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Abstract: In urban transformation processes, three different types of housing mobility can be observed. For those mobility types, distinct satisfaction parameters come into question. The scope of this research is, to define these satisfaction parameters for different mobility groups. Sarigol, a housing redevelopment site in Gaziosmanpasa, Istanbul, which mainly consists of Roman inhabitants, was chosen as a case study for this research. The site is very suitable for the case study because of its social, economic and geographical dynamics. Housing mobility decisions, which are seen during the redevelopment process, can be classified as the determinants in terms of grouping the users in the site through in-depth interviews. In the study, user groups were conceptualized as: stabiles, departers and new comers. The intense housing mobility occurred during the redevelopment process brought along a change in the population structure as experienced in the fieldwork. Such that, residents who have similar cultural, social and economic backgrounds left the site and people who have distinctive social values settled in their place. People from various cultural, economic and social backgrounds were forced to live within the
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1. Introduction

Defined as the moving of an individual from one house to another, housing mobility results from several underlying factors. Moving from one house to another is a step in the life cycle of an individual that occurs due to various reasons such as marriage, having children, marital separation, education, change in income level and work (Mulder & Wagner, 2010). In this study, we analyzed the scope of housing mobility during the redevelopment phase based on the types, reasons and results of this mobility.

When determining the level of happiness in one’s existence, quality of life plays a significant role (Ranci, 2010). The level of personal satisfaction an individual experiences attains from their place of residence, where the majority of their time is spent, the sense of belonging is fostered and the need for physical shelter is met, has a profound impact on achieving high quality of life standards. Comparatively, when a resident was not satisfied with housing, housing mobility decisions were made for the purpose of improving living conditions. However, housing mobility is not always implemented for the purpose of living in a better home.

The concept of housing mobility has two dimensions: voluntary and involuntary (displacement). In the scope of the research, the reasons for varying mobility behaviors were put forth (Tieskens & Musterd, 2013). In the scope of the Sarigol redevelopment project, residents who exhibited different mobility behaviors were classified under three groups: Stabiles, departers and newcomers. “Stabiles” were defined as inhabitants who were living in the zone prior to the redevelopment process and decided to stay. “Departers” were classified as those who decided to move during the redevelopment process and “newcomers” were defined as individuals who decided to move to the newly built residences upon completion of the redevelopment process.

At this point, it is necessary to examine the context of this research in terms of the housing redevelopment process in Turkey. The global neoliberal economic polices put forth in the early 1980s which aimed to redevelop the non-merchantable areas of Istanbul gained support in the country in the 2000s. Since then, the redevelopment of shanty towns has become a modern issue amid aims to add financial value to these zones. As a result, these unplanned areas that have remained within the city limits are now considered highly profitable. In the context of neoliberalism, investors were intrigued by the idea of demolishing establishments in poverty-stricken areas solely in the heart of the city, and transformed these areas into living quarters that would appeal to the “newcomers,” with the Turkish state paving the way for this process by asserting its role as lawmaker.

This transformation caused considerable changes in people’s lives, due to voluntary or involuntary movement. Namely, residents voluntarily moved in order to attain higher quality of life. On the other hand, when the planning stages of housing redevelopment projects began in these residential areas amid aims to generate high income, residents were faced with the issue of forced displacement, which is referred to as forcing individuals to move from one home to another, causing sudden and serious life changes against the will of the resident and creating material and moral burdens (Manzo & Devine-Wright, 2014).
The high occurrence of housing mobility observed during the redevelopment process came with the transformation of the demographic structure of the population, as experienced in the fieldwork. Namely, residents who shared similar cultural, social and economic backgrounds left Sarigol and individuals with distinctive social values settled in their place. Residents from various cultural, social and economic backgrounds were forced to live within a shared social environment, leading to various physical, social and economic problems which eventually caused dissatisfaction among different residential groups in various contexts. While Sarigol residents were affected psychologically and economically during the redevelopment process; changes in the quality of life were also observed (Bridge, Butler, & Lees, 2012). In this case, satisfaction became definable through the examination of various parameters for distinct user groups. In this study, such parameters were presented.

During the residential redevelopment project in Sarigol, a neighborhood located in the Gaziosmanpasa district of Istanbul, mixed-method research was conducted in the scope of the doctoral thesis titled, “Evaluation of Quality/Satisfaction over Housing Mobility: Sarigol Housing Redevelopment Site.”

The qualitative data obtained from this method of research are used in this article. Significant parameters of satisfaction regarding the research conducted on the redevelopment site have been stated by interpreting the codes of satisfaction, which were established through content analysis examining the causes and effects of housing mobility.

