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Abstract

This article deals with methodological challenges and presents solutions for the study of people who depart from state-subsidized housing in Ethiopia, Morocco, and South Africa. Having sold or rented out their units, these people have left and now live at dispersed locations. Assuming that many “missing people” leave state housing because of project-related shortcomings, studying the reasons for their departure is crucial to understanding standardized housing programs. “Missing people” urge scholars to emphasize the afterlives of housing policy interventions as a necessary analytical dimension. However, such research is confronted with three major methodological challenges: How is it possible to approach and study people who have disappeared from the area of a housing intervention? How can one link exploratory, in-depth qualitative accounts, rooted in subjective perceptions of the everyday, to potential structural deficiencies of standardized housing interventions? What kind of methodologies may help take into account the temporalities of displacement and resettlement? In order to overcome these challenges, the article presents innovative forms of purposive sampling and discusses analytical strategies, which—based on Clapham’s framework of “housing pathways”—bridge relational and structural perspectives to housing programs.
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1. Introduction

Since the turn of the millennium, public housing and resettlement programs (PHRP) have been through a renaissance in several African countries and beyond (Buckley et al., 2016). Such government-driven, typically national programs seek to provide subsidized housing to those on a low income, requesting that they leave their previous dwellings and, except for cases of in-situ resettlement, move to another, more distant place. Most often, PHRP are merely called “housing programs,” and are supposed to move so-called beneficiaries to better quality and socially more accepted forms of housing. However, by avoiding the term resettlement, such unilateral notions ignore important challenges for people of adapting to a new place and way of living—even if it is close to where they lived before (Beier et al., 2022; Deboulet & Lafaye, 2018; Koenig, 2018). Classic scholarly work studying the effects of PHRP on low-income people typically focuses on lived experiences, challenges, and opportunities of those who live in state-subsidized houses on respective resettlement sites (Beier, 2023a; Coelho et al., 2012; Harroud, 2019; Hassen & Soressa, 2018; Herath et al., 2017; Nikuze et al., 2019; Patel et al., 2015; Reddy, 2018; Salcedo, 2010). At first glance, it seems convincing and evident to study the effects of PHRP at the actual sites where the houses are constructed. Methodologically, it sounds straightforward to talk to people who live at the resettlement site and to ask them about their relocation and rehoming experience. However, such common practice contributes to a biased analysis as it leaves out an important group: those who
could not access resettlement housing and those who no longer live there.

In many studies on PHRP, it is acknowledged that some housing units remain either vacant or are not (permanently) inhabited by their original “beneficiaries” (Anand & Rademacher, 2011, pp. 1765–1766; Charlton & Met, 2017, p. 94; Choi, 2015, p. 586; Coelho, 2016, pp. 123–124; Koster & Nuijten, 2012, p. 193; Patel et al., 2015, p. 249; Plane & Bridonneau, 2017, p. 32). In francophone research contexts, such a phenomenon is known as glissement, referring to a “dropout” of intended beneficiaries from housing programs (Le Tellier, 2010, p. 63; Navez-Bouchanine, 2012, p. 170). The extent of the phenomenon varies from context to context but tends to be significant. In extreme cases such as Ethiopia, authorities estimate that far more than half of the original beneficiaries no longer live in their resettlement units (Keller & Mukudi-Omwami, 2017, p. 177). However, very few studies have explicitly dealt with this group of people who are “missing” at the resettlement site (Beier, 2023b; Charlton, 2018). This is mostly because of practical, methodological reasons. Such people are likely to live in dispersed locations, so they are hard to find, contact, and interview (Herath et al., 2017, p. 567; Lemanski, 2011, p. 66). However, without integrating the perspectives of non-resident “beneficiaries” (whom I will refer to as the “missing people” of PHRP), any study of the effects of PHRP tends to produce biased results, likely resulting in an overly positive portrayal.

