings (Figure 2(a) and 2(b)). They have experienced floods (Figure 2(c)) almost every year; the highest inundations on record were 7 m in 2007 (Antara News, 2012) and 4 m in 2013 (Salim, Bettinger, & Fisher, 2019; Vollmer, Prescott, Padawangi, Girot, & Grêt-Regamey, 2015). The government claims that clearing the informal settlements, i.e., displacing residents, will improve the overall environment of the city and solve its flooding problem (van Voorst, 2016). The city plans to displace around 728 households in Bukit Duri into housing areas located approximately 15 km away from the current settlement, according to the flood mitigation measures of the River Normalization Program. The government held a public meeting to provide information about the program to residents in Bukit Duri, and ordered the affected residents to move to the new settlement, claiming that they had no legal right to stay. However, the affected residents refused, stating that the eviction process was unfair and violated their human rights. The forced eviction led to several rallies involving residents. In addition, on May 10, 2016, around 150 households filed a class action lawsuit against the government, claiming that the legal basis of the River Normalization Program was unsound (Ciliwung Merdeka, 2016).
2.2 Procedure and Respondents

In total, 250 respondents were selected via simple random sampling of 728 households directly affected by the displacement. All participants were interviewed individually in their area of residence (including at home) by trained interviewers who studied at Institut Pertanian Bogor (IPB) University. During the interviews, which were based on a structured questionnaire, attitudes toward displacement policy were explored for a maximum of 1 hour per participant. The survey data were collected in September and October 2016. Of the 250 returned questionnaires, one was
excluded due to incomplete answers, leaving 249 usable responses. Among the 249 respondents, 49 participated in the class action lawsuit against the government.

2.3 Questionnaire

Table 1 presents an overview of the questionnaire used in this survey to measure nine variables: acceptance, intention to move, procedural fairness, outcome fairness, outcome favorability, place attachment, process control, decision control, general trust, sincerity, and capability. Following prior research (Kim, Schmocker, Bergstad, Fujii, & Garling, 2014), the respondents’ acceptance was quantified based on three items. Given that the local government of Jakarta had prepared housing (flats) for the displaced residents to move into, three items relating to residents’ intention to move to the new settlement were also included, in addition to acceptance-related items. Respondents’ opinions of procedural and outcome fairness were assessed by five items (fairness of procedure, fairness of decision-making, competence, bias, and opportunity for voicing opinion) and two items (compensation and fairness of displacement), respectively. These items were taken from Kim et al. (2014), Lind and Tyler (1988), and Nakayachi and Cvetkovich (2010). Regarding outcome favorability, we obtained respondents’ opinions on the impacts of displacement. As the main purpose of the displacement policy was to improve the lives of the residents, the respondents were asked to indicate whether they expected displacement to improve their lives via 12 items. Place attachment was also measured using 12 items, following Hernández et al. (2007). Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they felt they could control the decision-making process pertaining to the displacement policy. Regarding trust in the government, items on sincerity and capability, which together constitute the concept of trust (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995; Nakayachi & Watabe, 2005), were included in addition to ones on general trust in the government. The three sincerity-related and three capability-related items were developed from Nakayachi and Cvetkovich (2010) and Colquitt, Scott, and LePine (2007).

Principal component analysis with varimax rotation was conducted for each variable. A unidimensional solution was obtained for every variable, explaining 84.13% of the variance in acceptance, 92.46% in the intention to move, 67.01% in perceived procedural fairness, 53.03% in perceived outcome fairness, 56.77% in outcome favorability, 63.59% in place attachment, 95.78% in general trust, 88.92% in “trust in sincerity” and 96.17% in “trust in capability”. Accordingly, single measures of the variables (except process control and decision control) were constructed by averaging the scores of the corresponding items. The alpha reliabilities of these constructs were satisfactory (Table 1).

