

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

**ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT: HOUSING SATISFACTION
OF FORMERLY HOMELESS FAMILIES**

by

MARY EUSTACE VALMONT

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Psychology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
The City University of New York

1997

UMI Number: 9732982

**Copyright 1997 by
Valmont, Mary Eustace**

All rights reserved.

**UMI Microform 9732982
Copyright 1997, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.**

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

UMI
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

©1997

Mary Eustace Valmont

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of the Doctor of Philosophy.

March 30, 1997
Date

Leanne G. Rivlin
Chair of Examining Committee

March 30, 1997
Date

Kay Dean
Executive Officer

Dr. Leanne G. Rivlin

Dr. Michelle Fine

Dr. Pam T. Reid

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT: HOUSING SATISFACTION
OF FORMERLY HOMELESS FAMILIES

by

Mary Eustace Valmont

Advisor: Professor Leanne G. Rivlin

The sources of housing satisfaction for formerly homeless families were investigated in a group of 40 Black and Hispanic women who had been rehoused through their stay in the New York City shelter system. Housing satisfaction was examined for this population because the constraints imposed on housing options for such families by the rehousing policies of New York City, and the macro-level social and economic conditions shaped by their race, gender, and poverty, might hinder their opportunities for obtaining satisfaction with their housing. Respondents were interviewed in their homes using a structured, open- and closed-ended interview which assessed a variety of potential housing satisfaction factors such as pre-rehousing history, quality and satisfaction ratings for the apartment, building, neighborhood and housing, perceived housing alternatives and social connections. Housing satisfaction, as well as the other satisfaction and quality variables, was measured by a respondent's rating on a 5-point Likert scale. The research investigated the following: (1) if the length of time rehoused was significantly related to housing satisfaction (2) if

apartment quality, as compared to building and neighborhood quality, would have the highest correlation with housing satisfaction; and (3) the primary reasons for the housing satisfaction ratings.

The quantitative and qualitative data analyses revealed the following: (1) housing tenure was not statistically related to housing satisfaction; (2) apartment quality, when compared to building and neighborhood quality, did not have the greatest impact on housing satisfaction; and (3) analyses of the reasons for the housing satisfaction rating revealed a meta-theme of qualifying the responses with a "...but..." clause which deflates the predominately positive ratings of the apartment and building quality and satisfaction scales. In addition, three dominant themes arose from the analyses of these responses: safety in the neighborhood; maintenance of the apartment and/or building; and interpersonal relations with family, friends, neighbors and building staff.

The implications of these findings for policies concerning the rehousing of formerly homeless families and low-income housing are discussed, in addition to concerns about the possible limitations of the construct of "housing satisfaction" for such populations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

“For wisdom will come into your heart, and knowledge will be pleasant to your soul.”
Proverbs 2:10

First, I give thanks to God, through whom *all things* are possible, as evidenced by my completion of the doctoral process.

Next I must thank my family and friends who have provided me with an expansive, supportive and very loving social network for so long. My family, Rosalyn Charlemagne Valmont, Ignatius Valmont, Valerie Valmont, H. Leon Charles, Lunita Charlemagne Compton, and Elizabeth Charlemagne, has provided enormous emotional and financial support all these years. My sister Valerie Valmont has been a best friend, in addition to being a best (and only) sister. A special thanks to all the St. Lucian “Soufriere faces” who connect me to that special place.

Unfortunately I may exclude someone in this long list, but I must extend my thanks to the following friends and colleagues, from various stages of my life -- my academic careers at Syracuse University, New York University and CUNY, and my professional experiences at various places -- who have supported me in various and numerous ways. Listed in alphabetical order are: Maxine Bailey, Carla Berkley, Barry Callender, Eugena Callwood, Andre Davis, Stephanie Golden, Dee Hobart, Cynthia Jetter, Rhonda Johnson, Margit Katz, Eileen Ledwith, Jose Maldonado, Poppy McLeod, Larry Minore, Sharon Myrie, Deryck Palmer, Leslie Parker, Anne Rosberger, Olis Simmons, Luis Sierra, Meredith Swackhammer, Joanne Walsh, Sherece West, Nat Williams and Wayne Winborne. My

thanks also to CUNY and Housing Environments Research Group (HERG) colleagues: MaryAnn S. Allacci, Maria Armada, Susan Cooper, Alan Foster, Jodi Imbimbo, Keith Lawrence, Peter Lippman, Claudia Mausner, Les' Melnyk, Carol Oliver, Jennifer Pastor, Karen Peffley, Talya Rechavi, Bill Roane, and Pauline Waddell. A special thanks to Jude Kubran for giving me the matches, to light the candles, to guide my way through the program. More special thanks to Helene Clark for being a wonderful HERG office mate and Stephanie Scott-Melnyk for her humor, brownies (without nuts!), and her editing my last draft. Our daily e-mail correspondence kept Nicole E. Holland and Mun Wong as part of my constant and supportive presence. Other members of the CUNY Graduate center community who supported me include the recently deceased Dean K. Harrison, who in his role as director of the Office of Educational Opportunity, provided both financial and emotional support, and Gail Smith, director of the Office of Educational Opportunity and Diversity Programs.

Special blessings and thanks to my Concord Church "family" including, but not limited to Rev. Dr. Gary V. Simpson, Minister Mark-Anthony Middleton, Charlotte Hunter, Cozetta H. Green, Lisa Bing, Bernice Minott, Earline James, Anne McKinney, Corynne Corbett, Le'Roi Gill, Anthony Kirby, Sharen McKinney-Alston, Allan Williams, Sr., Randy Cameron, and so many other members of our congregation who provided me with the spiritual support I needed, especially in the final stages of my dissertation.

Warmest thanks to dissertation committee, Leanne G. Rivlin, my chair and advisor who guided me through this process, and Michelle Fine, Associate Provost Pam T. Reid, Susan Saegert, all CUNY Graduate Center faculty, and Victor Bach, Director of Housing

Research at the Community Service Society. They all helped make my dissertation process an educational and even enjoyable experience. Although Maxine Wolfe was not a member of my defense committee, her previous committee membership provided comments and guidance which challenged and encouraged me.

And finally I wish to thank the people who made conducting this research possible. Once again I must thank my parents Rosalyn and Ignatius Valmont, and my aunt, Lunita Charlemagne Compton, for their generous financial support. Without it I would not have been able to fund my major costs associated with this undertaking such as payments to secretarial staff, interviewers, and transcribers. I am grateful for the people who served as interviewers: MaryAnn S. Allacci, Rene Davila, Denise Jennings Houston, Doug Loring, Adnan Mirza, and Luisa Sanchez. People who helped me access respondents, such as Sister Georgette Lawton of the Partnership for the Homeless and Toni Lyde of Genesis Homes, also deserve my thanks. And most of all, I am indebted to the 40 women who welcomed me into their homes and shared part of their life histories with me. Without them this research would have been impossible.

As long as this list of acknowledgments is, I fear that I may have still excluded people who touched me and supported me in some positive and special way. If so, and you have any reason to read this, I ask your forgiveness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
New York City's Permanent Housing Programs for Homeless Families	2
BACKGROUND & RATIONALE	6
A Conceptual Model of Housing Satisfaction	7
Components of Housing Satisfaction	8
Constraints of Poverty, Race, and Gender on Housing Options	9
Poverty and Low-income Housing	9
Housing and Race	12
Women and Housing	14
Components of Housing Satisfaction	16
Demographic and Background Characteristics	16
Housing and Locational Features	22
Housing Quality	23
Research on Housing and Locational Features	25
Social Connections	31
Model of Social Networks	33
Research on Social Networks	33
SUMMARY	38
RESEARCH QUESTIONS & HYPOTHESES	40
Research Questions	40
Hypotheses	40
RESEARCH METHOD	42
Research Background	42
Access	42
Types of Housing	43
Respondents	45
Demographic Information	46
PROCEDURES	48
Pilot Interviews	48
Research Documents	49
DATA ANALYSIS	54

FINDINGS	56
Quantitative Analyses	56
Housing Tenure	58
Differences in Quality Ratings	59
Additional Analyses	60
Qualitative Analysis: Major Themes	62
Qualifying Housing Satisfaction: "...but there's room for improvement"	65
Safety in the Neighborhood: "You don't hear of that many people getting killed or robbed."	69
Apartment And Building Maintenance: "I've seen worse."	72
Interpersonal Relationships	75
Social Networks in the Building and Neighborhood: "So the less I have to do with them, the less they knock on my door to borrow things."	76
Social Connections With Friends And Family: "It depends on who I'm getting help from"	85
SUMMARY & DISCUSSION	88
APPENDIX A - NYC's Permanent Housing Programs for Homeless Families	102
APPENDIX B - Study Information Letter	103
APPENDIX C - Sign-Up Form	104
APPENDIX E - Adult Consent Form	111
APPENDIX F - Interview & Rating Guides	112
APPENDIX G - Length of Time Rehoused and Housing Satisfaction Rating Percentages	147
APPENDIX H - Summary of Simultaneous Regressions for Rating Scales	148
APPENDIX I - Summary of Simultaneous Regression Analysis for Quality Ratings	149
APPENDIX K - Percentages of Satisfaction Ratings for the Apartment, Building, Neighborhood & Housing	151
APPENDIX L - Reasons for Housing Satisfaction Rating - Multiple Response Percentages	152
APPENDIX M - Neighborhood Safety - Percentages of Safety Concern Ratings ..	153

APPENDIX N - Neighborhood Safety - Percentages of Ratings of Safety
 Personal and Children's 154

APPENDIX O - Basic Respondent Information 155

BIBLIOGRAPHY 157

INTRODUCTION

This research investigated the sources of housing satisfaction for formerly homeless families. The current investigation continues my research interests in homelessness and residential place, and extends it to examine some of the issues that impact on the potential for housing satisfaction for families who are housed through their stay in the New York City family shelter system. Since the mid-1980s New York City has provided permanent housing for more than 35,000 homeless families who stayed in the City's family shelter system. (New York City's Department of City Planning, 1994). The rehousing of homeless families is a relatively recent City directive, and as the limited research (Greenblatt, 1995; Guzman, 1989; Schwartz & Devance-Manzini, 1993; Weitzman & Berry, 1994) on rehoused formerly homeless families indicates, using the word "permanent" to describe the housing stability of these families is often overly optimistic. These researchers discovered that some families were leaving their apartments and returning to the shelter system. Although the majority of rehoused families do not leave their apartments, the post-rehousing experiences, including housing satisfaction, of all rehoused families need to be further investigated. The housing options available to such households are restricted to the least sustainable housing. Because of the economic barriers imposed by poverty, most of the housing for formerly homeless families is located in the city's most impoverished neighborhoods. These are communities damaged by poverty and its related social ills of substandard housing, crime, drug traffic, limited employment opportunities, and inadequate social service supports.