The impact of housing mobility on the social and economic aspects of individuals’ lives has been evaluated in the scope of a site research, in terms of the impact of the quality of housing and the satisfaction of the users. As a site which exemplifies the various user mobility types while being conducive with the observation of the before, during and after phases of the housing mobility process, the Sarigol Housing Redevelopment Area was chosen as the case study carried out over a number of years. The primary goal of this paper is to provide a more reliable approach to introducing the codes of satisfaction which emerged during the housing redevelopment process. In order to introduce the satisfaction codes, the article presents three major sections: (i) Review of discussions on the concepts of mobility and housing satisfaction within the existing literature, (ii) Demonstration of housing satisfaction parameters in relation to the variety of housing mobility in Sarigol and (iii) Discussion of the findings and the contributions of the study in terms of existing literature.

2. Literature review

2.1. Housing mobility in housing redevelopment process

The housing redevelopment process is defined in different ways, according to the type of mobility for various user groups. Housing mobility occurs voluntarily or involuntarily during the process. People voluntarily move to the redeveloped site with the desire of living in a gated community and increasing their quality of life standards. Individuals are directly or indirectly displaced during the redevelopment process due to economic and social-cultural reasons (Bridge et al., 2012).

The involuntary movement from one’s home to another home, known as “displacement,” occurs either because the inhabitants are not titleholders or because the inhabitants can no longer live in their current home due to socioeconomic factors. The forced eviction of individuals from the houses, known as “displacement,” is one of the exclusionary impacts on the low-income group in the housing redevelopment projects (Atkinson, 2005, p. 107; Uitermark, Duyvendak, & Kleinhans, 2007). Low-income group is the most affected population group from the displacement in terms of decrease of housing quality, increasing rent prices and higher maintenance costs. It is observed that in state-led development projects, individuals who live in rented houses are displaced the most (Tieskens & Musterd, 2013).
In housing redevelopment projects, housing mobility that takes place by displacement not only encompasses changing the physical address of the individual but also leads to unexpected transformation in the individual’s social network and personal life. Research shows that the level of housing satisfaction decreases and the quality of life is affected adversely when inhabitants lose their homes and are forced to make major changes in their social life, as they feel a sense of social belonging to their social and physical environment (Kleit & Manzo, 2006; Pinkster & Boterman, 2017).

Residential homes that are built during the redevelopment process are sold at higher market prices; hence, the individuals who lived in these areas prior to the renovation project are forced to pay more money in order to continue living there. As a result, the neighborhood becomes unaffordable for the “stabiles” as services are designed to cater to the needs of “newcomers.” These conditions force the “stabiles” to be indirectly displaced. The effects of these situations can easily be seen in transportation expenses and extra costs incurred on the household budget such as compound maintenance charges, taxes or other service sector expenditures (Newman & Wyly, 2006). People who cannot find the means to live in these redevelopment areas are directly or indirectly displaced and they push their economic limits to move to another house (Posthumus, Bolt, & van Kempen, 2013).

Similarly, individuals who cannot fit into the new social fabric of the redeveloped area move to different housing that meets their sociocultural expectations, resulting in involuntary housing mobility (Posthumus et al., 2013).

It is possible to explain the housing mobility process in terms of its causes and effects, based on the parameters of satisfaction according to the stabiles, departers and the newcomers.

2.2. Housing satisfaction
According to Galster’s approach (1987), housing satisfaction is defined as “the perceived gap between a respondent’s needs and aspiration and the reality of the current residential context.” The concept of housing satisfaction has been used as a key indicator of an individual’s perceptions of general “quality of life” (Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, 1976).

Andrews and Whitney have argued that the residents’ satisfaction perception defines the quality of their lives (Andrews & Withey, 1976). Housing satisfaction is a complex attitude (Satsangi & Kearns, 1992) that encompasses satisfaction with the housing unit and the neighborhood (Onibokun, 1974).

The concept of housing satisfaction is evaluated based on two criterions, including housing features and the neighborhood. Due to this evaluation, the notion enriched as a common interest of psychology, sociology, geography, anthropology, architecture and planning disciplines (Rossi, 1955).

According to Onibokun, the inhabitability of a home is influenced not only by physical dimensions, but also by social, behavioral and cultural aspects in the entire socio-environmental system. A person’s place of residence is only one link in a chain of factors that determine the relative satisfaction of individuals with their accommodation (Onibokun, 1974).

Similarly, Francescato, Weidemann, and Anderson (2017) associated housing satisfaction with physical and social environment. They defined the evaluation of the notion through fifteen aspects in their model; namely, density/crowding, safety/security, aesthetics/appearance, site facilities, access to friends, site location/access to community, maintenance, economic costs, sense of community, management policy, personal freedom/privacy, the perception of community, the perception of neighbors, personality attributes and demographic characteristics (Francescato et al., 2017).
According to Marans and Rogers's study (1975), there is a strong connection between the objective features of the neighborhood and housing satisfaction. The main concepts behind their satisfaction model can be classified as: (i) the direct or indirect effect of objective neighborhood features on the individual, (ii) the subjective reaction of the individual to the stimuli and (iii) the subjective behaviors. Moreover, the effect of housing and neighborhood satisfaction on one's life and the relation between housing mobility and housing satisfaction are also examined in the study (Marans & Rodgers, 1975).