Rather than presenting and discussing the results of empirical research about “missing people” of PHRP, this article’s interest is methodological. The principal objective is to discuss methodological strategies to integrate perspectives of “the missing people of resettlement sites” into studies of PHRP. Based on my own experience with field research about “missing people” in Ethiopia, Morocco, and South Africa, I will elaborate on practical questions of sampling, outlining strategies to find, contact, and interview what I call an “unconsciously hidden population.” Beyond that, the article shows how such methodological practice, which is necessarily of a qualitative and exploratory nature, can bridge between its deep embeddedness into (different) subjectively perceived contexts and the ambition to complement more structural analyses of large-scale and standardized PHRP. For this purpose, the article will outline the “housing pathway” approach (Clapham, 2005) as a suitable analytical framework to grasp the shifting meanings people attach to their different dwellings over time, one which is embedded within a dialectical interplay of structure and agency. Housing pathways can contribute to a biographical understanding of how resettled dwellers perceive and experience the (attempted) provision of state-subsidized housing over a longer period. In addition, and beyond a contextual understanding of such housing pathways, the article advocates for a comparative analysis of housing pathways of people missing from PHRP in order to discern typical patterns and to understand how specific characteristics of PHRP complicate the inhabitation of new dwellings.

While focusing on methodological questions and challenges, the article reflects on my own experiences with field research about people missing from PHRP in the growing capital regions of Ethiopia (Addis Ababa), Morocco (Rabat/Salé), and South Africa (Gauteng City Region). To increase the variety of investigated cases in Morocco, 10 additional interviews were conducted in Casablanca, the country’s economic capital. In total, the author conducted 101 narrative interviews across all three case studies. Representing typical examples of a millenial renaissance of PHRP in the Global South (Buckley et al., 2016), all three countries have implemented large-scale housing and resettlement programs to cater for a growing need for affordable housing. At the same time, all three PHRPs are part of national agendas to reduce the number of people living in informal, self-constructed housing and shacks (cf. Huchzermeyer, 2011). Whereas the Moroccan PHRP is only about the direct resettlement of residents of bidonvilles (shantytowns), the other two programs use waiting lists in addition. In the latter case, they are open to all people who do not own property and fall below a certain income threshold. Another significant difference concerning the phenomenon of “missing people” is the fact that despite the South African PHRP, the target population has to make a financial contribution to be able to access their new dwellings.

In the following, I will first briefly introduce the concept of “missing people,” arguing that it is crucial to integrate them into analyses and evaluations of PHRP. After that, I will focus on sampling challenges and discuss practical ways to cope with the hidden nature of the target group. Finally, I discuss the methodological framework of a housing pathway as a way to grasp the subjective reasoning behind decisions not to stay in new PHRP units—without ignoring the structural constraints.

2. The “Missing People” of Public Housing and Resettlement Programs

The phenomenon of people who depart from state-subsidized housing in the context of PHRP, which I am here referring to as the “missing people” of PHRP, can be divided into (1) those who depart after they have actually lived in resettlement housing and (2) those who have never accessed the units. The first category includes people who either sell or let their resettlement-housing unit—a contested practice, which I show below. Households belonging to the second category might have been unable to prove official eligibility criteria, which is, for example, common in the Indian context (Bhan & Shivanand, 2013, p. 57), or unable to afford relocation due to financial constraints and still high prices despite subsidies, common, for example, in Morocco (Le Tellier & Guérin, 2009, p. 662). In both categories, PHRP have forced people to leave their place of
residence (i.e., in an informal settlement). As they are not living in resettlement housing (anymore), both categories of missing people are now living in an unknown third place.