"Housing satisfaction" as used for this research, is an all encompassing term which

includes satisfaction with the physical and social attributes of the apartment, the building, and the neighborhood, as well as overall housing satisfaction. Housing satisfaction is conceptualized (Weidemann and Anderson, 1985) as associated with cognition, feelings, and behaviors that can either undermine, or secure and strengthen, formerly homeless families' residential stability. Already constrained by the limited low-income housing market, rehoused formerly homeless families may have even less residential choice than families with a similar socioeconomic profile, who have not been homeless. It can also be speculated that formerly homeless families may be more willing to tolerate a higher degree of residential dissatisfaction, rather than return to homelessness, either via the shelter system, or by alternatives, such as staying with family or friends.

New York City's Permanent Housing Programs for Homeless Families

Before the research on housing satisfaction and related issues is examined, New York City's programs for housing homeless families are briefly reviewed. This review is necessary to provide the parameters of residential choice available to homeless families who enter the City's family shelter system. An investigation of housing satisfaction for such families must be understood within the context of their housing options. Investigating the existence and policies of permanent housing programs for homeless families in the City's shelter system proved to be quite an undertaking. Because the programs are administered by various City (e.g., Human Resources Administration, Department of Homeless Services,

NYC Department of Housing Preservation and Development) and semi-autonomous city/state agencies (i.e., New York City Housing Authority), obtaining comprehensive information proved to be difficult. Information was gleaned from a variety of sources such as agency newsletters, City housing reports, and conversations with agency officials and shelter staff.

Families enter the New York City family homeless shelter system by going to an Emergency Assistance Unit (EAU) and declaring themselves homeless¹. At the EAU they are screened to collect basic background information, and to determine if they have housing alternatives (e.g., staying with relatives). Once the intake interview is completed, and they have been determined to be “truly homeless,” they are supposed to be placed in transitional housing, usually a “Tier II” (apartment-like shelter), or a hotel room, within 24 hours. Legally they are not supposed to remain in the EAU overnight, but the Human Resources Administration (HRA), and the Department of Homeless Services (DHS) officials are constantly charged with contempt of court for failing to provide immediate and adequate shelter. Particularly during the winter months, when the demand for shelter increases, families often stay overnight at the EAU. Once they are placed in the hotel, or Tier IIs, the services they receive vary widely depending upon the physical structure of the site, and the agency, or nonprofit managing the facility. On-site “housing coordinators” are required to meet with the family within the first two weeks of their placement at the shelter to discuss permanent housing options. Monthly meetings with the housing coordinator and the family

¹ As of September 1995, the only remaining EAU was located in the Bronx. Previously EAUs were located in all the boroughs, except for Staten Island.

are mandatory. The housing programs are described in Appendix A.

Under most circumstances, families must stay in the NYC family shelter system for a minimum of three months before they can be placed in permanent housing (see Appendix A). Those criteria only address the *earliest* date they are eligible to be placed. It does not take into account the availability of apartments through any or all of these programs. In 1989 families stayed an average of six months in the shelter before being placed in permanent housing. Due to the continuing influx of families into the system, and the decline of new, or renovated apartments becoming available, the length of stay in family shelters has increased. As of December 1995, the average length of stay for families was almost seven and one-half months (DHS' HOMES report, December 1995). Once families are deemed eligible for any of the permanent housing programs, their choice of housing has several constraints (e.g., availability, location of the housing, perceived desirability). Most homeless families have been placed in the poorest neighborhoods because those are the areas where the City is most likely to seize *in rem*² buildings, which are channeled into many of the permanent housing programs. Similar circumstances existed for the respondents who participated in this research. The average duration of their last shelter stay was almost 13 months. Families are placed in new or renovated apartments and/or buildings, usually located in impoverished neighborhoods. Given these less than ideal housing circumstances, the potential for housing satisfaction among rehoused formerly homeless families warranted investigation.

² "*in rem*" refers to property that the owner has abandoned because of tax foreclosures and its management has been taken over by New York City.

The review of New York City's permanent housing programs for homeless families provided the context for their housing options. A review of research on the characteristics of many homeless families that may further impact on their housing choices (e.g., income, race, gender, family size), and issues that may influence or comprise their satisfaction with their housing (e.g., housing conditions, social networks, housing aspirations), will be discussed to provide a framework within which to examine housing satisfaction.

BACKGROUND & RATIONALE

Most of the research which addresses the factors related to the housing satisfaction of low-income people has focused on three major components: (1) demographic and background characteristics such as race, gender, income, family composition, and housing history (e.g., length of residence, history as a primary tenant) (Berry & Weitzman, 1993; Cook, 1988; Rent & Rent, 1978; Rossi, 1980; Shinn, Knickman & Weitzman, 1991); (2) housing and locational features such as housing quality, housing preferences, meanings of home, and safety concerns (Berry & Weitzman, 1993; Birch, 1985; Fried & Gleicher, 1976; Mitchell, 1978; Rent & Rent, 1978; Shinn, Knickman & Weitzman, 1991; Weicher, 1989); (3) and social connections, usually conceptualized as participation in civic, social, or religious organizations, and social networks with neighbors, family, and friends (Berry & Weitzman, 1993; Cook, 1988; Fried & Gleicher, 1976; Rent & Rent, 1978; Shinn, Knickman & Weitzman, 1991). However, many of the findings of this body of research are inconclusive. As noted by Berry and Weitzman (1993) in their study of housing comfort among formerly homeless families, most of the research examining the link between such factors has produced inconsistent and/or statistically moderate results.

Although these three primary factors were used to frame the present research design and data analysis, a conceptualization of housing satisfaction which detailed the physical, social, cognitive, and behavior components was sought to provide a theoretical structure. Weidemann and Anderson's (1985) model of residential satisfaction provided such a structure. Based on their review of the research on residential satisfaction, they constructed

a comprehensive conceptual model. Weidemann and Anderson's model, and its overlap with the three components described above, provided the framework for this research.

A Conceptual Model of Housing Satisfaction

Housing satisfaction has been defined differently by many researchers, but Weidemann and Anderson (1985) provided a general, preliminary definition which focused on the affective component of a person's evaluation of their housing, and their responses to that environment:

It is the emotional response to the dwelling, the positive or negative feeling that the occupants have for where they live. As such, it is a global representation of the affective response of people to the social-physical environment in which they live. (p. 156)

They later expanded this definition into a conceptual model which includes not only the emotional response, but cognitive and behavioral responses as well. This expanded and integrated model was used for this research. Weidemann and Anderson's (1985) model posited that "objective" physical (e.g., housing quality) and social environmental attributes (e.g., people in those environments) influence perceptions or beliefs (cognition) about those attributes, which in turn influence attitudes (affect) toward the environment, which impact a person's intentions to behave (behavioral intention), and result in the actual behavior related to the environment. Their model also included a component, "person characteristics" (e.g., personality and sociodemographic characteristics), that can impact on all of the other components.

Although Weidemann and Anderson's (1985) model proved to be useful for framing

the components of residential satisfaction, they must be criticized for their use of the word "objective," which was not defined. They indicated that the research on residential satisfaction often combines "objective" measures of housing quality with more subjective measures of satisfaction. It is very questionable whether any feature of housing quality is truly "objective." For example, even a seemingly "objective" physical, structural features such as "heat" or "hot water" could be perceived differently based on a person's previous experiences. The objectivity of social attributes such as "relationships with neighbors" is even more questionable. Even so-called objective attributes, such as apartment quality, are influenced by respondents' experiences.

Components of Housing Satisfaction

As noted earlier, the research on the components that may impact on, or comprise, housing satisfaction can be divided into three primary categories: demographic and background characteristics of the household members; housing and locational features such as housing and neighborhood conditions; and the existence and extent of social connections in a variety of settings (e.g., family, neighborhood, civic participation). However, before the research which specifically addresses housing satisfaction is reviewed, research and analyses which describe the larger socioeconomic context will first be discussed. Similar to how the description of New York City's permanent housing programs for homeless families was provided to define the housing options available to this population, so too must the larger socioeconomic constraints be examined. The potential for housing satisfaction for

formerly homeless families must be viewed within the boundaries imposed by poverty, the low-income housing market, race, and gender. This context is particularly relevant when investigating the first two components: background characteristics of household members, and housing and locational issues. The macro-level constraints on such families include the connections of poverty and low-income housing (Lazere, Leonard, Dolbeare & Zigas, 1991; Stone, 1993), racial segregation and poverty (Clay, 1992; Berger, 1970), and gender (Austerberry & Watson, 1983; Birch, 1985; Mann, 1985; Peterson, 1987; Watson & Austerberry, 1986).

Constraints of Poverty, Race, and Gender on Housing Options

Poverty and Low-income Housing

Lazere, Leonard, Dolbeare and Zigas (1991) analyzed the low-income housing crisis in the United States and found that from the early 1970s through the mid-1980s, the availability of low-income, affordable housing declined. They identified the decrease in the supply of low-income housing and the increase in the number of people living in poverty as the primary reasons for this crisis. As the gap between the supply of, and the need for, low rent housing increases, while income decreases, low-income households are forced to incur an increasing housing cost burden. In 1989, 56% of all low-income renter households spent at least 50% of their income on rent and utilities; 81% spent at least 30% of their incomes on these necessities. This increased financial burden often results in low-income households

living in deficient and overcrowded housing, puts them at risk for homelessness, and limits both their shelter and non-shelter options. During 1989 only 36% of low-income renter households received a rental subsidy from a federal, state, or local program, or lived in public housing. This lack of housing assistance, coupled with the decline in other types of government aid, has resulted in the current low-income housing crisis. Similar to Lazere et al.'s analysis of the dynamics of low-income housing market, Stone (1993) examined the conditions under which low-income families struggle to afford housing, and also meet their non-shelter needs.

Stone (1993) defined affordability as "The measure of the quest to secure the housing we need and desire with the resources we have or can obtain" (p. 1). Stone maintained that the relationship, or the gap, between housing as a commodity and its affordability, is the cause of shelter poverty. Shelter poverty was defined as: "A household is shelter poor when the squeeze between its income and housing cost leaves it with insufficient resources to meet its non-shelter needs at a minimum level of adequacy" (p. 6). Using Stone's definition of shelter poverty, one-third of Americans are caught in the squeeze of income and housing costs. Stone's concept, which differed from the conventional standards of affordability (25-30% of income), revealed different patterns of affordability. Housing affordability was a much more severe problem among larger and low-income households. This finding has implications for homeless families, all of whom are low-income households.