Similarly, Amerigo and Aragones's housing satisfaction model is based on an analysis of the relation between residents and the housing site, as well as the perception, effects and behaviors involved in this relationship. According to this model, the objective features in the neighborhood are expressed subjectively in the analysis of the personal attributes of the inhabitants (Amérigo & Aragonés, 1997).

Another housing and neighborhood satisfaction model, which was approved by Marans, claims the inadequacy of the objective housing and neighborhood features in terms of evaluating the level of satisfaction in housing quality. Marans argues that a definitive conclusion can be reached via the subjective answers of the inhabitants regarding those objective features (Marans, 2014).

Due to the dynamic structure of housing and neighborhood satisfaction, it is important that the research is gathered from the previous experiences, expectations, aspirations and housing mobility plans if dissatisfaction is a reason for moving (Varady & Carrozza, 2000).

Varady and Carrozza (2000) defined the factors which affect housing satisfaction in four dimensions: (i) personal factors (e.g. age, length of residence); (ii) housing service characteristics (e.g. housing standards); (iii) recent experiences (e.g. outstanding requests for service) and (iv) situational factors (e.g. the landlord’s image, the quality of the surrounding neighborhood).

2.2.1. Previous studies on housing satisfaction
Mohit and Khanbashi Raja's (2014) article titled, “Residential Satisfaction - Concept, Theories and Empirical Studies,” demonstrates both the theoretical and empirical aspects of housing satisfaction. According to their study, housing satisfaction is a composite concept since it terminologically comprise two multifaceted terms: housing and satisfaction. Housing satisfaction is also composite because it involves cognitive, affective and behavioral processes. Those processes bring the third reason why housing mobility is a composite concept according to the authors: The concept demands different measurements including personal characteristics, objective and subjective attributes. Mohit and Khanbashi Raja's discussion also stated that those measurements belonging to housing and the site, such as the socio-demographic attributes of inhabitants, have a crucial impact on housing satisfaction. Moreover, cultural impacts can also be effective depending on the case’s context (Mohit & Raja, 2014).

Mohamed, Mohammad Yusoff, Iman Pratama, and Raman’s (2014) study titled, “Satisfaction Perception of Indoor Environment of Low-Cost Housing: A Case Study of Flat Taman Desa Sentosa” presents a site observation and questionnaire researching the low-cost flat in Kampung Teras Jernang, Selangor, in order to discuss housing satisfaction from the resident’s perspective. According to the study, the satisfaction levels are very high among the residents with the exception of one condition which has a great effect on satisfaction: noise pollution. High satisfaction levels, they argue, can be a reason for good adaptation (Mohamed et al., 2014).

Salleh's (2008) article titled, “Neighborhood factors in private, low-cost housing in Malaysia” examines the reasons for residents’ satisfaction in the fast-growing state of Penang and the less-developed state of Terengganu, in Malaysia. The research included dwelling units, housing services, neighborhood facilities and the surroundings and the random sample consisted of 795 households. The results of the factor analysis indicated the fact that the neighborhood is the determinative
element of housing satisfaction. Neighborhood facilities and surrounding quality factors such as children’s playgrounds, car parking facilities, parks and security cause low levels of satisfaction since those elements failed to meet the residents’ needs (Salleh, 2008).

Kahraman’s (2013) article titled, “Dimensions of Housing Satisfaction: A Case Study Based on Perceptions of Rural Migrants Living in Dikmen” examines the level of housing satisfaction among rural immigrants who live in the Dikmen district of Ankara. Data was obtained following in-depth interviews conducted with the sample group, consisting of 25 participants. As a result, Kahraman argued that there are six major characteristics which specify the housing satisfaction of rural immigrants in Ankara: (i) Architectural features, (ii) functions, (iii) interior features, (iv) location, (v) social characteristics and (vi) economic features. According to the results of the content analysis, housing satisfaction can be defined as a multifaceted and relative concept. The relativity of the concept comes along with the physical, social, economic and cultural characteristics of the residents; in this case, the rural immigrants. Furthermore, the research indicated that physical environment and experiences have crucial impacts on the perception of housing satisfaction. Since the cultural background of those immigrants were similar, their perceptions on housing satisfaction showed commonalities (Kahraman, 2013).

In Ibem, Opoko, Adeboye, and Amole’s (2013) study titled, “Performance evaluation of residential buildings in public housing estates in Ogun State, Nigeria: Users’ satisfaction perspective,” 452 households were asked to participate in a survey to determine the level of housing satisfaction in the scope of the key areas of physical and spatial aspects, location, services, aesthetics and economic attributes. According to the research, adequacy of temperature-based and visual comfort and security, the sizes of living and sleeping areas in the residences and the management of housing estates have the most dominant impact on housing satisfaction. Namely, the research clearly revealed that most of the residents in Nigeria’s Ogun state were dissatisfied with their housing sites due to the low qualities of aforementioned factors (Ibem et al., 2013).