The missing people of PHRP are of both analytical and practical significance. As outlined briefly above, analytical significance relates to the inability to draw an accurate analytical picture of the effects of resettlement without including those who no longer live in resettlement housing at the precise moment of field research. Related to this, it is relevant to ask to what extent housing projects reach their intended target group and, beyond this quantitative interest, to understand whether and how standardized housing is improving the living conditions of resettled people. Why is it difficult for some people to access or stay in state-subsidized housing? Practically, such information could help to improve future PHRP. From a public finance perspective, a high share of non-intended residents at the resettlement site may signal gentrification and, hence, an undesired diversion of public money to less vulnerable population groups who would not be eligible for state support (Le Tellier, 2010, p. 64). Moreover, it is crucial to understand where the missing people have moved to and why. Most PHRP have the goal to reduce or even eradicate informal settlements (Beier, 2021; Dupont & Gowda, 2020; Erman, 2016; Hassen & Soressa, 2018; Meth, 2020; Planel & Bridonneau, 2017; Salcedo, 2010). If formerly resettled people return to informal settlements, this may thwart such political objectives. In Morocco, for example, high numbers of glissement of up to 50% have led to the introduction of some participatory planning elements in the early 2000s and a third-party scheme a few years later to improve resettlement acceptance and affordability, ultimately to prevent people from returning to informal settlements (Navez-Bouchanine, 2007, p. 418; Toutain, 2016).

As such, departure from state-subsidized housing is a deeply moralized phenomenon, which renders missing people prone to criticism and accusations. Especially if people are assumed to have returned to informal settlements, wide parts of society—notably politicians, housing activists, and other low-income people waiting for a house—see departures as signs of betrayal and profiteering by people who neither need state assistance nor deserve state housing (Anand & Rademacher, 2011, p. 1765; Beier, 2023b; Lemanski, 2014, p. 2947; Zaki, 2005, pp. 65–67). Consequently, many states that run PHRP—including all countries of this study—have introduced temporary resale bans that should prevent quick cash-ins of state housing. Even if resales happen on a legal basis, they often remain morally contested. In South Africa, public authorities conducted occupancy audits to check whether the original owners actually lived in their state houses, threatening non-occupants with sanctions, although many practices of non-occupation had never been unlawful (Lemanski, 2014, p. 2947). Because of that, many resales happen informally, which lowers the price while increasing the risk (Beier, 2021; Mbatha, 2022).

Other than blaming people who depart from state-subsidized housing, some scholars tend to passivize missing people, assuming that they are forced—typically for financial and locational reasons—to move out and accept worse conditions as a consequence of downward raiding and gentrification (Lemanski, 2011, 2014; Navez-Bouchanine, 2012, p. 170). Notwithstanding the existence of severe constraint and force, such accounts leave little room for peoples’ own perspectives and rationalities (Anand & Rademacher, 2011; Charlton & Meth, 2017; Doshi, 2013). Moreover, they do not aim for an in-depth understanding of what happens after people acquire state housing (Beier et al., 2022; Meth et al., 2023). In the next sections, I outline methodological pathways toward including the missing people of PHRP, focusing on both advanced methods of sampling and a people-centered framework for analysis.

3. Sampling and Interviewing an Unconsciously Hidden Population

It is widely acknowledged that finding and researching the “missing people” of PHRP at dispersed, unknown locations is challenging. Exemplarily, Lemanski describes her frustration with the impossibility of locating people who had left state housing (so-called “RDP houses”) in Cape Town:

Tracing previous owners (i.e., RDP beneficiaries who had sold or let their houses) proved impossible because current residents were reluctant and/or unable to provide specific locations for previous owners. ... I suspect that the problems I encountered in finding these people is linked to concerns surrounding the illegality of selling RDP houses. (Lemanski, 2011, p. 66)