We also included six questions on demographics (gender, age, education level, family size, income, and housing tenure).
Table-1 Mean and standard deviation of all items per construct

| Item per construct                                                                 | Mean | SD  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|
| Acceptance (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.91)                                              |      |     |
| Do you agree with the government’s policy regarding displacement?                  | 3.72 | 1.83|
| Do you support the government’s policy regarding displacement?                     | 3.48 | 1.97|
| Are you willing to accept the government’s decision to implement the displacement policy? | 3.87 | 2.02|
| Intention to move (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.96)                                        |      |     |
| I expect to move from my current house to the new settlement.                      | 3.19 | 2.03|
| I want to move from my current house to the new settlement.                        | 3.76 | 2.02|
| I intend to move from my current house to the new settlement.                      | 3.26 | 2.13|
| Perceived procedural fairness (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.91)                            |      |     |
| Do you think this displacement policy is fair?                                     | 3.60 | 1.67|
| Do you think the process of government decision-making that led to the displacement policy is fair? | 3.17 | 1.89|
| Does the government propose and implement displacement procedures fairly?          | 3.31 | 1.87|
| Do you think the government has the competency to propose and implement displacement policies effectively? | 3.54 | 1.89|
| In deciding the benefits of the displacement policy, do you think the government is considering the views of all sides before making a decision? | 4.22 | 1.89|
| Perceived outcome fairness (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.72)                               |      |     |
| Do you think the financial compensation counterbalances the losses that you will experience because of this displacement? | 2.88 | 1.56|
| Do you think it is fair or unfair for the residents to move to the new settlement? | 2.56 | 1.61|
| Outcome favorability (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.95)                                     |      |     |
| How improved your life do you expect if you’re moving to new settlement compared to your current residence? | 4.48 | 1.39|
| How improved the public school condition in the new settlement do you expect compared to your current residence? | 4.27 | 1.80|
| How improved the health facility condition in the new settlement do you expect compared to your current residence? | 4.43 | 1.66|
| How improved the commercial facility condition in the new settlement compared to your current residence? | 4.52 | 1.81|
| How improved the condition of the new settlement’s buildings do you expect compared to your current residence? | 4.23 | 1.84|
| How improved place for the worship condition in your new settlement do you expect compared to your current residence? | 5.22 | 1.67|
| How improved the development level of the lifeline facilities (electricity, water, telephone, etc.) in the new settlement do you expect compared to your current residence? | 4.69 | 1.74|
| How improved the development level of the transportation infrastructure (road, bridge, pedestrian, etc.) around the new settlement do you expect compared to your current residence? | 5.04 | 1.68|
| How improved accessibility to public transport in the new settlement do you expect compared to your current residence? | 4.54 | 1.65|
| How improved your household’s financial situation do you expect if you take part on the displacement compared to your current situation? | 4.08 | 1.95|
| How many job opportunities do you think you will have in the new settlement compared to your current residence? | 4.04 | 1.81|
| How improved the social cohesion in the new settlement do you expect compared to your current residence? | 3.54 | 1.76|

Note. All items measured on 7-point Likert scales; higher scores indicated greater agreement with the item, SD = standard deviation
### Table 1: Mean and standard deviation of all items per construct (Cont)