Byun and Ha’s (2016) research titled, “The Factors Influencing Residential Satisfaction by Public Rental Housing Type” evaluates the level of housing satisfaction among the residents of public rental houses in Seoul, South Korea. In order to make a comparison, the sample households were selected depending on their distinct physical qualities. The four major elements were defined according to the data collected through face-to-face interviews: (i) safety, (ii) physical, (iii) accessibility, (iv) equipment. According to these environmental factors, the residents of apartment buildings in Seoul exhibited high levels of satisfaction since the complex apartment buildings offered many opportunities in terms of education, business, socialization and culture. Moreover, the apartment buildings have additional facilities which provide safety and cleanness (Byun & Ha, 2016).

Hur and Morrow-Jones’s (2008) article titled, “Factors that Influence Residents’ Satisfaction with Neighborhoods” provides an assessment of housing and neighborhood satisfaction with a focus on homeowner perception. According to the regression analysis, 14 variables are specified as the major elements which affect the satisfaction levels of the home owners. Those 14 variables were as follows; crime prevention safety, local government services, cleanliness, tress, pedestrian access to stores, traffic, ethnic demographics, distance to work, family and friends, access to recreational opportunities, proximity to problem areas, general aesthetic appearance and the crowdedness of housing (Hur & Morrow-Jones, 2008).

Since the level of housing satisfaction is influenced by numerous physical and social factors as stated in the literature review, the description of trends is supplemented with a set of multivariate analyses of the housing quality-satisfaction parameters of different groups in the neighborhood. The field research of the article aims to demonstrate the housing quality-satisfaction parameters in Sarigol.
The literature review on housing satisfaction has shown that the satisfaction evaluation of the user became meaningful through the subjective judgements on the house and the objective features of the relevant neighborhood. Therefore, in-depth interviews were conducted with users living in the redevelopment site, in order to interpret the housing mobility that occurred in the housing site redevelopment process in the scope of the satisfaction parameters.

3. Case study
According to recent studies, urban transformation is one of the most common reasons for housing redevelopment projects in Turkey. Increasing value of urban land and the effects of the 1999 Marmara Earthquake may be regarded as the starting point of this movement towards urbanization. In the early 2000s, Istanbul embarked on a continual transformative process which led to the expansion of the city. Due to this expansion, the squatter areas remained within urban areas and further triggered the rising value of urban land (Turkun, 2014). On the other hand, the 2001 economic crises also paved the way for a new era in urbanization in the country, via the new policies implemented with regard to economic growth and the fear of a possible earthquake. The effects of globalization also became an issue as globalization had shifted the trend of national economic policies from industrial production to service delivery. Therefore, investments in Turkey’s private construction sector increased (Sen, 2008). In order to prevent illegal housing and to increase housing mobility, the government penned a social policy titled, “The Urbanization and Localization Action Plan.” The action plan aimed to demolish shantytowns, increase the rights of municipalities and support planned urbanization, granting ownership rights to low-income users and reducing the unemployment rate by supporting the private construction sector (Yağlın, Çalışkan, Çilgin & Dündar, 2014). The field that was chosen for the scope of this research, Sarigol, was redeveloped based on this policy.

3.1. Site
The site has been chosen as the subject for this case study because its social, economic and geographical dynamics make it highly suitable for the scope of our research. Sarigol was very adequate in terms of observing the before, during and after phases of the transformation process.

Sarigol is a settlement area in the Gaziosmanpasa district of Istanbul, very close to 2. Belt highway and 2. Bosphorus Bridge. Consisting mainly of illegally produced, low-rise shanty houses and residents from the low-income social bracket, Sarigol was formerly a rural area with an agrarian-based economy until 1935. However, the migration of the Roma community displaced during the construction of Vatan Street in the 1950s and the migration of the Yugoslavian community after 1954 allowed for illegal housing projects to gain momentum. The intense movement from rural areas to Istanbul in the 1980s brought a rise in population in the Gaziosmanpasa district. The development of illegal housing was accelerated through increasing accessibility to the area, with the construction of the second bridge and the Tem Highway in 1988. Thus, shantytowns such as Sarigol started to be seen as problematic areas of the city in the 2000s due to their unplanned structure and insufficiency in meeting the needs of residents aside from serving as mere shelter (Figure 1).

The social fabric of Sarigol was formerly comprised of Roma citizens and Balkan immigrants (Gaziosmanpasa Municipality Report, 2014, p. 94). Limited access to education and the lack of permanent job opportunities compelled the youth in the neighborhood to resort to illegal ways of earning an income. Thus, the level of drug sales and drug use in the neighborhood rose above the levels of other districts of Istanbul; and Turkey in general. This illegal activity propels crime in Sarigol and has negative impacts on the security of the lives of Sarigol residents.