Accordingly, the missing people of PHRP fulfill all criteria of a hidden or hard-to-reach population: “No sampling frame exists, so the size and boundaries of the population are unknown; and second, there exist strong privacy concerns, because membership involves stigmatized or illegal behavior” (Heckathorn, 1997, p. 174). Hidden populations have become a subject of discussion related to studies on HIV, drug addiction, sex work, and illicit activities. However, unlike these classic “hidden populations,” the missing people of PHRP do not necessarily form a conscious group with shared interests and clearly defined attributes (e.g., HIV infection, drug addiction, previous incarceration, etc.). This complicates research, as typical access points for field research, such as specialized NGOs, anonymous support groups, medical centers, illegal vending spots, etc., hardly exist. The shared group attribute (“departure from state housing”) is also less likely to stir specific support networks with strong social ties, as most people depart individually. Furthermore,
missing people of PHRP rather pursue ordinary lives that
do not look different from those of their current neigh‐
bors, who might not have departed from state housing.
Thus, I refer to missing people of PHRP as an “uncon‐
sciously hidden population,” which creates further chal‐
lenges for sampling.
For people that are hard to reach, nonprobabil‐
ity purposive sampling is more suitable than proba‐
bility sampling, which aims at statistical representa‐
tiveness. Concerning hidden populations, chain-referral
sampling (typically snowball sampling) is a classic, use‐
ful, and frequently applied sampling strategy (Ellard-Gray
et al., 2015; Goodman, 2011; Heckathorn, 2011). In the
absence of better alternatives and besides general weak‐
nesses of nonprobability sampling, researchers have to
deal with specific shortcomings of snowball sampling,
including a potential referral bias that may lead to unde‐
sired sample homogeneity and self-selection bias, as
well as the difficulty of reaching isolated respondents.
However, concerning the study of people who leave
PHRP, the above-mentioned characteristics of uncon‐
sciously hidden populations lead to three additional chal‐
lenges for snowball sampling. First, as illustrated by
the quote from Lemanski (2011) above, initial access can
be difficult as typical access points are lacking. Second,
effective snowball sampling is difficult when interview‐
ees are unwilling to identify other people who are miss‐
ing from PHRP due to the (perceived) illegality of state
housing resales. Third, if we assume that departure is a
rather individual practice and unlikely to inspire the for‐
mation of specific local support networks, missing peo‐
ples might not even know each other. Hence, interview‐
pes might be not only unwilling but also unable to
identify others, and sampling chains are unlikely to
be long.
Because of that, and based on my sampling expe‐
rience with missing people of PHRP in three countries,
I argue the diversification of access points and strategies
for snowball sampling is even more relevant than for clas‐
sic “hidden populations.” This requires a comprehensive
understanding of local contexts and especially the social
structures that shape the ways people depart from state
housing, their destinations, and which group of people
would be able and willing to identify them. For exam‐
ples, in South Africa, some people rent out their so-called
RDP houses. A typical access strategy, as outlined by
Lemanski above, would then be to ask tenants for the
contact details of their landlord. Initially, my research
assistant and I tried the same strategy, and through sev‐
eral leads, we found a tenant who gave us their landlord’s
contact details, whom we subsequently interviewed on
the same day. However, because of occasional (rumors
about) sanctions by public authorities, many people in
South Africa falsely believe that renting out an RDP house
is illegal (Gordon et al., 2011, pp. 44–48). Although we
ensured strict confidentiality and explained the purpose
of our research several times, later, relatives of the land‐
lord convinced them that the tenants wanted to betray
him to get his house, which made him consider evicting
them. Only after another visit to the site did the issue
begin to slowly calm down.
This experience made us reconsider our strategy. To
reduce failure and mistrust, and to avoid escalation,
two strategies seem to be most effective: (1) insider
snowball sampling and (2) anonymous and individ‐
ual contacting via publicly available phone numbers.
Combinations and repeated adaptations of both methods
(see below) may help overcome bias and achieve a diver‐
sified sample covering a solid spectrum of realities.

The first makes use of trusted insiders. In the Gauteng
case study, this was a person, who belonged to a state
housing community, aware of implicit risks and fears, and
known to be trustworthy. She contacted former neigh‐
bors who had sold and current community members who
were in the process of selling, planning to let, or staying
in the area while renting their house out. Unlike leads
from people outside the community, the contacted miss‐
ing people were less concerned that third persons might
find out they were not using the house in a “morally
appropriate” way because they knew that community
insiders would know which original owners still lived
in their houses. Moreover, unlike renters who are hier‐
archically dependent on their landlord, the intermedi‐
ate did not fear personal consequences. However, such
insider strategies only work where some sense of com‐
munity exists, which is not necessarily true in state hous‐
ing communities.