| Item per construct | Mean | SD  |
|--------------------|------|-----|
| **Place attachment** *(Cronbach’s alpha = 0.92)* |      |     |
| I feel comfortable to stay in my current house. | 5.90 | 0.99 |
| I feel attached to this neighborhood. | 6.04 | 1.39 |
| I would regret having to move to another neighborhood. | 5.67 | 1.62 |
| When I’ve been away for a while, I really want to come back. | 5.27 | 1.85 |
| I feel at home in this neighborhood. | 5.87 | 1.24 |
| When I’m away, I always miss my house and my neighborhood. | 5.92 | 1.28 |
| This is my favorite neighborhood to live in. | 5.98 | 1.28 |
| When I’m away, I’m happy to come back. | 5.94 | 1.17 |
| I identify with this neighborhood. | 5.91 | 1.25 |
| This neighborhood is part of my identity. | 6.05 | 1.24 |
| I feel I belong to this neighborhood. | 6.04 | 1.17 |
| I feel like I’m from this neighborhood. | 6.07 | 1.22 |
| **Process control** | - | - |
| To what extent do you feel you were able to control what happened to you under the process/procedure used in this displacement? | 2.98 | 1.80 |
| **Decision control** | - | - |
| How much control did you have over the decision that was made in this displacement case? | 2.98 | 1.82 |
| **General trust** *(Cronbach’s alpha = 0.96)* |      |     |
| In general, do you trust the government? | 4.15 | 1.94 |
| Do you trust the government to make displacement policy? | 4.18 | 1.98 |
| **Trust in sincerity** *(Cronbach’s alpha = 0.93)* |      |     |
| In general, do you trust the government to do what is right? | 4.12 | 1.96 |
| Do you trust the government to do what is right in this displacement policy? | 4.02 | 1.83 |
| Do you trust that the government tries hard to be fair in dealing with residents affected by this displacement policy? | 3.87 | 1.86 |
| **Trust in capability** *(Cronbach’s alpha = 0.93)* |      |     |
| Do you feel confident about the government’s competence to make and implement policies? | 4.22 | 1.72 |
| Do you feel confident about the government’s competence to make and implement displacement policies? | 4.13 | 1.86 |
| Do you feel the government has much knowledge about the displacement policy? | 4.14 | 1.86 |

*Note: All items measured on 7-point Likert scales; higher scores indicated greater agreement with the item, SD = standard deviation*

### 3. Results

3.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The descriptive statistics of the respondents are presented in Table 2. The mean age of the respondents was 43 years (*SD = 14.28*). In total, 53.82% of the respondents were female (*n* = 134) and 46.18% were male (*n* = 115). Most of the respondents had finished senior high school (*n* = 103, 42.16%) or junior high school (*n* = 70, 28.11%), while 26.10% had only an elementary school education or lower (*n* = 65) and 4.41% (*n* = 11) had completed college or university studies. The mean number of family members per household was four (*SD = 1.59; range: 1–9*). In terms of income, 19.67% of the respondents (*n* = 49) had incomes lower than 1,000,000 IDR, 48.59% (*n* = 121) had incomes of 1,000,000–2,500,000 IDR, 28.91% (*n* = 72) had incomes of 2,500,000–5,000,000 IDR, and only 2.81% (*n* = 7) had incomes higher than 5,000,000 IDR. Regarding
housing tenure, 79.11% \((n = 197)\) of the respondents claimed to own their dwellings, while 20.89% \((n = 52)\) categorized themselves as renters.

Table-2 Descriptive statistics of participants \((N = 249)\)

| Variables               | Percentage | Frequency |
|-------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Gender                  |            |           |
| Male (1)                | 46.18      | 115       |
| Female (0)              | 53.82      | 134       |
| Age                     |            |           |
| 20 – 30                 | 22.08      | 55        |
| 31 – 40                 | 26.50      | 66        |
| 41 – 50                 | 25.30      | 63        |
| 51 – 60                 | 12.85      | 32        |
| 61 and higher           | 13.25      | 33        |
| Education level         |            |           |
| Elementary school or lower (0) | 26.10    | 65        |
| Junior high school (1)  | 28.11      | 70        |
| Senior high school (2)  | 42.16      | 105       |
| University (3)          | 4.41       | 11        |
| Family members          |            |           |
| 1 – 3                   | 30.92      | 77        |
| 4 – 6                   | 59.83      | 149       |
| 7 – 9                   | 9.23       | 23        |
| Income level (IDR/month)|            |           |
| Lower than 1.000.000 (1) | 19.67    | 49        |
| 1.000.000 – 2.500.000 (2) | 48.59    | 121       |
| 2.500.000 – 5.000.000 (3) | 28.91    | 72        |
| Higher than 5.000.000 (4) | 2.81     | 7         |
| Housing tenure          |            |           |
| Private (1)             | 79.11      | 197       |
| Rent (0)                | 20.89      | 52        |