Stone (1993) identified the orientation of the research on shelter poverty as arising from a critical perspective that maintains that the "affordability problem is the inevitable

result of real (not abstract) labor and housing markets" (p. 7). Stone weaves the concepts of affordability and shelter poverty into a historical analysis of the housing markets and labor markets in America through the early 1990s. This critical perspective's detailed and compelling historical analysis can be summarized:

The evolution of the housing system in this country can be understood as a history of attempts to cope with the social, economic, and political consequences of the affordability problem without altering the primary dependence on the labor market to distribute income and the private housing market to produce and allocate housing. In each major historical period these attempts have provided a measure of relief for systemic stresses, and even real housing benefits for some people, but always generated new problems and eventually undermined long-term social and economic stability. (p. 7)

Stone's (1993) solution for ending shelter poverty would transform much of America's housing from a commodity to a social entitlement through new concepts of tenure, home ownership and finance. Though the likelihood of the implementation of Stone's solutions is improbable, the larger issues of how shelter poverty is an inherent product of our capitalist system and the production of housing, has rather dismal implications for our society ever providing low-income people with sustainable housing. When viewed from Stone's critical perspective, the creation and expansion of the shelter system, the provision of services via nonprofit agencies, and the creation or renovation of permanent housing for homeless families, are decisions based on the erroneous notion that issues of affordability are only "imperfections" in the housing market, not "impediments" to full access to the housing markets.

Stone's (1993) research on housing affordability conceptualizes housing not only as a necessity but, as a physical, economic, and social structure which impacts on every

aspect of our lives:

More than a physical shelter, the residential environment consists of not only the dwelling unit but the site and setting, neighbors and community... public services, habitability and accessibility....We occupy our houses, and for better and for worse, they become our homes. (p. 13)

Although Stone's view of the inevitability of a dwelling becoming a home is unsupported, this all-encompassing view of housing highlights the need to investigate more than the dwelling unit as a basis for housing satisfaction. Clay's (1992) and Berger's (1970) research indicates that race must also be considered as a significant barrier to many housing markets and therefore, may impact on opportunities for housing satisfaction.

Housing and Race

Clay's (1992) research identified several factors, most occurring since the mid 1970s, or early 1980s, that have contributed to the present housing problems of Black Americans. These social, economic, and political factors include: increasing poverty, the concentration of extreme poverty in low-income neighborhoods, the accelerating cost of housing while real incomes were declining, neighborhood disinvestment or displacement via gentrification or housing abandonment, continuing, if not worsening segregation and housing discrimination, and the absence of a national affordable housing policy. The persistence of housing problems for Black Americans was described by Berger (1970) in his research on residential segregation in the 1960s.

Berger (1970) examined the social consequences of residential segregation for urban Blacks and described the damage as being related to the fact that "Housing and

neighborhood are among the most important symbols and rewards of high status in American society" (p. 19). The segregation of Blacks in the physically inferior neighborhoods, the "ghettos," supported Blacks' "caste inferiority in all ways in which segregation generally does" (p. 20). Berger stated that the housing that is available to Blacks is usually substandard and deteriorating because often those were the only neighborhoods in which they were allowed to live. Residential segregation also resulted in educational segregation, limited job opportunities, higher prices for consumer goods, and the alienation of the residents. These are all issues which could still affect housing satisfaction. Clay (1992) indicated that the housing crisis for urban Blacks had actually increased in the more than 20 years between his research and Berger's investigation.

Factors similar to those described by Clay (1992) and Berger (1970) have also been identified by other researchers (Wright & Lam, 1987) as the underlying causes for the current low-income housing crisis, the creation of the "underclass," and the continuous increase in homelessness. These barriers to affordable, quality housing are particularly daunting when looking at housing options for Black, female-headed, formerly homeless families. The research on shelter poverty, the low-income housing crisis, and race-based housing issues provide only part of the larger socioeconomic forces that constrain the "average" rehoused, formerly homeless family in their choice of housing, and therefore limit the potential for housing satisfaction. In addition to these issues, such families have to contend with the special needs of, and discrimination against, female-headed households.

Women and Housing

Several researchers have studied the barriers to decent, affordable, low-income housing for women with children (Austerberry & Watson, 1983; Birch, 1985; Mann, 1985; Watson & Austerberry, 1986). Mann's (1985) demographic data on female-headed families in New York City provided a reference for understanding the extent of the housing crisis for women. Mann reported that between 1970 and 1980 there was a 47% increase in the number of female-headed households with minor children. Fifty-five percent of these women lived below the poverty level. Between 1970 and 1980 such families increased by 72%. Their ability to find and maintain housing is restricted by their poverty, and by discrimination against families with young children. In addition, these women's lower socioeconomic status limits their marketability in the labor force. If they were able to find employment, then issues of child-care would arise.

Birch's (1985) discussion of the needs of the "unsheltered woman" extended much of Mann's (1985) data. "Females head up about 27% of all American households...yet, they are disproportionately represented among those experiencing housing problems...they are the largest sub-group of the poorly sheltered population" (p. 21). The housing plight of female-headed households with minor children is the most extreme of the subgroups Birch examined. Birch reported that 51% of such families, who are Black or Hispanic, have some type of housing quality or cost problem. Birch identified several shelter needs of women including: "Housing located in safe, well-serviced neighborhoods...near safe, reasonably priced transportation...in neighborhoods with child-orientated services...proximity to work

places...with family-related amenities... with adequate private space for parent(s)" (p. 121-122). If fulfilled, these shelter needs would certainly contribute positively to the housing satisfaction of the women and their families.

Watson and Austerberry's (1986) research corroborated Birch's (1985) and Mann's (1985) findings on housing and homelessness issues for women. Based on their assumption that housing is a reflection of the dominant ideology, Watson and Austerberry viewed the creation and the design of housing as a structure which supports the nuclear family within a patriarchal society. Housing and home function to maintain women's subordinate status. Women's access to decent housing is often determined by their relationship with a male. If women exist outside the image of the nuclear family, which occurs for single women, or female-headed families, the housing structure is not designed to be supportive. Watson and Austerberry found that such women are usually burdened with higher housing costs and more housing problems, such as homelessness. These women are marginalized both socially and spatially into the poorest housing and the worse neighborhoods.

All of this research depicts the substandard housing available to most female-headed households and highlights such families' unfulfilled shelter and non-shelter need. As discussed, there are numerous constraints imposed on the residential choices for low-income, Black, female-headed households because of the barriers of race, gender, family composition and poverty. These families' opportunities to find satisfaction from such inadequate housing may be limited, and needs to be further investigated. The impact of these factors on housing satisfaction has been examined by several researchers. The influence of background and background characteristics on housing satisfaction will be discussed next.

Components of Housing Satisfaction

As discussed earlier, the research on the factors, or attributes that impact on housing satisfaction can be subdivided into three primary components: (1) demographic and background characteristics of the household members; (2) housing and locational features such as housing quality, satisfaction with the various components of housing (e.g., apartment, neighborhood), emotional connections to housing; and (3) social connections at a variety of levels, including social networks with family and friends. Studies that investigated the impact of demographic and background characteristics on housing satisfaction will be discussed first.

Demographic and Background Characteristics

The demographic and background characteristics of the household which have been examined to determine their impact, if any, on housing satisfaction include income, race, gender, length of residence, location of the housing, and family composition (Berry & Weitzman, 1993; Cook, 1988; Fried & Gleicher, 1976; Rent & Rent, 1978; Rossi, 1980; Schwartz & Devance-Manzini, 1992). Fried and Gleicher's (1976) research from the late 1950s on Boston's West End's residents highlighted the importance of several features (e.g., ethnicity, length of residence, social networks in the neighborhood) in residential satisfaction. In the 1976 study Fried and Gleicher identified the respondents as "a probability sample of residents.... The sampling criteria included households in which there

was a female household member between the age of 20 and 65. The present analysis is based on the pre-location data from the female respondents.” (p. 551). They did not provide any other information about the respondents. However, Gans (1982) identified some of the demographic characteristics of the female respondents in the book, *The Urban Villagers*. Although there is no way to check exactly who were the respondents used for the Fried and Gleicher analysis, Gans’ information does provide some parameters. Gans provided the following information on the West End female respondents³: second-generation Italian-Americans, 100%; age 20 to 29 years, 15%; 30 to 39 years, 34%, 40 to 49 years, 36%, 50 to 59 years, 11%, and 60 to 65 years, 4%; married and living with their husbands, 76%, and never married, 8%; “working class”; less than a high school diploma, 72%, completed high school, 26%, and some college, 2%.

The housing features investigated by Fried and Gleicher (1976) were residents’ feelings about their apartments, which were connected to their feelings about the West End. Respondents who indicated that they liked their apartment were more likely to indicate very positive feelings about the West End. Consistent with this finding, residents who indicated that they disliked their apartment also indicated they had mixed feelings, or disliked living in the West End. The West Enders’ sense of identifying with their neighborhood was tied to both familiar locales and interpersonal relationships in the place. It must be noted that the predominately positive feelings were expressed after residing in the West End for a long period of time, so most residents had been stably housed, and felt that the West End was their “home.” However, the respondents for this research were relatively new residents in

³ The entire sample was 128 respondents.

their communities, so the applicability of Fried and Gleicher's findings may be limited.

Rent and Rent's (1978) investigation of residential satisfaction among low-income, public housing residents examined factors across all three components of housing satisfaction. Their research is important because they were among the few researchers to distinguish between satisfaction with the apartment and with the neighborhood. This distinction, which was incorporated into this research, is important because it addressed Weidemann and Anderson's (1985) concerns, regarding the ambiguity of the housing scale. In addition to investigating housing satisfaction, Rent and Rent also examined satisfaction with structural aspects of the housing, previous housing experiences, social participation, housing preferences, and the residents' "social-psychological perspective" toward society. The findings relevant to the demographic and background component of housing satisfaction will be reviewed first. Rent and Rent conducted interviews with 257 low-income residents of public housing. The demographic characteristics of the respondents were as follows: 96% female, and 4% male heads of households; 97% Black and 3% White; the median age was 30, with a range of 17 to 80; the median income was \$3,339; 60% reported the major source of income as salary from a blue collar occupation; the average years of schooling were 10; 75% were renters in multiple family dwelling, and 25% were renters in single family detached dwellings.