Due to the rising crime rate, the earthquake risk, deteriorated housing conditions and the high demand from renters, Sarigol was officially declared in the Official Gazette No. 28540 as a risky area, in accordance with Law No. 6306, the Law About Transformation of Areas Under the Risk of Natural Disaster, with the decision of the Council of Ministers dated 24.12.2012 and numbered 2012/4099 (Table 1 and Figures 2–4).
The 256 structures which existed before the process at the Sarigol Urban Transformation Site are squatter houses which were mostly built at 1-storey or 2-storey heights, in accordance with the masonry structure technique used before 1980 (Gaziosmanpasa Municipality Report, 2014). The ownership rights of a total of 393 households who resided in those structures varied in terms of title holders and ownership certificate holders in the scope of the project. This difference led residents to either stay or be displaced, according to their economic situations.

Prior to the redevelopment project, the population of Sarigol consisted of 60% primary school graduates and 5% university graduates. The monthly incomes of the residents before the process were distributed as follows: 21% below $275; 34% between $275 and $550; 37% between $550 and

Table 1. Profile attributes of the groups in Sarigol

|                      | Stabiles                      | Departers                     | Newcomers                     |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Educational status   | Primary school graduate       | Primary school graduate       | University graduate           |
| Monthly housing income| Approximately 500 USD         | 500–1250 USD                  | 500–1250 USD                  |
| Ownership of housing | Current housing 100%          | Current housing 73%           | Current housing 81%           |
|                      | Previous housing 100%         | Previous housing 64%          | Previous housing 78%          |
| Professional status  | Retiree                       | Retiree                       | Salaried employee             |
| Previous period of residency | More than 20 years           | More than 20 years           | 1–5 years: 41%; 5–10 years: 24%; 10–20 years: 13%; more than 20 years: 22% |
| Location of previous housing | All previous houses were located in Sarigol | All previous houses were located in Sarigol | Location of previous houses: GOP, Sarigol, Besyuzevler, Alibeykoy |
| Location of new housing | Sarigol                       | Undemolished squatters in Sarigol and surrounding neighborhoods, hometown | Sarigol                      |
| Current housing expenses | 100% increased               | 46% increased; 27% unchanged; 27% decreased | 76% increased; 11% unchanged; 13% decreased |
| Do you consider moving following the redevelopment process? | 17% of the population consider moving after redevelopment “Close to Sarigol” | 11% of the population consider moving after redevelopment “Close to surrounding neighborhoods” | “To surrounding neighborhoods” “For cheaper rent” “To surrounding neighborhoods” |
| Where do you move?   | Hometown, or another house in Sarigol | Sarigol, or somewhere close to Sarigol | They do not consider moving |

Figure 1. The location of Sarigol in Istanbul (highways, bridges).
$1,375 and 8% above $1,375. The 82% of people who decided to stay after the process was completed moved from single-detached dwellings to apartment blocks and have lived in the area for more than 20 years. These socio-demographic features express the power of social bonds in the neighborhood and the sense of belonging to Sarigol.

### 3.2. Method

In this article, the qualitative research data collected from the site of the case study Sarigol was presented. Academic references in relation to the methodology of this article are stated as follows:

Berkoz & Kellekci’s article in 2005 titled, “The factors that increase dwelling and environmental quality satisfaction” investigates the parameters which affect the housing, housing environment and quality satisfaction in the Istanbul Metropolitan Area in order to demonstrate the factors which...
enhance the satisfaction levels and to construct a conceptual model. The data was collected through 400 questions given in a questionnaire to 401 residents. A factor analysis was conducted after data collection and the factor groups which affect satisfaction levels were specified as accessibility, environmental quality variables, environmental security, neighborhood relations, housing environment and economic value. As a principal component analysis, factor extraction technique and as a factor rotation technique, varimax were applied to all variables to determine the meaningful variables.

Oktay and Marans’ research titled, “Neighborhood satisfaction among diverse groups of inhabitants: Findings from Famagusta Area Study” (2011) provides an evaluation of neighborhood satisfaction with regard to neighborhood quality in Famagusta, North Cyprus. A probability sample consisting of 302 inhabitants of the area and 96 international students was chosen and a standardized questionnaire and multiple regression analysis are conducted. The aim of the research was to determine neighborhood satisfaction based on a number of quality criterion which include attractiveness, accessibility, traffic, noise and availability. Moreover, the study also presents the responses of the inhabitants as well as international students’ views of the neighborhood with regard to their sense of social belonging.

The case study was designed as a two-staged research: (i) the collection of data from the field through in-depth interviews and (ii) content analysis of the qualitative research data.

In prelude, knowledge of the redevelopment process was enhanced as a result of the literature review. In the scope of the new information, the semi-structured, in-depth interviews were formed with factor groups. The scope of the research was considered together with semi-structured, in-depth interviews conducted on 20 people. Respondents were chosen by random sampling method in the redevelopment area (Teddlie & Yu, 2007).