In Morocco, insider snowball sampling did not con‐
centrate on communities at the resettlement site but
focused on established networks among former neigh‐
bors in now-demolished bidonvilles. While, in general,
the neighborhood plays an important role in identity
construction in Morocco, neighborhood pockets within
bidonvilles are characterized by even stronger social ties
(Arrif, 1999; Beier, 2019; Zaki, 2007). I built on previ‐
ously established relationships with two resettled resi‐
idents of two former bidonvilles in Casablanca and Salé
with whom we tried to identify former neighbors who
no longer lived in resettlement housing. They spread
the word and contacted them via phone or through
other contacts. There was very little reluctance to talk
and widespread willingness to share further contacts
of other missing people. However, social networks may
erode with time if people live at dispersed and iso‐
lated locations. Whereas in Salé, about one year had
passed between the demolition of the bidonville and
field research, in Casablanca, it had been at least four
years, making it more complicated to find interlocutors.
In Morocco, 37 out of 39 interviews resulted from insider
snowball sampling, compared to nine out of 27 inter‐
views in South Africa.

In Ethiopia, people’s reluctance to talk was less due
to widespread and negative public discourses about
departure from state housing. Instead, people were con‐
cerned about commenting on housing policies in general,
as Addis Ababa’s physical expansion is partially fueling
violent ethno-political conflicts (Alem, 2021). Therefore, also in Addis Ababa, trust was an important condition for successful snowball sampling. However, Ethiopia’s capital’s comparatively high share of departure (approximately 70% according to government estimates; Keller & Mukudi-Omwami, 2017, p. 177) offered the advantage that it was rather simple to find “insiders.” Through personal contacts of my research assistant and others, we found a relatively large number of people who had got a so-called condominium and were no longer living in it. For respondents, the initial contact with the help of people they knew marked the trustworthiness of the researcher and helped to overcome initial skepticism. The interview often enhanced trust and—unlike in the case of South Africa—subsequently enabled us to pursue rather classic chain-referral sampling. In total, 31 out of 35 interviews could be realized in this way.

Thus, chain-referral sampling may be more likely to fail in contexts with greater mistrust and stigmatization around the departure from state-subsidized housing. Because of that, except for Ethiopia, where snowball sampling was most effective, my research assistants and I applied an alternative, more anonymous, and individual access strategy by calling people who had publicly advertised their housing units for sale or rent. In South Africa, this happens mainly on online platforms such as Facebook but also on blackboards in supermarkets. In Morocco, people write their numbers on house walls or on electrical boxes on self-build plots. Notwithstanding comparatively high reluctance and refusal, this worked for 11 out of the 27 interviews in South Africa and two in Morocco. However, in South Africa, many people sell via agents who, except for one case (additional two interviews), did not share the contact details of their clients. Three other interviews in South Africa were realized by randomly talking to people in the streets—a tactic employed at different places while waiting for interviews. Through the same tactic applied in one resettlement community and one other further place in Addis Ababa, we were able to also generate four additional interviews in Ethiopia.

4. Comparing Housing Pathways of the “Missing People”

Another methodological challenge of the study of the missing people of PHRP is to produce knowledge that can fill the gap and complement existing research on the impact of PHRP on resettled dwellers in a meaningful way. As research about people’s rationales behind departure (for technical reasons explained above) is necessarily of qualitative nature, research on missing people faces limitations for generalizations. However, suppose the interest is to enlighten general black spots of existing quantitative and qualitative research as well as to inform policy. In that case, the challenge is to move beyond empirical particularism: How to make use of in-depth data, which is inextricably linked to people’s everyday lives, for a more structural critique of PHRP? How to be mindful of people’s agency without ignoring structural constraints (e.g., exclusionary program designs, widespread unemployment, or state-enhanced insecurity of tenure) that may push people to leave PHRP?