Rent and Rent (1978) found that neighborhood satisfaction was not related to length of residence. Most of the respondents, almost 80%, had lived in the neighborhood for 3 years or less. Unlike the ratings of neighborhood satisfaction, satisfaction with the apartment was related to length of residence. The longer a resident lived in the apartment

the more likely they were to report housing dissatisfaction. Rent and Rent explained this finding as "[it] would seem to be one of the 'newness' wearing off, and/or the realization that higher aspirations will never be achieved." (p. 476). However, this assessment was not confirmed by having the interviewees respond to the researchers' explanation. Because it is relevant to this research, it should be noted that the length of residence may impact on housing satisfaction when it is associated with deteriorating housing conditions. As several researchers have reported (Rent & Rent, 1978; Schwartz & Manzini-Devance, 1993), residential satisfaction may decline over time as the condition, or quality (e.g., damage to the ceiling, peeling paint) of the apartment and/or building declines due to lack of maintenance. In addition, the more recently rehoused residents' relief at being rehoused may cause their initial assessments of housing quality to be positive, and they may be unaware of apartment and building problems.

Cook's (1988) research on neighborhood satisfaction examined the impact of demographic and background characteristics, and of housing and locational conditions, on neighborhood satisfaction. The demographic and background conditions will be discussed first. Cook compared 449 surveys based on the sub-samples of urban (n=232) and suburban (n=217) low-income, single-parent women, all of whom were receiving Section 8 rental subsidies. The demographic characteristics of the 232 urban women were as follows: 52%, White and 48%, "Nonwhite"; 10%, 24 years or younger, 74%, 25 to 39 years, and 16%, 40 years or older; 41%, two members in the household and 59% with 3 or more members; 37% employed; and an income of less than \$4,999, 43%; \$5,000 to \$9,999, 40%; and \$10,000 or more, 17%. The demographic characteristics of the 217 women in the suburban sample

were as follows: 94%, White and 6%, "Nonwhite"; 19% , 24 years or younger, 64%, 25 to 39 years, and 17%, 40 years or older; 56%, two members in the household and 44% with 3 or more members; 54% employed; and an income of less than \$4,999, 37%; \$5,000 to \$9,999, 37%; and \$10,000 or more, 26%. Respondents completed a mail return survey which included "objective and subjective" closed-ended questions about the housing, neighborhood, housing opportunities, and socioeconomic characteristics of the household. Neighborhood satisfaction was measured by asking respondents to rate their overall neighborhood satisfaction on a five-point scale ranging from "extremely dissatisfied" to "extremely satisfied."

Cook (1988) hypothesized that the constrained choices of the residential setting available to low-income, single-parent women would reduce overall neighborhood satisfaction. In terms of the impact of the demographic and background characteristics on neighborhood satisfaction, Cook found that there was no significant association between these factors and neighborhood satisfaction. Cook's other research factors (e.g., neighborhood maintenance, safety, residential attachment, and perception of housing opportunities) are discussed in the following section, "Housing and Locational Features."

Similar to the scope of the Rent and Rent (1978) research discussed earlier, Berry and Weitzman's (1993) investigation of "housing comfort" among formerly homeless families who have been rehoused, also examined factors across all three components of housing satisfaction. Their respondents were 98 heads of household with the following demographic characteristics: 92% female and 8% male; 63% Black and 31% Hispanic; the mean age was 27, with a range of 18 to 50 years; 33% had a partner living in their

household; 90% had at least one minor age child living with them; and 55% had never lived independently (i.e., been a primary tenant). All of these respondents had lived in their new neighborhood for six months after leaving the shelter. Berry and Weitzman assessed housing comfort by asking respondents to rate "How comfortable do you feel in your new neighborhood?" on a 4-point scale. The demographic and background characteristics they collected included: age, gender, ethnicity, size of household, dwelling density, shelter histories, length of time as a primary tenant, and length of time rehoused. Also included as part of this component of housing satisfaction were "indices of individual vulnerabilities" (p. 28), such as involvement with child protective services, substance abuse history, battering, psychiatric problems, and foster care placement as a child.

Berry and Weitzman (1993) found that respondents reported a fairly high level of comfort: 23% indicated that they were "very comfortable," and 56% reported that they were "pretty comfortable." As an individual predictor of comfort they found that demographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender, race) were not related to neighborhood comfort. Neither were the measures of housing and shelter history, nor the measures of individual vulnerabilities significantly related to neighborhood comfort. Only the presence of a partner and the number of "other(s)" (i.e., people doubling-up with the respondent) was slightly related to neighborhood comfort. Although this research was useful in identifying factors across all three components, it must be cautioned that though "neighborhood comfort" may be related to housing satisfaction, the use of the word "comfort" may elicit different responses. Comfort implies efforts on the part of the resident to make the housing accommodating. Also, the use of the phrase "neighborhood comfort" may have elicited

different responses than if “housing” comfort was used instead yet, inexplicably Berry and Weitzman use “housing comfort” in the article’s title. Berry and Weitzman’s measures and findings for the other two components of housing satisfaction; housing and locational features; and social connections, will be discussed in those respective sections below.

Housing and Locational Features

Generally, reviewing the literature in the area of housing and neighborhood conditions was problematic. Authors frequently did not provide definitions for the terms they used (e.g., distinguishing between “housing quality” and “housing conditions”), or they provided multiple and therefore seemingly interchangeable terms (e.g., “neighborhood” or “housing” or “residential satisfaction”) without explaining if there were differences in these constructs (e.g., see above example in the Berry and Weitzman, 1993 research, and Rent and Rent, 1978 below). In addition to the problem with terminology, the distinctions between the physical, affective, or social attributes of housing and the neighborhood were also ambiguous. Some research on housing satisfaction emphasized the apartment’s structural “quality,” and limited the role of the surrounding physical and social environment of the building and the neighborhood. Before reviewing the research examining the influence of housing or locational features on housing satisfaction (Berry & Weitzman, 1993; Birch, 1985; Cook, 1988; Fried & Gleicher, 1976; Guzman, 1989; Rent & Rent, 1978; Schwartz and Devance-Manzini, 1993), two studies which provide the American Housing Survey’s (Weicher, 1989) and HUD’s (Birch, 1985) definition of housing quality are first presented.

Housing Quality

Housing quality has been defined in numerous ways, usually emphasizing the physical features of the unit, and often ignoring or minimizing the interrelationship of those features with a person's housing needs and financial capabilities. The research on housing quality includes physical, nonphysical, environmental components, and the influence of economic factors. From the late 1950s to the 1960s there was a shift from minimum standards (e.g., indoor plumbing) to the much more abstract concept of housing affordability in urban areas. Weicher's (1989) research on the measurement and progress of housing quality presented an assessment of the changes in housing quality and housing affordability that contradicts much of the other research presented in this literature review. Weicher maintained that overall housing quality has improved for all Americans, including subgroups such as Blacks, Hispanics, female-headed households, and very low-income households. Though Weicher reported that housing affordability problems had been increasing, Weicher viewed this as a natural dynamic of the housing market. This research is discussed partly because it presented an alternate view of housing opportunities for the types of households that this research studied. However, the primary reason for this study's inclusion is that it provided the federal government's definition of housing quality from the late 1940s as: "A unit with complete plumbing (in urban areas) and not in need of major structural repairs" (p. 12). Weicher noted that this standard was commonly used by housing policy analysts until the early 1970s. By the early 1970s a new definition of housing quality was needed because one component of the existing definition, identification of dilapidated housing, was dropped

from the housing survey. This component was dropped because the federal government felt that some minimal level of housing had been achieved in most areas. Since the early 1970s the AHS (originally the "Annual Housing Survey," later renamed the "American Housing Survey") has provided new and more detailed information on housing quality.

Birch's (1985) research on the "unsheltered" woman revealed a very different scenario of housing quality than Weicher's (1989) assessment. Most of Birch's findings have already been discussed in an earlier section on "Women and Housing." In summary, 33% of American dwellings have problems (e.g., inadequate heating), and female households reside in more than 40% of these dwellings. "Female-[headed] households with minor children are the most problem-ridden group among those living in substandard shelter in the United States" (p. 35). Birch reported that the problem is even worse in New York City. "Over 40% of all households have a housing problem, while 56% of the female households are afflicted" (p. 36). Birch provided the current U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) assessment of housing quality:

[HUD] measures physical adequacy with a survey of systems (plumbing, electrical, heating) and facilities (kitchens and bathrooms); the presence of crowded units (more than one person per room); and the existence of excessive costs (more than 30 % of income for rent, or 40% of income for mortgage and maintenance). (p. 33)

Though housing quality, including structure and affordability issues, is often viewed as a major component of housing satisfaction, other researchers (Berry & Weitzman, 1993; Cook, 1988; Fried & Gleicher, 1976; Guzman, 1989; Rent & Rent, 1978; Schwartz and Devance-Manzini, 1993) have investigated a variety of other housing or locational features that may impact on satisfaction, these studies are discussed next.

Research on Housing and Locational Features

Rent and Rent's (1978) study of apartment and neighborhood satisfaction was described in detail in the previous section "Demographic and Background Characteristics."

Some of their research questions and findings are relevant to the housing and locational features component of housing satisfaction. Almost 90% of the respondents had positive feelings about their neighborhood. Thirty-seven percent indicated that it was a "very good place to live," and more than 50% reported that it was a "fairly good place to live." As previously reported, there was no significant relationship between neighborhood satisfaction and length of residence. Almost 60% of the respondents indicated that they considered their present residence to be "home." When comparing their present neighborhood with the past, 77% felt that the present neighborhood was better, or the same; 20% rated it worse. However Rent and Rent did not report how these measures were associated with either apartment or neighborhood satisfaction. Similar to the ratings of neighborhood satisfaction, most respondents were satisfied with their apartment, 93%, gave ratings of "very much" (59%), or "average amount" (34%). Unfortunately the researchers do not provide an explanation of why they used different scales, "very good" to "not very good" for neighborhood satisfaction, and "very much" to "not at all" for apartment satisfaction.

Rent and Rent also tested the relationship between satisfaction with the apartment and the neighborhood. They found that there was only a moderate, positive relationship between the two factors, and therefore justification for treating them as independent variables. The last locational feature that Rent and Rent examined was that of housing

preferences. More than 50% of the respondents indicated that they intended to stay in the “area,” and 18% reported that they would move as soon as possible. Rent and Rent do not indicate what the remaining 32% of the respondents would choose to do. Nearly 85% of the sample indicated that they would prefer to live in a single family detached house. Eighty-three percent of the respondents indicated that they wanted to own a house. Of this group, the reason ownership was preferred was because the home would be an investment. Although home ownership was considered to be important to most of the respondents, Rent and Rent report that it was not significantly related to “residential satisfaction” (p. 479), but they don’t indicate if that phrase refers to the satisfaction with the apartment or the neighborhood.