*Note. The numbers in parentheses represent the definitions of variables related to demographic characteristics in the subsequent regression analysis.*

3.2 Descriptive Statistics

As shown in Table 1, the acceptance of displacement policy and intention to move scores \((\text{mean} = 3.72, \text{SD} = 1.83, \text{and mean} = 3.19, \text{SD} = 2.03, \text{respectively})\) suggested that respondents tended to disagree with the displacement and were not willing to move from their residences. The scores for perceived procedural and outcome fairness were both below the midpoint of the 7-point Likert scale \((\text{mean} = 3.60, \text{SD} = 1.67, \text{and mean} = 2.88, \text{SD} = 1.56, \text{respectively})\). The outcome favorability score was higher \((\text{mean} = 4.48, \text{SD} = 1.39)\), indicating that the participants viewed the consequences of displacement favorably. The place attachment score was considerably high \((\text{mean} = 5.90, \text{SD} = 0.99)\). The process and decision control scores were below the midpoint \((\text{mean} = 2.98, \text{SD} = 1.79, \text{and mean} = 2.98, \text{SD} = 1.82, \text{respectively})\). The scores for the three variables pertaining to trust in the government were generally high \((\text{mean} = 4.15, \text{SD} = 1.94 \text{for general trust}; \text{mean} = 4.00, \text{SD} = 1.76 \text{for trust in sincerity}; \text{mean} = 4.22, \text{SD} = 1.72 \text{for trust in capability})\).
3.3 Regression Analysis of Displacement Policy Acceptance and Intention to Move

Regression analyses were conducted to examine the effects of procedural fairness, outcome fairness, outcome favorability and place attachment on resident acceptance of the displacement policy and their intention to move, after controlling for demographic characteristics. The results are presented in Table 3. Procedural fairness had a strong association with displacement policy acceptance, whereas outcome fairness did not. This indicates that respondents who had more favorable perceptions of procedural fairness were more likely to accept displacement. Procedural fairness was also significantly associated with intention to move. In addition, outcome fairness contributed significantly to the intention to move, while place attachment had a moderate negative association with the intention to move. The results indicated that respondents who had positive perceptions regarding both procedural and outcome fairness were more willing to move from their current residence to the new settlements, while those with higher place attachment scores tended to be less willing to leave their current residence.

Table 3. Regression results for acceptance and intention to move

| Variables       | Acceptance |         | Intention to move |         |
|-----------------|------------|---------|-------------------|---------|
|                 | B         | SE      | B                 | SE      |
| Procedural fairness | 0.66***   | 0.09    | 0.48***           | 0.11    |
| Outcome fairness   | 0.12      | 0.09    | 0.26**            | 0.11    |
| Outcome favorability| 0.04      | 0.07    | 0.08              | 0.08    |
| Place attachment   | -0.00     | 0.11    | -0.24*            | 0.13    |
| Gender             | -0.12     | 0.18    | 0.16              | 0.22    |
| Age                | 0.02      | 0.01    | -0.01             | 0.01    |
| Education          | 0.22      | 0.11    | 0.04              | 0.13    |
| Family size        | -0.00     | 0.06    | 0.03              | 0.07    |
| Income             | -0.10     | 0.12    | -0.15             | 0.15    |
| House tenure       | 0.02      | 0.23    | 0.07              | 0.27    |
| Constant           | 0.47      | 1.02    | 1.70              | 1.24    |
| R-square           | 0.47      |         | 0.37              |         |
| N                 | 249       |         | 249               |         |

Note. *p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01, B = unstandardized coefficient, SE = standard error