Using small samples and conducting each interview for a minimum of one hour were crucial factors in increasing the depth of the research. Qualitative research questions were directed as open-ended questions to the sources during the interviews. As a result, data was collected regarding how participants understand the concepts of social belonging, displacement and social exclusion; how they conceptualize those concepts and how they evaluate these concepts (Greasley & Ashworth, 2007).
Within the scope of the research, the users in the neighborhood were classified in three groups according to their housing mobility types; namely, “Stabiles, Departers and Newcomers.” Figure 5 shows the groups according to housing mobility behavior of users’ groups (Figure 6).

The group, which is categorized as “stabiles,” consisted of 38%. Stabiles preferred to stay in the neighborhood in the context of their socio-economic conditions. This group feels a sense of belonging to the neighborhood and usually have titles to their homes. As an advantageous group during the redevelopment process in terms of ownership rights, they feel socio-economically ready to live in newly built homes.

The group, which is classified as “departers,” makes up 16% of residents. Departers decided to leave amid fears that they would not fit in with the new fabric of the neighborhood socio-culturally, economically and physically. This group is disadvantageous in terms of ownership rights, as they either have ownership certificate or they are tenants. Unable to fulfill such economic requirements as rising rent in new apartments built during the redevelopment process, tenants are the first displaced group. The residents who hold ownership certificates are also involuntarily displaced because they cannot afford the difference between expropriated prices of their homes and the price of new homes.

The group, which is defined as the “newcomers,” makes up 46% and shows voluntary housing mobility because of the physical features of the neighborhood such as the security provided by the gated community, playgrounds for children, parking garages and conditions for physical comfort. This group aimed to have better living conditions and higher quality of life by moving to the neighborhood.

Qualitative data were collected via semi-structured, in-depth interviews, and the main seven factors of the interviews were as follows: Physical properties of the housing, environmental factors, comfort conditions, physical environmental qualities, social environmental qualities, security facilities and user profile. From October 2015 to July 2016, face-to-face interviews were conducted at different frequencies. The inductive approach of the semi-structured, in-depth interviews was crucial in discovering the patterns, codes and themes (Table 2).
**Figure 6. User groups in Sarigol redevelopment area.**

**Table 2. The main seven factors of semi-structured, in-depth interviews**

| Seven factors of semi-structured in-depth interviews | Type of housing |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Physical properties of the housing                   | Size            |
|                                                      | Satisfaction from bathroom facilities |
| Environmental factors                                 | Housing fabric density |
|                                                      | Population density |
| Comfort conditions                                   | Humidity         |
|                                                      | Thermal performance |
|                                                      | Smell            |
| Physical environment qualities                       | Location         |
|                                                      | Transportation to work and friends |
|                                                      | Equipment        |
| Social environment qualities                         | Neighborliness   |
|                                                      | Structure of social environment |
|                                                      | Sense of belonging |
| Security facilities                                  | Earthquake risk management |
|                                                      | Safety of life and property |
|                                                      | Child safety     |
| User profiles                                        | Stabiles         |
|                                                      | Deppers          |
|                                                      | Newcomers        |
Statements noted down during in-depth interviews aimed to understand this phenomenon related with the experiences of respondents by means of interpreting their important statements and expressions. The common statements of respondents produced the codes of the research. These codes were used to identify the quality-satisfaction parameters, which are the reason for the mobility of different groups that demonstrate different mobility behaviors. Clustering quality-satisfaction queries under the factor groups facilitated the analysis of user’s housing mobility trends.

3.3. Data analysis
The most common statements in semi-structured, in-depth interviews demonstrated the themes defining the evolution of the redevelopment process.

Stabiles were asked to evaluate the redevelopment process and the most common answers were:

- “We had a space, a garden which belong to us.”
- “Expenses of new houses are too high.”
- “All our friends moved from Sarigol, there is no one familiar left in the neighborhood.”
- Many new people came to the neighborhood, I no longer know my neighbor.”
- “I have been living in Sarigol for many years, I don’t think I can live somewhere else.”
- “Our old house has been renewed, but the quality of the construction is low.”

When departers were asked to evaluate the process, the most common answers were:

- “I feel that I belong in Sarigol. I chose to rent a house that has not been torn down yet.”
- “We wouldn’t be able to live there with our economic conditions.”
- “We are used to living in shanty houses, with gardens. We cannot live in apartment blocks.”
- “I bought another shanty house which is close to my relatives.”