Cook’s (1988) research on the components of neighborhood satisfaction, discussed in the previous section, found that the overall neighborhood satisfaction for the urban and suburban samples was not significantly different. Regardless of location, satisfaction with neighborhood safety was the single most important factor in predicting overall neighborhood satisfaction. Though there was no significant difference in overall neighborhood satisfaction for the two groups, different components of the neighborhood contributed to urban versus suburban women’s satisfaction. Satisfaction with neighborhood upkeep, quietness, and nearness to child care were most important to the urban women. Satisfaction with the home, neighborhood quietness, nearness to quality schools, and the availability of shopping were most important to the suburban women. Cook concluded that the housing needs of single-parent, low-income households warrant more attention, especially regarding issues of safety for the women and their children.

Although not conducted as an investigation of housing satisfaction, Guzman's (1989) research on rehoused families provided some information about the constraints on satisfaction with the apartment. Guzman investigated formerly homeless families (N=136), housed by several permanent housing managers. The demographic characteristics of this sample were not provided by Guzman. Initially this research sought to determine whether families who had left their "permanent" housing had returned to the homeless shelter system. However, this goal was abandoned because Guzman was unable to contact these families to determine their whereabouts; that is why demographic information was not obtained. The revised purpose of the research was to determine the "turnover rate," defined as the rate at which families left their permanent housing. These data were obtained from the managers of the building. The research also identified factors that seemed to reduce the turnover rate. Guzman found that the turnover rate declined from 22% in 1987 to 12% in 1989. This was attributed to stricter screening procedures (e.g., participation of the tenants' association in the final selection, more thorough investigation of a prospective tenant for a history of substance abuse, independent living history, credit checks, and employment history) by the housing managers.

In addition, through the use of 12 case studies of families who were still rehoused, Guzman's (1989) research provided a view of the rehousing process. The demographic characteristics of the 12 families were as follows: Hispanic, 58%, Black, 42%; separated, 50%, single, 25%, married or common-law, 16%, and divorced, 8%; median age 32, range 22 to 45; and average length of stay in the shelter, 13 months. The case studies revealed that overcrowding due to inadequate apartment space, and the addition of family members

through births or move-ins, was voiced as the major reason these families wanted to move. Guzman's (1989) research provided a starting point for theorizing which issues may impact on families' decisions to remain in or leave their housing, although the methodology can be criticized. Too much crucial information is unknown, such as the locations of the families who had left the "permanent" housing, and the reasons for their departure.

The primary goal of Schwartz and Devance-Manzini's (1993) research was the investigation of reasons for "recidivism"⁴ and strategies for preventing it, among formerly homeless families. Their study revealed some issues impacting on housing satisfaction relevant to this research. Their sample of 196 heads-of-households, of homeless families consisted of both first time homeless families (N=78) and families who had returned to the shelter (N=118). The demographic characteristics of the 78 first time homeless families were as follows: 78% Black and 22% Hispanic; 92% female and 8% male head of household; 36% under the age of 25 years, 42% between 25 to 34 years, and 22%, 35 years or older; and 79% "single" and 21% married. The characteristics of the 118 families who returned to the shelter were as follows: 65% Black, 31% Hispanic, 2% White, and 2% "other"; 92% female and 8% male head of household; 26% under the age of 25 years, 48% between 25 to 34 years, and 26%, 35 years or older; 71% "single" and 29% married.

Schwartz and Devance-Manzini (1993) examined several strategies designed to prevent formerly homeless families from becoming homeless again: a revolving loan fund to act as a "cash buffer"; a fund to ensure that public assistance payments were maintained;

⁴ Schwartz and Devance-Manzini's (1993) term, it is commonly used to describe the return to a previous condition.

legal or public assistance ombudspersons; and intervention through case management. They concluded that case management and financial assistance would have prevented homelessness for many of the households. Their investigation of the reasons for reentry into the shelter revealed several findings relevant to this research such as the number of months rehoused before shelter reentry and reasons for shelter reentry. Pertinent to this research's data analysis was that Schwartz and Devance-Manzini's (1993) analysis of the return to shelter subgroup (n=118) revealed that 85% had been rehoused in their "permanent" housing as the primary tenant. Within this group, the average length of time from rehousing to shelter reentry was 24 months. Respondents who had been rehoused in their "permanent" housing as a secondary tenant reentered the shelter after an average of 13 months. Reasons for shelter reentry among these 118 families included: 36% returned because of "building/neighborhood conditions (violence)"; and 30% because of problems with other tenants in their apartment, in their building, or with the landlord. Unfortunately, Schwartz and Devance-Manzini's (1993) data analysis combined the primary areas of concern that respondents reported into the one category they labeled "building/ neighborhood conditions (violence)." They identified these areas of concern as: "drug-related activities and violence; community violence and crime; dilapidated neighborhood conditions; racial tensions; and lack of facilities for youth" (p. 34). It would have been much more informative to separate out respondents' safety concerns, ratings of a neighborhood structural quality and access to services, and interpersonal relationships with neighbors and building staff.

Though Schwartz and Devance-Manzini's (1993) study identified the importance of safety and housing conditions in formerly homeless families' decisions to stay in, or leave

their housing, and provided a time frame for anticipating a family's possible reentry into the shelter system (24 months), the research is problematic. The study only investigated those families who left their housing and returned to the shelter. Most rehoused, formerly homeless families do not reenter the shelter system. Therefore, investigating *their* tactics and reasons for remaining rehoused has important implications for designing homelessness prevention strategies and should have also been investigated.

Berry and Weitzman's (1993) study of housing comfort was discussed in detail in the previous section, "Demographic and Background Characteristics." Several of their findings are also relevant to housing and locational features that may influence housing satisfaction. Their review of the research of housing satisfaction among low-income residents stressed the "overwhelming importance of neighborhood safety to residential satisfaction." (p. 27). Berry and Weitzman hypothesized that housing conditions and safety of the block would be significantly related to housing comfort. Their findings supported these hypotheses. Most of the measures of neighborhood and housing quality such as heat, hot water, cleanliness of building, apartment repairs, and safety were associated with comfort in the neighborhood. Respondents' favorable rating of building conditions was uniformly related to comfort. Consistent with other research of the housing satisfaction of low-income residents (e.g., Cook, 1988), safety issues were the single strongest predictor of comfort, and social networks with neighbors, friends or family in the area provided mixed results. Demographic and background characteristics such as shelter history and length of current residence were unrelated to comfort.

As indicated by the research reviewed above (Cook, 1988; Berry Weitzman, 1993:

Schwartz & Devance-Manzini, 1993), the only housing and locational feature consistently associated with neighborhood satisfaction has been the perceived safety of the neighborhood. Generally, as concerns about neighborhood safety increase, neighborhood satisfaction decreases. Much of the research yielded mixed results: “housing conditions” those features usually associated with “quality” (e.g., hot water, heat) as investigated by Berry and Weitzman (1993); the less well-defined set of conditions (e.g., size of the apartment, overcrowding) discovered by Guzman (1989); and the rapid deterioration of the quality of the apartment and/or building noted by Schwartz and Devance-Manzini’s (1993) research. Issues regarding housing preferences such as intentions to move or stay, preferred housing type, and preferred ownership status, yielded inconclusive or insignificant results (Rent and Rent, 1978). Fried and Gleicher’s (1976) research on feelings about the apartment were found to be positively associated with residential satisfaction.

Social Connections

The influence of social connections on housing satisfaction has been primarily investigated by examining a resident’s social relationships with family and friends (e.g., social networks). To a much lesser extent, a few researchers (Berry & Weitzman, 1993; Rent and Rent, 1978) have also examined a resident’s participation in formal civic, social,

or religious organizations (e.g., tenants' association). Social networks are of particular interest when examining housing satisfaction because as Mitchell (1987) noted, the reasons for homelessness that imply strained relationships such as "eviction by primary tenant," "difficulties with others," or "problems with spouse," are often given as the cause for entry into the family shelter system. However, Mitchell cautioned that the reason given at the time of shelter entry is not a "reliable indicator of the 'cause' of homelessness" (p. 39). Several studies which examined the social networks of homeless people assumed that they are socially disaffiliated (Bahr & Garrett, 1976; Passero, Zax & Zozus, 1991; Shinn, Knickman and Weitzman, 1991). Most of this research focuses on the social connections - or lack thereof - of homeless single men; rarely are families studied (an exception is Shinn et al. 1991). The outcome of this disaffiliation would be that homeless people would have smaller social networks and/or less contact with their networks. Strong, positive social networks are seen as a support that can aid a person's ability to withstand stress from a variety of sources, including inadequate housing. The existence and maintenance of social networks assume that a person is connected to other people and/or settings. However, as Berry and Weitzman (1993) indicated in their review of the research on social networks, studies which examined the role of social networks in housing satisfaction have produced results that are mixed, and oftentimes, difficult to interpret.

Before reviewing the research on social networks and housing satisfaction, a model of social networks from sociological theory will be discussed briefly. Milardo's (1988) overview of social network theory and methodology, as well as research which examined the influence of social networks on housing satisfaction (Cook, 1988; Fried & Gleicher,

1976; Mitchell, 1987; Rent & Rent, 1978; Shinn, Knickman & Weitzman, 1991), provided directions for this research.

Model of Social Networks

Milardo's (1988) overview of social network theory presented the assumptions underlying the study of social networks as:

All investigations of families and social networks fundamentally rest on the premise that individuals exist within a social context that is both directly and indirectly defined by the individual and is in turn influential in personal and social life. (p. 36)

Within this context, Milardo (1988) identified three types of social networks: (1) networks of close associates or significant others, defined as "collectives of people who are considered important and perhaps intimate 'friends'" (p. 22); (2) exchange networks, defined as a subset of the total network which targets people with "whom the probability of rewarding exchanges is high" (p. 26); and (3) interactive networks, which is not a type of network but instead, methods for identifying those members of the social network who are interacted with on a "routine" basis.

