

## ***Investigating the Factors Affecting Mehr Housing disapproval in Iran***

*Zanganeh Shahraki, Saeed (PhD)<sup>a</sup>*

*Farhadikhah, Hossein<sup>b</sup>*

*Heydari, Asghar<sup>c</sup>*

*Fotohi Mehrabani, Bagher<sup>d</sup>*

*Abbasifallah, Vahid<sup>e</sup>*

*Farhadi, Ebrahim<sup>f</sup>*

*Abdali, Yaghob<sup>g</sup>*

***Received: 28/08/2019    Accepted:13/04/2020***

### **Abstract:**

The Mehr Housing Plan is one of the plans to reduce the housing problems of low-income Iranians. So over time it has not been very welcomed. In this regard, the present study seeks to investigate the most important factors affecting the lack of Mehr housing in Iran. The research method was descriptive-analytical. 45 experts, especially Mehr Housing Experts, were used to collect the data. SMART-PLS software was used for data analysis. The results showed that the six indicators (physical, institutional-managerial, economic, socio-cultural, legal and locational) selected had a positive and significant effect on housing project disapproval. Among the social and cultural indices, the coefficient  $\beta_{12}$  had the most effect on the lack of housing Mehr.

### **Introduction**

The shortage of housing and the poor quality of existing housing has always been one of the socio-economic problems in our country, and providing affordable housing, especially for low-income urban groups, has been an increasingly important and challenging subject. In the past decades, various policies have been put in place to address the issue of housing shortages,

---

<sup>a</sup> Assitant Prof. of Geog. & Urban Planning, University of Tehran  
saeed.zanganeh@ut.ac.ir

<sup>b</sup> PhD. Candidate of Geog. & Urban Planning, University of Tehran

<sup>c</sup> PhD. Candidate of Geog. & Urban Planning, University of Tehran

<sup>d</sup> PhD. Candidate of Geog. & Urban Planning, University of Tehran

<sup>e</sup> PhD. Candidate of Geog. & Urban Planning, University of Tehran

<sup>f</sup> PhD. Candidate of Geog. & Urban Planning, University of Tehran

<sup>g</sup> PhD. Candidate of Geog. & Urban Planning, University of Tehran

especially low-income housing. Over a decade after the Mehr Housing Plan and its implementation and completion, its strengths, weaknesses, advantages and disadvantages have been gradually evaluated in numerous studies. Although there are contradictory statistics on the number of housing without an applicant. In this regard, this research seeks to identify in detail the most important reasons for not welcoming and without applying for a significant number of Mehr housing units.

### **Materials and Methods**

The research is descriptive-analytical in nature and applied in terms of purpose. The data collection is documented and surveyed. The research indicators are also extracted from a detailed review of the theoretical literature. According to the theoretical literature review, 33 items were found in six physical, economic, socio-cultural, institutional-managerial, legal, and locational dimensions. In addition, to confirm the indicators derived from the theoretical literature on the reasons for not welcoming Mehr housing, 50 housing experts, especially experts related to Mehr housing project, were used and structural equation modeling was used to validate the extractive model.

### **Results and Discussion**

Findings show that among the six dimensions derived from theoretical literature, experts believe that location, institutional-managerial, socio-cultural, economic, physical, and legal dimensions are the most important factors affecting housing deprivation, respectively. Also among the items, lack of infrastructure and superstructure services in the physical dimension, lack of reliance on previously constructed seal housing in the institutional-managerial dimension, Mehr Housing Project's position on communication routes and access, lack of attention to geographical and environmental studies. Location and lack of attention to geographical and environmental studies In the dimension of location, respectively, experts have the most impact on the lack of housing in the seal. In examining the effect of each of the six dimensions on non-acceptance of Mehr housing, considering the significance level of 0.000 and the t value obtained for each of them, it is found that there is a significant relationship between each of the factors and non-acceptance of Mehr housing has it. The results show that socio-cultural dimension with path coefficient 0.255 and t value 7.015, economic dimension with path coefficient 0.160 and t value 5.479, legal dimension with path coefficient 0.243 and t value 7.326, location dimension with path coefficient 0.207 and T 6.470, institutional and managerial dimension with path coefficient of 0.233 and t 6.614 and physical dimension with path coefficient of 0.244 and 5.947 all having a significant level of 0.000 have a positive and significant effect on housing deprivation. Also, the coefficients of path coefficients show the most impact among the six dimensions for not welcoming Mehr housing, socio-cultural dimension with path coefficient of 0.255, physical dimension with path coefficient of 0.244 and legal dimension with path coefficient of 0.243 respectively. They were not

welcomed by housing, followed by institutional-managerial factors with a coefficient of 0.233, locating dimension with a coefficient of 0.237 and finally having the least impact on the economic dimension with a coefficient of 0.160.

### Conclusion

The results showed that the selected dimensions had a significant and positive impact on housing project disapproval. The social and cultural dimension with the coefficient of 0.255 had the greatest impact on the lack of housing in Mehr. Lack of attention to the household dimension in the assigned residential area, lack of hope for the future of Mehr housing, lack of cultural and social homogeneity, insufficient awareness of urban planning processes, inadequate type of cultured housing and people's morale, lack of trust in Mehr and Peyman Housing Cooperatives, People's perception of Mehr Housing Project has been the most important socio-cultural indicators affecting Mehr Housing, respectively. The physical dimension has also been selected as the second most influential dimension on the lack of population and inefficiency of the Mehr Housing Project, which is one of the most important indicators of this dimension. Lack of local architectural features, lack of attention to climate in housing design, uniformity of construction pattern and lack of diversity, lack of space in buildings especially courtyards, lack of consolidation of residential buildings against accidents, and failure to comply with national standards and engineering systems. Arrangement as the most important physical indicators is the second most effective dimension of citizens' dissatisfaction with housing. After the socio-cultural dimension and the physical dimension there are legal, institutional-managerial and location dimensions, and finally, the economic dimension is selected as the least effective factor on housing deprivation.

**Keywords:** Factors of disapproval, Mehr housing, Iran

### References

1. Bolt, Gideon , Phillips, Deborah and Van Kempen, Ronald 2010)): "Housing Policy, Desegregation and Social Mixing: An International Perspective", *Housing Studies*, 25: 2, 129-135.
2. Deng, F. (2018). A theoretical framework of the governance institutions of low-income housing in China. *Urban Studies*, 55(9), 1967-1982.
3. Kleinhans, Reinout and Elsinga, Marja (2010): "Buy Your Home and Feel in Control' Does Home Ownership Achieve the Empowerment of Former Tenants of Social Housing?" *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 10: 1, 41 – 61.
4. Moon- Jeong Kim (2010): "Residential Location Decisions: Heterogeneity and the Trade-off between Location and Housing Quality", the Ohio State University.

5. Mulder, Clara H. and Lauster, Nathanael T. (2010): “Housing and Family: An Introduction”, *Housing Studies*, 25: 4, 433 – 440.
6. Van Gent, W. P. C. (2010): “Housing Context and Social Transformation Strategies in Neighborhood Regeneration in Western European Cities”, *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 10: 1, 63-87.