3.4 Regression Analysis of Class Action Lawsuit

As previously mentioned, 49 of the 249 respondents participated in a class action lawsuit against the government due to the displacement policy. To test the effect of perceived fairness, outcome favorability and place attachment, we conducted a binary logistic regression, in which a dummy variable for participation in the class action lawsuit (1 for participant and 0 for non-participant) was regressed onto other explanatory variables. Procedural fairness was significantly negatively associated with participation in the class action lawsuit, as shown in Table 4. This indicates that respondents who had more favorable perceptions of procedural fairness were less likely to participate in the class action lawsuit.
Table 4. Results of binary logistic regression for class action lawsuit

| Variables            | B     | SE  | Odds Ratio |
|----------------------|-------|-----|------------|
| Procedural fairness  | -1.07*** | 0.29 | 0.34       |
| Outcome fairness     | -0.45 | 0.28 | 0.64       |
| Outcome favorability | -0.21 | 0.14 | 0.82       |
| Place attachment     | -0.47 | 0.34 | 0.63       |
| Gender               | 1.23*** | 0.44 | 3.42       |
| Age                  | -0.03 | 0.02 | 0.97       |
| Education            | -0.41 | 0.26 | 0.67       |
| Family size          | -0.05 | 0.14 | 0.95       |
| Income               | 0.31  | 0.29 | 1.37       |
| House tenure         | 0.03  | 0.57 | 0.86       |
| Constant             | 6.70** | 2.87 | 814.62     |
| -2 Log-likelihood    | 145.02 |
| N                    | 249   |

Note. *p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01, B = unstandardized coefficient, SE = standard error

\[ x^2 = 101.95, df = 11, p < .001, \text{Nagelkerke's pseudo R-Square} = 0.53 \]

Classification accuracy = 89.2%

3.5 Regression Analysis of Perceived Procedural Fairness

Finally, a regression analysis was performed to examine the predictive power of process control, decision control, and trust in the government (i.e., general trust, sincerity, and capability) with respect to procedural fairness. The results, presented in Table 5, indicate that process control and trust in sincerity were significantly associated with procedural fairness. Trust in the government’s capability was also moderately associated with procedural fairness. Thus, respondents who had more opportunity to control decision-making pertaining to the displacement policy tended to have more favorable perceptions of procedural fairness. In addition, respondents with trust in sincerity and capability also tended to have more favorable perceptions of procedural fairness.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

This study explored the reasons for residents’ opposition to a displacement policy intended to improve their living environment, from the perspectives of procedural fairness and place attachment. The main finding of this study is that residents’ perceptions of procedural fairness significantly affected their acceptance of displacement and overall intention to relocate. Furthermore, perceived procedural fairness influenced residents’ participation in a class action lawsuit against the government. This finding, combined with the positive perceptions regarding the outcome desirability of displacement, suggests that local residents may oppose the policy if they are dissatisfied with the procedures leading to its formulation, even if they believe that it will improve their lives. Much of the existing research on procedural fairness in the context of NIMBY issues shows that, even when a public policy has negative consequences for residents, they are likely to agree with it if the procedures involved in its formulation are perceived positively (Devine-Wright, 2013; Siegrist, Connor, & Keller, 2012; Vilhunen et al., 2019). However, those studies did not take into account cases where public policies have positive consequences for residents. This study has novelty by showing that, even if the outcome of displacement policy is perceived as being favorable for residents, they may still oppose displacement if the procedure...
This study thus highlights the role of residents’ perceptions of procedural fairness in public acceptance of the displacement policy implemented in Jakarta. The positive effects of procedural fairness on policy acceptance have largely been documented in Western countries. Accordingly, there is some skepticism about whether similar results are likely in other areas, such as East Asia; few studies have systematically investigated theories of procedural fairness in non-Western societies (Tankebe, 2009). An important contribution of this study is that it demonstrates that, to some extent, residents of Jakarta evaluate policies based on the normative concept of procedural fairness.

In the present study, the effect of place attachment on public acceptance of displacement was limited. The reason for this result is not clear. One plausible explanation, however, is that the residents may not have been aware that displacement would affect place attachment, because the displacement area was still within Jakarta. Therefore, the residents may have decided to support or oppose the displacement independent of their attachment to the neighborhood. However, this is speculative; further study is needed.