Research on Social Networks

Mitchell (1987) studied 10 formerly homeless women who had been rehoused in their parental homes. No other demographic information about the respondents was reported. Mitchell's research investigated whether the respondents were able to depend on

support from family and friends. The women recorded what they considered to be their social networks at the time they had become homeless. Five dimensions of social networks were reported. They were: frequency of contact; self-defined closeness; sociability; emotional support; and practical aid. Although this research was very useful for clearly identifying the major dimensions of social networks, Mitchell does not follow the highly detailed tables and diagrams with any general conclusions about the nature of the women's social networks.

Many of Mitchell's social network dimensions were investigated by the Shinn, Knickman and Weitzman (1991) study of homeless families. Shinn, et al. investigated the possible connections between disruptive social relationships as a child and/or an adult (e.g., foster care as a child, or battered as an adult), and current social ties in the form of emotional or financial support, with families' vulnerability to becoming homeless. They compared these social relationships in a sample of mothers (N=677) entering the shelter, and mothers (N=495) with a similar demographic background who were housed. The demographics of the women entering the shelter whereas follows: average age, 27.7 years; average number of children, 2.2; Black, 54.8%, Hispanic, 38.9%, White, 4.3%, and "other," 1.9%; married or with a partner, 21.9%, separated or divorced, 19.3%, widowed, 0.6%, and single, 58.2%; and previous shelter use, 34.5%. The demographics of the women who were housed were as follows: average age, 34.5 years; average number of children, 2.7; Black, 33.1%, Hispanic, 59.8%, White, 4.4%, and "other," 2.6%; married or with a partner, 6.5%, separated or divorced, 44.8%, widowed, 2.8%, and single, 45.9%; and previous shelter use, 9.1%. Shinn et al. hypothesized that families requesting shelter had less contact

with friends and family than the housed families. This hypothesis was not supported:

Contrary to our hypothesis, [homeless mothers] were more likely than were housed mothers to have had recent contact with parents, other relatives, and friends, although they felt less able to draw on these resources for help with their current housing needs. More than three fourths of families seeking shelter had already stayed with members of their social network in the past year. (p. 46)

The authors concluded that the homeless mothers may have exhausted the resources of their social networks before they entered the shelter system. It should be noted that the respondents were not asked if this was the case.

Although the respondents in this research are no longer homeless, their use of their social networks prior to their shelter stay seems relevant based on Schwartz and Devance-Manzini's (1993) findings. Several respondents in Schwartz and Devance-Manzini's (1993) study indicated that it was the overcrowded conditions in their apartments, caused by doubling-up, that made them leave their housing and return to the shelter. Usually the people who were doubling-up with the respondents were family or friends who had housed the respondents when they were homeless. Although not noted by Guzman (1989), the people who moved in with the primary tenant and caused the overcrowding, may have been family and friends that the respondent had stayed with prior to becoming homeless themselves. In addition to the research which examined social networks among homeless populations, other researchers (Cook, 1988; Fried & Gleicher, 1976; Rent & Rent, 1978), investigated social ties among other low-income populations.

Fried and Gleicher's (1976) study of residential satisfaction among the West End residents was discussed earlier. One of the major findings of their research concerns the role of social networks in housing satisfaction. In addition to length of residence and social

networks in the neighborhood, Fried and Gleicher also identified other sources of residential satisfaction including: low rents; the expected difficulties of relocation; considering the West End as "home"; and feelings of belonging. They found that most of the respondents had lived in the area for more than 20 years, and had made few, if any moves within the past 10 years. Fried and Gleicher's study provided some direction for understanding the role of social networks. They discovered the number of relatives and/or friends, and closeness to neighbors were tied to positive feelings about living in the West End. Those residents who had few or no relatives living in the West End reported less positive feelings about the neighborhood than residents with some or many relatives in the area.

Rent and Rent's (1978) research on apartment and neighborhood satisfaction has been reviewed in the previous two sections. Some of their findings are also relevant to understanding the impact of social connections on housing satisfaction. Rent and Rent found that the presence of friends in the neighborhood, but not of relatives, was positively related to feelings of apartment satisfaction, but not neighborhood satisfaction. Neighborhood satisfaction was also found to be positively related to residents' satisfaction with their neighbors. The researchers also examined the amount of participation in formal groups. Almost 80% of the respondents were not members of any type of civic, religious or social group. This last finding was consistent with Berry and Weitzman's (1993) finding that participation in formal or informal groups was not associated with housing comfort.

Contrary to Fried and Gleicher's (1976), and Rent and Rent's (1978) findings, Cook's (1988) research on neighborhood satisfaction indicated that for the urban portion of the sample, having close friends in the neighborhood was positively related to dissatisfaction

with the overall neighborhood. Cook does not provide an explanation for this finding. Anecdotal information from homeless and formerly homeless people suggests that the proximity of close friends and/or family may create a drain on the limited resources (e.g., doubling-up, money, food) of the newly rehoused families.

Compatible with Berry and Weitzman's assessment after their review of the literature investigating the influence of social networks on housing satisfaction, and the results of their own study of possible connections, the previously cited research also produced inconsistent findings. Fried and Gleicher's (1976) study yielded the most conclusive findings about the importance of family and friends in the neighborhood. Rent and Rent (1978) and Berry and Weitzman (1993) found inconclusive results for the impact of social networks on housing satisfaction. Schwartz and Devance-Manzini (1993) found that respondents who reentered the shelter were more likely to report problems with co-tenants and the landlord; and their proximity to family and friends seemed unrelated to shelter reentry. Similarly, relative to this dissertation, no conclusions can be reached from Guzman's (1989) and Mitchell's (1987) research because of the scarcity of data.

SUMMARY

For the purposes of this research, housing satisfaction was defined as a resident's satisfaction with their *overall* housing. It was expected that respondents' satisfaction with the individual components of their housing (i.e., apartment, building, and neighborhood) would be influenced by numerous factors, including their assessment of the quality of those individual components, characteristics of the person (i.e., length of time rehoused) and features of the housing (e.g., safety). The review of the research on poverty, and the low-income housing market, revealed that there may be few opportunities for rehoused, formerly homeless families to obtain housing that is adequate and secure. With the residential choice constraints imposed on low-income, Black or Hispanic, female-headed households by the barriers of race, gender, family composition and poverty, the opportunities for such families to find sustainable residences and to remain stably housed seem very limited. Families who are inadequately housed in impoverished neighborhoods may not be satisfied with their housing, yet may be unable to find better housing. The research on the influence of background and demographic characteristics, housing and locational features, and social connections on housing satisfaction yielded mostly inconsistent or statistically non-significant results (e.g., length of time rehoused, social networks) with the exception of the importance of neighborhood safety. The research review however, did provide direction for the course of this research.

This research examined a number of these same factors to determine their influence on the housing satisfaction of formerly homeless families because the constraints imposed

on such families by both the housing policies of New York City, and the macro-level socioeconomic dynamics suggested that satisfaction may be difficult to maintain. Unlike most of the research of housing satisfaction which was reviewed, this research also attempted to differentiate satisfaction with the different components of housing, in addition to an overall level of satisfaction (i.e., "housing satisfaction"). This is in contrast with most of the research which has focused on neighborhood satisfaction. Consistent with this framework, this research addressed all three individual housing components to examine their influence on overall housing satisfaction, as well as the satisfaction with that particular component. Despite the non-significant findings (Berry & Weitzman, 1993; Rent & Rent, 1978), for the impact of length of residence on neighborhood satisfaction, this relationship was examined as a primary research question because it was potentially a significant factor for indicating when a resident's dissatisfaction with her housing reached a level that would prompt her to leave her housing for either reentry into the shelter system, or other options (Schwartz & Devance-Manzini, 1993).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS & HYPOTHESES

Research Questions

- **Is there a relationship between the length of residence since rehousing and the housing satisfaction of formerly homeless families?**

- **Is there a relationship between the ratings of the quality of the apartment, building, neighborhood, and the overall housing, and the housing satisfaction of formerly homeless families?**

- **What are the primary reasons for housing satisfaction?**

Hypotheses

- The length of time a respondent is rehoused will influence her housing satisfaction. Respondents who have been rehoused 25 months or longer will report lower satisfaction with their overall housing than those rehoused 24 months or less.

The choice of 24 months as a crucial period for examination, was based on Schwartz and Devance-Manzini's (1993) research. As discussed earlier, they analyzed a group of rehoused formerly homeless families, who had returned to the shelter. Their analysis revealed that within this group, the average length of time from rehousing to shelter reentry was 24 months.

- A respondent's ratings of the quality of her apartment, the building and the neighborhood, will have different influences on the respondent's overall housing satisfaction. A respondent's rating of the quality of the immediate environment, her apartment, will be the best predictor of her overall housing satisfaction when compared to her ratings of building and neighborhood quality.

- Safety concerns will be a major reason for housing satisfaction. In addition, other variables will have a major impact on the reasons for housing satisfaction.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Background

This research is part of a larger, ongoing study examining the rehousing experiences of formerly homeless people (Rivlin, 1996). Rivlin's study focuses on the rehousing experiences of formerly homeless families rehoused in various types of housing. This research is using a subgroup ($n=40$) of the sample ($N=50$) to investigate the components of housing satisfaction. The research was funded from various sources: Dr. Rivlin's PSC-CUNY grant; her private funds; and the private funds of this author. Dr. Rivlin and this author are co-principal investigators of the larger "Rehousing" study.

Access

The families were contacted through city/state agencies such as the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA), and nonprofit organizations such as Partnership for the Homeless, Genesis Homes, Concourse House, Mt. Hope and the Highbridge Community Life Center. Potential respondents received information about the study in a variety of ways (e.g., mailings, flyers posted in building lobbies (See Appendix B), announcements at tenants meetings) depending upon the arrangement with the agency or the nonprofit group. A respondent's willingness to be interviewed was indicated either by their returning a sign-

up form (See Appendix C) or by calling and leaving a contact name and phone number. The potential respondent was called, and her eligibility to be interviewed was determined by use of a screener. Interview eligibility was based on factors such as race, use of the New York City family shelter system, willingness to have the interview taped, and ability to have the interview conducted in English. Most of the interviews were conducted in respondents' homes. In the largest of the "complex" type housing (see "Types of Housing" below), 16 of the 18 interviews done at that location were conducted in the community center. All of the interviews conducted in respondents' homes were done by an interviewing team of two or three interviewers. One person functioned as the interviewer and the other person(s) took notes and/or observed. Some of the interviews at the large complex were conducted by only one interviewer. All of the interviews used for this research were also tape recorded. The length of the interviews ranged from an hour-and-a half to a little under two and-a-half hours. This author was either the interviewer or the note taker for 14 of the 40 interviews.