To address these challenges, I suggest comparing the housing pathways of people who depart from state-subsidized housing across contexts. The analytical framework of “housing pathways” goes back to Clapham (2002, 2005, 2008), who sees it as an approach that foregrounds the interactions that shape and the meaning that individuals attach to housing, how they change over time, and how they interrelate with other aspects of life, including employment and family matters (Clapham, 2005, p. 27). Epistemologically, the housing pathway approach is rooted in social constructivism, but—mindful of a potential overemphasis of micro-level interactions and individual agency—builds on Giddens’ (1984) theory of structuration, emphasizing social practices as dynamic products of a dialectical and inextricable interplay of structure and agency. For Giddens, human activities may not be seen as purely individual practices but are embedded within space and time. He argues for an analysis of social practices that are shaped through individual agency yet always occur within the structural framework of social systems that such practices may reproduce and alter over time. Focusing on the dynamic everyday of regular, often routine-like social practices, he conceives individuals to be knowledgeable and reflexive agents who know—sometimes unconsciously—about the social systems in which they act and who may articulate their reasons for action (for a detailed review of the theory of structuration, please refer to Held & Thompson, 1989).

Translating Giddens’ time-sensitive notion of social practices to the field of housing, Clapham’s analytical framework of a housing pathway sits at the interface of structure and agency, best designed to understand why people choose particular kinds of housing at a certain time under certain conditions at a certain place. Housing pathways always mark the dynamic analytical link between households’ housing-related decision-making and its wider social structures, shaped, among others, through housing policies and related discourses (Clapham, 2005, pp. 29–32).

From a methodological point of view, biographical and narrative interviews are best suited to grasp the dynamic meanings that constitute housing pathways (Clapham, 2005, p. 240). As demanded by scholarship on urban resettlements, biographical interviews may be suitable longitudinal methods to grasp meanings related to changing environments over time (Beier et al., 2022; Beier & Strava, 2020; Meth et al., 2023). Likewise, biographic narration may represent a helpful way to forward the decolonizing project—especially if such methods invite marginalized and largely unheard urban groups to voice their stories and alternative readings of hegemonic urban policies (Ortiz, 2023). Thus, in my own research on missing people, people’s narratives contained reflections...
on all previous places of residence and future plans. This approach not only allows the collection of the reasons for people’s departure from state housing, but in line with the theory of structuration, biographic reasoning further enables us to understand unconscious aspects of decision-making anchored in people’s implicit contextual knowledge, their embedded experiences, and housing aspirations. Borrowing the words of Clapham (2005, p. 240), the aim is to “explore the unconscious meanings and actions, bearing in mind the constraints and opportunities that structure them.”

Concerning the interview analysis, I suggest combining a more thematic analysis (practically, this may be done through open coding and categorization, as inspired by grounded theorists such as Charmaz, 2003) with elements of a more sequential and reconstructive approach rooted in the work of Schütze (1983) and Riessman (1993). Such a combination is relevant because of the practical limitations of thematic-oriented coding to understand—in its hermeneutic sense—the more implicit meanings within longer narrative accounts of decision-making (Riessman, 1993, p. vi). While thematic analysis helps to grasp and structure meanings in relation to the subthemes of housing (access to employment, quality of shelter, community, etc.) as well as structural frameworks (e.g., housing policies), reconstructive analysis allows for more time-sensitive and in-depth interpretation of subjective reasoning related to variegated notions of progress and setback. If the number of housing pathways to be analyzed is relatively high, it is possible to integrate sequential and reconstructive approaches into analysis by creating schematic representations of pathways. As shown by Figure 1, these schematic representations capture all places of living (including type of dwelling) since birth, the most significant meanings respondents attach to each of them, as well as reasons for moving from one place to another.

Schematic representations may function as a first step towards a comparison of individual housing pathways and as a basis for typification. Developing typologies is an accepted practice in qualitative research that could function as a further bridge between the “everyday” (individual housing pathways) and the “structural” (e.g., housing discourses and policies, macroeconomic conditions, etc.). They represent careful generalizations that are indispensable to inform and criticize policymaking (Clapham, 2005). To give an illustrative example, community belonging was a major factor in Morocco, influencing both people’s desire to depart and their search for appropriate alternatives, highlighting the adverse effects of Morocco’s PHRP-driven individualization (Beier, 2021, 2023a). In South Africa, a repeated pattern was people’s emphasis on the possibility of departure from state housing as a way to increase their resilience against potential shocks such as the sudden loss of their job during the Covid-19 pandemic (Beier, 2023b). In Ethiopia, the research reflected a severe housing crisis in the capital. Several people considered their condominiums a protection against future displacement from their desired neighborhoods due to rent increases and eviction. Anchored in the research objectives, typologies may set different thematic priorities, such as notions of subjective progress and relegation, major reasons for departure, types of destinations, and relationships to housing policy.