Another finding of this study was that the degree of control over the policy formulation process predicted respondents’ perceptions of procedural fairness. On the other hand, the degree of control over the ultimate decision was not significantly associated with perceived procedural fairness. As already mentioned, sources of the perceptions of procedural fairness can be divided into outcome- and process-oriented accounts, which pertain to the effects of decision control and process control, respectively (Lind & Tyler, 1988). The effect of process control found in this study indicates the viability of the process-oriented account, where perceptions of procedural fairness can be enhanced by promoting process control, even when decision control cannot be increased. This result is consistent with recent findings of Nonami, Hirose, Ohnuma, Midden, and Ohtomo (2015), who showed that enhancing process control by taking account of the opinions of residents plays an important role in fostering favorable perceptions of procedural fairness and public acceptance of policy. It was also found that trust in the sincerity of the government

| Variables             | B     | SE  |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|
| Process control       | 0.33**| 0.06|
| Decision control      | 0.09  | 0.06|
| General trust         | 0.09  | 0.06|
| Sincerity             | 0.25***| 0.09|
| Capability            | 0.15* | 0.08|
| Gender                | 0.01  | 0.11|
| Age                   | 0.01  | 0.00|
| Education             | 0.02  | 0.06|
| Family size           | -0.04 | 0.03|
| Income                | 0.03  | 0.07|
| House tenure          | -0.02 | 0.13|
| Constant              | 0.10  | 0.40|

R-square 0.74  N 249

Note. *p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01, B = unstandardized coefficient, SE = standard error
predicted perceived procedural fairness. Fujii (2017) reported that, as long as people trust the government, they perceive its decision-making procedures to be fair, even if they cannot directly influence the decisions themselves. Our results support this view by showing that trust in sincerity influences perceived procedural fairness independent of process control.

Based on these findings, the refusal of residents in Bukit Duri to vacate their residences, and their legal action against the Jakarta government, may be attributed to their unfavorable perceptions regarding procedural fairness. Our results have several implications regarding promoting resident acceptance of displacement policies in Jakarta. First, residents may have concerns not only about the consequences of displacement, but also the fairness of the associated decision-making process. The findings of this study suggest that local authorities may not be able to gain resident acceptance simply by offering compensation and new settlements. It is important that the authorities implement displacement procedures that residents perceive as fair, to promote resident acceptance of displacement and encourage them to move to new settlements. Second, perceptions of procedural fairness can be improved by enhancing the sense of process control of residents over the displacement policy. This could be achieved by giving residents an opportunity to participate in decision-making processes and voice their opinions. Several case studies have shown that public consultation and engagement increase the likelihood that displacement policy will be agreed upon by residents (Davidson, Zaaier, Peltenburg, & Rodell, 1993; Viratkapan & Perera, 2006). As shown by this study, residents perceive procedures as fair when they can take some ownership over them, even if they cannot ultimately control the decisions made. Thus, procedures that enable residents to express their views about displacement can improve perceptions of fairness. However, the findings of this study do not imply that the consequences of displacement on residents’ lives could be neglected in pursuing displacement policy in Jakarta. It was also shown that residents’ perceptions of the fairness of displacement outcomes are significantly related to their intention to vacate. Previous studies on displacement policies in Jakarta raised concerns regarding the possibility that the policies may impoverish residents (Quetulio-Navarra, Niehof, van der Horst, & van der Vaart, 2014; Sholihah & Shaojun, 2018). Thus, the government must strive to improve the living conditions of residents when pursuing displacement policies.

Our study had several limitations. First, the relationships among different variables associated with the acceptance of displacement were not investigated. In the future, it will be important to systematically examine the direct and indirect associations among these variables through structural equation modelling, and to clarify the psychological processes that underlie acceptance of relocation. Furthermore, case studies characterized by a participatory approach enabling residents to express their views will be important, to determine the effects of such an approach on residents’ attitudes toward displacement.
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