Types of Housing

Respondents lived in a variety of housing settings including newly constructed building, totally renovated buildings, and buildings where only some apartments were renovated.. Although some information about the housing (e.g., address, contact agency) was collected, no systematic evaluation of the housing or apartment (e.g., an environmental check list) was done. Therefore, unless details about the housing were mentioned in the interview (e.g., ceiling leaks), very little specific information is available for analysis and

descriptions. A general categorization of housing type was the only assessment done for this research. For the purposes of analysis, housing type was divided into two major groups: complex and scatter-site.

“Complex” housing was defined as a site which was built or renovated to provide housing for several families, both formerly homeless and others, and which included on-site services (e.g., counseling, day-care, GED classes). Twenty-one of the 40 respondents lived in four different complex settings. The largest complex housed 18 of the respondents. This site was a large fort-like structure which housed a total of 150 families, 75 of whom were formerly homeless, and 75 other low-income families. Entry to this structure was through one entrance with 24 hour security. The social service and administrative offices were located near the entrance. All of the apartments faced a large courtyard which was nicely landscaped and contained a large playground. The three smaller complexes varied in size from approximately 28 to 40 units. Two buildings were renovated and the other was newly constructed. The three complexes that this researcher observed were fairly new, either built or renovated within the past four years, and they seemed to be in very good condition.

Women who resided in apartments located in buildings that had either no, or some apartments renovated and no on-site services, were categorized as “scatter-site.” This included apartments managed by non-profit organizations, and those obtained through private landlords. Based on this author’s assessment, the conditions of this housing ranged from very good to very poor. The conditions of some of the apartments which this author would categorize as very poor included problems such as no heat on a cold winter day, roach infestation, non-working kitchen appliances and hallways in poor condition.

Respondents

The respondents were 40 female heads-of-household of formerly homeless families who obtained housing through their stay in the New York City family shelter system. According to a report issued by a nonprofit organization, in the fall of 1991 only 32% of the families who entered the shelter system obtained housing with New York City's assistance (Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, 1992). The families that were part of this research were rehoused in apartments managed by various agencies (e.g., NYCHA), nonprofit organizations, and private landlords. Based on the demographic makeup of the New York City family shelter population, Black⁵ and Hispanic women were targeted for interviewing. Black, single-parent, female-headed households with children, comprise approximately 80% of the families who use the New York City shelter system. "Formerly homeless family" was defined as a family which stayed in a New York City family homeless shelter immediately prior to moving into their current housing. This definition was used to limit the pool of potential interviewees to those who obtained their housing because of their stay in the family shelter system and moved directly from the shelter into their current housing.

⁵ I prefer the use of the term "Black" as all encompassing rather than "African-American" which would be inaccurate in several cases.

Demographic Information

The women⁶ ranged in age from 20 to 57 years. The mean and median age was 30 years. Almost 54% (n=21) were 30 years or younger; 46% (n=19) were 31 years, or older. Mirroring the racial makeup of the homeless family shelter population, 75% (n=34) of the respondents were Black, and 15% (n=6) were Hispanic. Sixty-seven percent (n=27) of the respondents were born in New York City. Twenty-five percent (n=10) were born outside of New York state, but within the United States. Only 5% (n=2) of the respondents were born outside the United States.

All of the respondents were either the mothers 95% (n=38) or the grandmothers 5% (n=2) of children under the age of 18. Twenty-eight percent of the women (n=13) had one child living with them, and another 30% (n=12) had two children in their household. Forty percent (n=16) of the respondents had three or more children in their households. Forty percent (n=16) of the women reported that they had a partner who was part of their household.

The length of time they were rehoused ranged from four months to almost six years (\bar{x} =26.625 months, SD =15.031 months). Forty percent (n=15) of the respondents were rehoused 24 months or less, and 60% (n=25) were rehoused 25 months or more. Regarding their monthly rent, 40% (n=16) paid \$600 or less, another 40% paid between \$601 and \$800, 15% (n=6) paid between \$801 and \$900, and 5% (n=2) reported paying more than

⁶ Some of this demographic information was not obtained for respondent # 19. That interview ended at the "Social Networks" section.

\$901. All of the respondents collected welfare (AFDC) grants and 32% (n=13)⁷ reported financial support from a partner, 25% (n=10) obtained income from a part-time job, 20% (n=8) received disability payments from SSI/SSD, 15 (n=5) received financial support from their family, and 5% (n=2) each reported receiving: child support and/or financial support from friends. Thirty-one, 79% of the respondents indicated that their shelter allowance, which is part of their welfare grant, was insufficient to cover their entire rent. These 31 women reported other sources that paid the balance: 90% (n=27) named their Section 8 voucher, 10% (n=3) indicated another government source (e.g., SSI/SSD payments), and one woman reported private funds (e.g., income from part-time job). Respondents were rehoused in three of New York City's five boroughs: 58% (n=23) in Brooklyn, 33% (n=13) in the Bronx, and 10% (n=4) in Manhattan. Twenty-six percent (n=10) of the respondents had less than 12 years of schooling; 35% (n=14) had either completed the 12th grade or obtained a GED; and 39% (n=15) had completed "some college." Almost 28% (n=11) of the respondents reported that either they and/or their partner *currently* worked, usually part-time. Of the 36 respondents for whom this information was collected, only one woman had *never* worked in either a part-time or full-time job. Most of the women who had worked, or who were currently working, were employed in a full-time job. No salary information was collected.

⁷ Most respondents reported income from more than 1 source.

PROCEDURES

Pilot Interviews

Thirteen pilot interviews were conducted between July and October 1994. Based on a review of these interviews, and a preliminary analysis of the housing quality and housing satisfaction questions, the interview was revised. New questions on housing satisfaction were added to the interview to address the research questions. The revised interview was re-piloted in December 1994 and additional revisions were made (see Appendix F).

Interview revisions relevant to this research focused primarily on:

- Providing definitions of the "housing quality" of the apartment, building, and neighborhood, "housing satisfaction" of the apartment, building, neighborhood, and overall for the respondent to use as an anchor before she responded to that series of questions. In addition, the respondent was given guides with the quality and satisfaction ratings to refer to when they answered the questions.
- Expanding the questions on safety to distinguish between different safety targets (i.e., personal, child), and the location (i.e., building and neighborhood). Respondents used a 5 point "safety concerns" guide, with the choices "extremely concerned, somewhat concerned, neither concerned nor unconcerned, somewhat unconcerned, not at all concerned" to

indicate their concern with a range of possible threats (e.g., personal attack, drug activity) to them and their children. These revisions were made because the housing satisfaction research indicated that safety issues were the most reliable predictor of satisfaction, and concerns for safety were salient in the pilot interviews.

Supplemental interviews, based on the new questions, were conducted with two respondents from the pilot interviews.⁸ This was done to ensure that the final sample of respondents has all been asked the same questions that are relevant to the research, though not in the same manner.

Research Documents

Research documents included the study information sheet (Appendix B), the sign-up form (Appendix C), and the consent form (Appendix E). Both the information sheet and the consent form were printed on the letterhead of the Housing Environments Research Group (HERG), a research group within the Center for Human Environments, at The Graduate School and University Center of The City University of New York. Five research instruments were used for this study: the telephone screening interview (Appendix D); the "initial contact" interview (to distinguish it from the follow-up interviews for the larger "Rehousing Experiences" study) which includes the three, 5-point guides for the rating of quality, satisfaction, and safety concerns (Appendix F).

The purpose of the telephone screener was to determine a potential respondent's

⁸ Respondent #s 01 and 04.

eligibility for the study based on the recency of their stay in the New York City shelter system, their race, household composition, willingness to have the interview taped, and ability to have the interview conducted in English. If the respondent was eligible and willing to be interviewed, an interview time and place were arranged. Families who participated in this research were paid \$20, either in cash or money order, as payment for their time.

The interview format was structured and consisted of both open-ended and closed-ended questions. The open-ended questions allowed an understanding of the rehousing experience, including housing satisfaction, in the words of the respondents. A structured format was chosen to guide each respondent through the same series of questions with the same wording. This structure aided data retrieval for the analysis. The interview was designed to encompass a wide array of issues relating to rehousing experiences. Most of the interview questions were analyzed for this research, therefore an overview of the entire interview is provided. The revised final version consists of 402 questions broken down as follows:

◆ The first section, "Current Residential Information," investigated:

- Moving-in Experiences, including an interviewee's familiarity with her neighborhood, any help she received from agencies or family and friends when moving into her apartment, and the existence and use of on-site social services.

- Independent Living History determined if the respondent was ever a leaseholder, the length of time she had lived independently, and reasons for leaving the place where she last lived independently.

- Assessment of the Apartment, the Building and the Neighborhood, examined the interviewee's assessment of the quality of features of her apartment (e.g., heat, hot water), the building (e.g., pest control, security) and the neighborhood (e.g., choice of shopping, access to public transportation). Respondents rated each feature on a 5 point scale of "very good, good, fair, poor, very poor." For each of these three sections, interviewees also provided an overall "quality" rating using the same scale. This section also included respondents' rating of their satisfaction with their apartment, building and neighborhood, in addition to an overall housing satisfaction rating. They used a 5 point scale of "very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, neutral, somewhat dissatisfied and very dissatisfied." The quality and satisfaction rating questions were followed by a follow-up questions which asked the respondents to explain the reasons for their rating. This section also included questions on damage and repairs to the apartment, safety in the building and neighborhood, and relationships with residents of the building and neighborhood. Also included are questions which explored housing expectations, feelings about whether the apartment is "home," the definition of home, intentions to move or stay, and a description of their "ideal" housing.

- ◆ The second section, "Social Networks," examined:

- The existence and number of people in the interviewee's social network. The interviewee chose up to 5 members of her social network to relate her relationships with them, including the frequency and type of contact (e.g., baby sitting, staying overnight), and where the person lives.

- Other social network issues such as people who stayed with the respondent since she was rehoused, and her stays with others since rehousing.

- Social and Political Participation which explored involvement in organizations or activities both inside the building (e.g., tenants' association) and outside (e.g., church groups).

◆ The third section, "Residential History," explored:

- The most recent residence prior to moving into the current apartment, including the last shelter stay.

- Homelessness history, including length of time first homeless and reason for that episode of homelessness.

- Feelings about homelessness to determine if the respondent felt that she was ever homeless, and her definition of homelessness.

- Most important place(s), its existence, and reasons for its importance.

◆ The fourth section, "Household Information," investigated:

- Demographic data (e.g., age, birthplace, and race).

- Household and family composition including the size of the household and the relationship of its members to the interviewee. Data on immediate family members not living in the household were also collected.