A last step towards an effective use of housing pathways of missing people for an advanced understanding of the effects of PHRP is comparative analysis across case studies. As the aim of the research project is to complement a larger gap in research about PHRP, a comparative analysis could help to identify more structural deficiencies of resettlement and large-scale quantitative housing supply—beyond contextual specificities. Thus, if housing pathways could help to identify structural frameworks that influence and constrain individual agency concerning place and time, a comparative analysis across contexts may help to discern repeated patterns of departure and to see missing people as a more structural phenomenon of PHRP. This could help to identify specific characteristics (or deficiencies) of PHRP that may promote the non-inhabitation of new dwellings. Robinson (2016) noted that such generative comparative analysis is useful to generate and revise concepts while being open towards a multiplicity of (previously underestimated) perspectives that may challenge dominant discourses. Again, it is possible to use certain recurrent themes and types of pathways to draw comparisons, for example, by focusing on the different expressions of the crucial relationship between housing affordability and departure. For example, in a first step, if the data were

![Figure 1. Possible schematic representation of a housing pathway.](image-url)
to suggest that among all respondents of all case study samples, housing affordability issues were a major reason for departure. In a second step, one may analyze different expressions that could be linked to housing policy, such as the impossibility of affording access to state housing in Morocco versus the impossibility of affording continuous presence in state housing in South Africa or the impossibility of affording a desired life in rental accommodation outside state housing in Addis Ababa. The cross-case comparison increases the significance of repeated observations and allows for careful generalizations about the implications of particular modes of PHRP policy and implementation (including effects of resale bans) on people's inclination to depart, as well as their practices and destinations. Here, any attempts at generalization benefit from the analytical advantages of housing pathways as interfaces between people’s everyday realities and structural conditions, showing how people who are missing from PHRP interact with policy discourses and frameworks.

Careful generalizations based on sound comparative analysis can serve to not only relativize the statistical representativeness of samples and findings of classic studies on the effects of PHRP but may offer multiple possibilities to further describe potential bias. The latter may be combined with basic descriptive statistics, such as counts of destinations and major reasons for departure, to increase the significance of results further. As such, it might be possible to argue why, for example, it is too simplistic and potentially stigmatizing to assume that people would return to informal settlements.

5. Conclusions

The departure of “beneficiaries” from PHRP is an under-researched but crucial phenomenon. This lack of attention may result from methodological challenges in finding the missing people of PHRP at unknown, dispersed locations. Being part of a larger research project about the missing people in housing programs in Ethiopia, Morocco, and South Africa, this article has proposed methodological strategies to integrate “missing people” into research on PHRP. Addressing sampling challenges, it discussed two innovative sampling strategies adapted to access an “unconsciously hidden population”: snowball sampling through the help of insiders (local residents, former neighbors, personal contacts) and a more anonymous approach of making contact through house sellers’ publicly available telephone numbers. Beyond sampling, the article sought to outline methodological strategies to understand the individual reasons for departure and how they relate to more structural conditions such as housing and urban renewal policies and affordability constraints. Therefore, the article foregrounded Clapham’s “housing pathway” framework as a useful analytical tool inspired by Giddens’ theory of structuration. In particular, the cross-case comparison of different housing pathways may offer a chance to bridge people's subjective and textually embedded lived experiences and more structural deficiencies of housing programs. Comparative analysis makes it easier to enlighten the gaps in existing research on the impacts of PHRP and to put their findings up for discussion. As such, it is possible to link affordability, which appears across all case studies as a crucial structural constraint explaining departure, with people’s own notions of unaffordability and the coping strategies that they employ, including the possibility of departure. In addition, the identification and establishment of typologies and repeated patterns (e.g., unaffordability) offer the chance to point at a significant bias of classic PHRP studies that focus only on the current inhabitants of resettlement sites.
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