| Table 3. Perceptual attributes of housing mobility |
|--------------------------------------------------|
| **Stabiles**                                      | **Departers**                                    | **Newcomers**                                   |
| Best quality of former house                     | “It was our personal house”                      | “I had a sense of routine within my familiar neighborhood” |
|                                                 | “There were no interferences”                    | “We had a terrace”                              |
|                                                 | “We used to do whatever we wanted”               | “It was the neighborhood”                       |
| Worst quality of former house                    | “It was a squatter house”                        | “It was old”                                    |
|                                                 | “It was dilapidated”                             | “There was no parking space”                    |
| Best quality of new house                        | “New, modern, safe, good, of high quality”       | “There are not many”                            |
|                                                 | “Close to relatives”                             | “It is a gated community”                       |
| Worst quality of new house                       | “Dues”                                          | “It is new and well-maintained”                  |
|                                                 | “I cannot do whatever I want”                    | “The surrounding buildings”                     |
|                                                 | “Earthquake concerns due to poor construction quality” | “Some neighbors”                          |
|                                                 | “We have no terrace”                             | “New surroundings”                               |
|                                                 | “We are not familiar with apartment buildings”    | “Uncertainty of the redevelopment process”      |
When newcomers were asked to evaluate the process, the most common answers were:

- “This is one of the limited residence sites in Sarigol where one can live.”
- “We moved here because the site is being protected by security.”
- “There are spaces in the site where children can play securely.”
- “It is close to my work.”
- “I think I made a good investment.”
- “I want the shanty houses around the district to be torn down immediately because of the high crime rate.”

The users who changed their housing during the process were asked about the best and worst qualities of their new houses and a content analysis was conducted on their statements. The perceptions of residents on housing mobility are shown in Table 3.

Table 4. Quality-satisfaction codes according to groups

| Group 1: Individuals living in Sarigol previously who continue to live there | Group 2: Previous Sarigol residents who leave after the redevelopment process | Group 3: Individuals not previously living in Sarigol who decide to move after redevelopment process |
|---|---|---|
| **Stabiles** | **Departers** | **Newcomers** |
| • Newer buildings | • Housing expenses | • Gated community |
| • Sense of belonging | • Installments | • Investment |
| • Housing expenses | • Sense of belonging | • Location |
| • Private houses with gardens | • Rent | • Crime |
| • Low construction quality of new buildings | | |

The codes defining housing satisfaction for the groups that showed different housing mobility are varied. In the Sarigol housing site redevelopment project, distinct satisfaction codes occurred for stabiles, departers and newcomers, which are categorized in terms of their mobility types. At this point, it would be necessary to explain the different housing mobility types.

The stabiles preferred to stay in the area for social and economic reasons. One part of the group who felt a sense of belonging to the site showed no mobility since their economic conditions were sufficient enough to afford the new houses. In the context of ownership rights, the stabiles usually had a land registry certificate.

As Atkinson also stated, the site became unaffordable for the other portion of stabiles due to rising housing expenses. The neighborhood became expensive for the stabiles since services are designed to meet the needs of the newcomers; thus, economic conditions forced the stabiles to be indirectly displaced. Besides, as Goetz argued in 2002, a change in physical and social environment causes a decline in housing satisfaction and quality of life. Therefore, some inhabitants who are a part of the stabiles decided to leave the site.

In the housing redevelopment process, departers could no longer live in the area due to the transformation of the socio-economic fabric of Sarigol. This group usually had either a multi-partnered land registry or a land allocation certificate, or they were living as tenants. Moreover, the economic conditions of the departers were not suitable for affording the rents, taxes or other expenditures of
the newly built houses. Therefore, those socio-economic conditions led the departers to involuntarily leave the redevelopment site. The exclusionary impact of the displacement due to economic conditions on the low-income group, as Atkinson asserted in 2005, can be observed in the departers.

The last group, which is referred as the newcomers, showed voluntary housing mobility because the residences offered new buildings, a secure environment and physical characteristics. The main reason for the newcomers to show housing mobility was for living in better conditions and having a better quality of life. In the economic context, the newcomers had all means to enhance their quality of life.

The idea which Onibokun argued for in 1974 can be applied in the case of the newcomers. They usually do not consider the social and physical fabric and they come for the physical features of the residences. However, the newcomers in Sarigol were disturbed by the social fabric of the site; thus, they became dissatisfied with their houses and their environment.

The major aim of urban development processes is to lower poverty rates and improve the quality of life for the inhabitants of Sarigol. Nevertheless, Tieskens and Musterd’s study has shown that in some cases, this aim is converted to: (i) demolition of squatter houses, (ii) forced displacement of the inhabitants, (iii) transformation of the site suitable with the lifestyle of middle-high income group, (iv) increasing middle-high income group’s attention to the site and (v) socio-culturally mixed population structure (Tieskens & Musterd, 2013).

At this point, it is necessary to discuss the results of the Sarigol site research with regard to the satisfaction models.

In the model, which Amerigo and Aragones suggested in 1997, the relation between users and the housing site is examined through perceptions, effects and behaviors (Amérigo & Aragonés, 1997). For stabiles and departers, the old fabric of Sarigol became meaningful through social relations, belonging and detached house parameters. On the other hand, for stabiles and new comers, the new Sarigol fabric was interpreted in terms of economic relations, crime and residence life parameters. The ownership rights’ issue, one of the most crucial reasons of housing mobility during the redevelopment process, was the most important dynamic of economic relations. People who hold a land registry certificate or land allocation certificate are granted ownership rights at different rates, so they either decide to continue living in these sites where they have been living for many years or leave these sites, depending on their economic opportunities. Especially the economic profit expectation of people who hold a land registry certificate reflects in various ways on quality-satisfaction parameters that arise from the housing mobility behavior in these redevelopment projects. People who can cover the operational costs in new houses built preferred to remain in the area, whereas people who do not have the economic means to survive, considering the increasing residential expenses, prefer to sell their houses for a high price and move to a more economic house. In general, people with land allocation certificate needs to pay high amounts of money to own a house in the redevelopment area and this has a significant impact on housing mobility. The tenants who cannot fulfill economic requirements have to leave the site.

As Marans advocated in his model in 2003, the different user groups evaluate the objective features of the house, and its environment, subjectively (Marans, 2003). Since housing satisfaction is influenced by numerous characteristics of the physical and social environment, the description of trends is supplemented with a set of multivariate analyses of the housing satisfaction parameters of different groups in the neighborhood.

Parameters such as moving to the newly built residences which offer high quality comfort, feeling a sense of belonging to the site, housing expenses and living in single-detached houses with gardens and low-quality construction verbalized the satisfaction codes for the stabiles.
## Table 5. Suggestions for the process of urban transformation

| Prior to transformation                                                                 | Transformation process                                                                 | After transformation                                                                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Suggestions for the process of urban transformation                                      | Participation of user groups in the process should be ensured                            | Poverty of user groups should be reduced                                             |
| • The profile of the affected population should be presented. Suitable projects should be designed for user groups | Agents of the urban transformation should trust each other                              | Opportunities such as education, work, easy terms of payment, low housing expenses, suitable policies for low income groups should be provided |
| • Expectations of different user groups should be met through alternative designs       | Departers should also be included in the process. (information, education, economic support and problem-solving) | Support for social, psychological and cultural losses should also be provided         |
| • Social fabric should be protected amid aims to transform the neighborhood and integrate all groups | Problems of stabiles should be solved                                                   |                                                                                      |
| • Forced displacement should be prevented                                                |                                                                                         |                                                                                      |
| • Action plans should be designed for tenants and departers                              |                                                                                         |                                                                                      |
| • The aim of the transformation should be social, physical and economic sustainability, education, diminishing cultural differences and effects of social exclusion |                                                                                         |                                                                                      |
| A transformation fund should be created                                                 |                                                                                         |                                                                                      |
For departers, the housing mobility has two dimensions: Social and economic. The changing social fabric of Sarigol during the redevelopment process no longer created a sense of belonging for the inhabitants who were living in the same social environment for years. Therefore, a house and its environment without a sense of belonging did not satisfy the departers. Since those inhabitants either had a land allocation certificate or they were tenants, the installments, new housing expenses and increasing rents led to the mobility of the departers. Hence, economic accessibility is one of the crucial parameters, which determined the housing satisfaction of them.

For the newcomers, the housing satisfaction parameters were listed as being a good investment opportunity, the location in the city and the security services. Consequently, it can be asserted that the newcomers did not consider the socio-cultural parameters while engaged in housing mobility. As observed in the site research, the newcomers who could not be fitted accurately within the existing social fabric described the crime factor as a major threat to their quality of life.

Inadequate planning within the transformation process led to moral and material losses for different user groups. Moral losses for departures and stabiles can be defined as the loss of the sense of belonging, social exclusion and displacement, while increasing housing expenses can be defined as material losses. The architectural project is not suitable for the needs of different user groups; therefore, the situation prevents the enhancement of the sense of belonging to the site. Some policies should be developed in order to diminish the socio-cultural and economic differences within the neighborhood since stabiles and newcomers could not achieve full social integration. Those problems were detected through the site research and suggestions were presented for different stages of the transformation process in Table 5. These suggestions are the key points in order to meet the different user groups’ expectations.

5. Conclusion
In the urban transformation process, users are divided into three groups according to their housing mobility types: “Stabiles, Departers and Newcomers.” While mobility is occurring voluntarily or involuntarily, it brings along different approaches to housing satisfaction. For stabiles, the physical and economic conditions in the housing redevelopment site are satisfactory; however, the changes in the social fabric and neighborhood relations cause a decline in housing satisfaction, in the social context. The reasons for the housing mobility of the departers are economic; still, the separation from the social network which they belong to leads to the decline in their housing satisfaction. Lastly, the newcomers consider the housing redevelopment site as a good investment; however, they see the other groups in the site as crime risks. Therefore, the newcomers are satisfied with their new houses physically and economically, but the social dissatisfaction can be observed.

The satisfaction codes defined within this study also imply dissatisfaction for the user groups. The suggestions placed in the discussion part for the different stages of urban transformation can be evaluated in future research in order to raise the housing satisfaction levels. In this way, urban transformation may have an impact on the enhancement of housing satisfaction and quality of life standards, as presented in the main objectives of the transformation project.