- Information on children including their schooling or day care enrollment and experiences, and foster care contact.

- Stressful events, which examined the respondents' experiences with stressful events as a minor and as an adult (e.g., foster care experience, crime victim).
- Income, Education, Medical and Employment background which collected data on an interviewee's current sources of income, monthly rent, possible problems meeting living expenses, education, family's medical problems, and employment and training history.
- Future Plans which examined the respondents' plans for the next 12 months, and 5 years.

DATA ANALYSIS

Content Analysis and Coding Schemes

All of the interviews were fully transcribed to make data retrieval easier. The open-ended questions were content analyzed, coded and tabulated. The strategy for the content analysis was to examine respondents' answers to the same question and identify the different themes that emerged. The structured interview format facilitated the cross-interview coding. The initial development of the codes for the questions central to this research's questions was done by five coders⁹. The coders used approximately 40% of the interviews to compile the first level of code development. The coding system was "open" in the sense that it allowed the addition of new categories as they appeared in the interviews. Additional development of these codes for this research was completed by the author. All of the interviews were reviewed to create the coding scheme for other important interview questions (e.g., meanings of home, meanings of homelessness). For other questions, 30% to 40% of the interviews were used to compile the codes. To address the issues of reliability, a research assistant also coded 40% of the respondents for the questions central to the primary research questions (i.e., reasons for quality and satisfaction ratings of the apartment, the building, the neighborhood, and overall housing). The inter-rater agreement ranged from 80% to 88%.

⁹ Leanne Rivlin, MaryAnn Allacci, Doug Loring, Stephanie Scott-Melnyk and Mary Eustace Valmont

The cross-interview content analysis involved identifying and categorizing major patterns or themes. There were two primary sources of these themes and patterns: the underlying theories addressed in the review of the literature (e.g., safety concerns); and themes which emerged from the data (e.g., some respondents' ambivalence toward their housing). The research provided a reference to frame the scope of the content analysis. This framing of possible themes still allowed other patterns to emerge. The major themes that emerged from the reasons for quality and satisfaction rating questions were: safety concerns about neighborhood crime; concerns about the maintenance of the apartment and the building; and interpersonal relationships. The themes are described later in the "Findings" section.

FINDINGS

The primary findings are presented in two major sub-sections: the first two research questions which were addressed primarily using quantitative analyses; and the third research question which was answered through qualitative analyses. The first findings that will be reported are those of the first two primary research questions. These findings were analyzed using primarily the quantitative data supplied by the various rating scales (quality, satisfaction, safety concerns and safety). The process for the quantitative analyses were those standard for testing models: a correlation matrix was computed for the variables hypothesized to impact on housing satisfaction; cross-tabulations were computed for these variables with housing satisfaction; and multiple regressions were computed to determine their impact on housing satisfaction. In addition to the testing of the first two research questions, other quantitative analyses are presented.

Quantitative Analyses

The first step in the quantitative analyses was the computation of a correlation matrix with the variables that were predicted to impact on housing satisfaction. This computation included housing satisfaction, the length of time rehoused as a continuous variable, the quality and satisfaction scales of all the housing components, housing type, and the safety concerns and safety ratings for the building and the neighborhood. Although they were not part of the primary research questions, the safety scales were included because, as

discussed in the review of the literature, concern about neighborhood safety was the only variable which consistently impacted on housing satisfaction. The correlation matrix of these variables indicated that several had significant correlations with housing satisfaction. These variables and their correlation (r) with housing satisfaction in descending order of r were as follows: housing quality, $r = .791^{**10}$, building satisfaction, $r = .712^{**}$, apartment satisfaction, $r = .597^{**}$, neighborhood satisfaction, $r = .498^{**}$, building quality, $r = .484^{**}$, apartment quality, $r = .469^{**}$, rating of child's safety in the building, $r = .390^{**}$, rating of personal safety in the building, $r = .352^*$ and neighborhood quality, $r = .328^*$.

The correlation of the length of time rehoused as a continuous variable, with housing satisfaction was nonsignificant, $r = .115$. As a dichotomous variable, 24 months or less, or 25 months or more, its correlation with housing satisfaction was $r = .108$, also statistically nonsignificant. The other variables included in this matrix which yielded non-significant results were: concerns about personal safety in the building, concerns about child's safety in the building, concerns about personal safety in the neighborhood, concerns about child's safety in the neighborhood, rating of personal safety in the neighborhood, rating of child's safety in the neighborhood and housing type. In addition, correlations with housing satisfaction were done for all of the household composition variables and none of them were statistically significant.

¹⁰ * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Housing Tenure

Cross-tabulations were computed to address the first primary research question. The length of time rehoused, dichotomized as 24 months or less, and as 25 months or more, was cross-tabulated with housing satisfaction (see Appendix G). The length of time a respondent was rehoused did not have a statistically significant impact on her housing satisfaction. There were no statistically significant differences in the housing satisfaction ratings of women rehoused 24 months or less, compared to those rehoused 25 months or more. Additional analyses were conducted to test if 24 months was the appropriate break for dichotomizing the length of time rehoused. Scatter plots of length of time rehoused, as a continuous variable, cross-tabulated with housing satisfaction ratings as both five and three categories were computed. Neither plot indicated a different time as a more appropriate break.

A reasonable explanation for length of time rehoused, as both a dichotomized and continuous variable, not statistically influencing housing satisfaction is the general favorable rating of housing quality. Note that 65% of the women (see Appendix J) rated their housing *quality* as good (“very good” or “good”). As discussed in the preceding “Background & Rationale” and “Summary” sections, neither Rent and Rent (1978), nor Berry and Weitzman (1993) found length of residence to have a significant impact on “neighborhood satisfaction” or “housing comfort.” It was Schwartz and Devance-Manzini’s (1993) findings that deteriorating housing conditions led some families to return to the shelter, on the average after 22 months of being rehoused, which resulted in the development of this primary

research question. Because many of the families in this current research were rehoused in housing that was still in good condition, the impact of their housing tenure on their housing satisfaction was not a factor for the period of time under study.

Differences in Quality Ratings

Although respondents' ratings of the qualities of their apartment, building, and neighborhood did impact differently on housing satisfaction (see Appendix I), apartment quality ratings did not have the greatest impact on housing satisfaction. A simultaneous multiple regression, with the length of time rehoused and the three quality ratings, was calculated to determine the ratings' relative impact on housing satisfaction. The equation indicates that the rating of neighborhood quality resulted in the biggest change in housing satisfaction, followed by apartment, then building quality (β s of .3203, .3123 and .2567 respectively). It should be noted that the difference in the neighborhood and apartment quality β s are very small and not significantly different.

It was anticipated that the area a respondent can control most effectively, her apartment, would impact the most on her housing satisfaction. However, the setting least controllable by the respondents had a slightly greater impact on their housing satisfaction. It may be that the inability to control the quality of the neighborhood as "easily" as one can control the quality of an apartment (e.g., by painting, having the management maintain it) may account for its impact on housing satisfaction. Unlike the primarily positive ratings of the quality of the apartment and building, most respondents, 40%, rated their neighborhood

quality as fair; 32% rated it as good (“very good” or “good”) and 28% rated it as poor (“poor” or “very poor”) (see Appendix I). The impact of neighborhood quality on housing satisfaction may reflect several realities including the fact that most of the housing for formerly homeless families is located in low-income, distressed areas, with few services, high crimes rates and few opportunities for changing the poor neighborhood conditions.

Additional Analyses

Housing Type

The type of housing in which a respondent was rehoused was investigated to determine if it impacted on housing satisfaction. Almost half of the respondents, 18 women, were rehoused at the large complex, which was fairly new, only four years old, and well maintained. This complex, in addition to many of the other residences seen during the interviewing was housing stock in excellent to very good condition, as assessed by this researcher’s casual observations¹¹. These 18 women, in addition to the three other women who resided at other sites, were categorized as residing in a “complex” for a cross-tabulation with housing satisfaction. To explore the possible impact of the type of housing “complex” versus “scatter-site,” a cross-tabulation of this variable with housing satisfaction was computed. Although many more of the women living in the complex sites reported that they were “satisfied” compared to the women at the numerous scatter sites, respectively

¹¹ Environmental inventories of the housing were not conducted.

65% versus 35%, the correlations from the cross-tabulation were not statistically significant, the $r = -.186$.

The next steps of the quantitative analyses included computing a multiple regression¹² with all the important rating scales (i.e., satisfaction, quality, safety concerns, and ratings of safety) and length of time rehoused as a continuous variable. Although several of the variables of interest did not have a significant correlation with housing satisfaction, they were included because they were predicted to have an impact on housing satisfaction, and the computation of this multiple regression was done to explore their relative impact on housing satisfaction. This regression equation, consisting of 16 variables, was computed as a simultaneous regression to ensure that even variables that were not significantly correlated with housing satisfaction were included (see Appendix H). This model accounted for 76% of the variance, which is good but not too surprising considering the number of variables included. A review of this model's partial correlations, and their probability, indicated that only five variables had a significant impact on housing satisfaction, in this order: neighborhood satisfaction, housing quality, personal security in the neighborhood, child's security in the neighborhood, and child's security in the building.

¹² A multiple regression was also computed with all 18 respondents of the large complex treated as 1 data point, resulting in a total of 23 data points. This model was similar to the pattern described for 40 data points.

Qualitative Analysis: Major Themes

Although the presentation of the findings from the analysis of the quantitative data reveals some of the components of housing satisfaction for the respondents, it is only part of their stories. In order to understand what these ratings reflected about the lives of formerly homeless women living in situations which they had little control in choosing, it is imperative that we move beyond the numerical analysis. In the following sections vignettes and quotes from interviews with the participants are presented. They allow the reasons for the housing satisfaction ratings to be understood within the context of the women's lives. The vignettes and quotes are taken primarily from the responses to that question "Why did you give that rating?" but also from wherever the themes were expressed throughout the interview. The first section discusses the meta-theme - the "...but..." clause, and the following sections present the dominant themes which emerged from the analysis of the questions on reasons for housing satisfaction.

As described in a previous section "Content Analysis and Coding Schemes," the open-ended responses to the follow-up questions, the reasons for the ratings of quality of the apartment, the building, and the neighborhood, and housing satisfaction, were coded based on themes from the review of the literature, and those that emerged from the data. The major themes that emerged from the reasons for the quality of, and satisfaction with, the various housing components included:

- **Structural or Locational Aspects** - This includes both unchangeable (e.g., the location of the building) and changeable (e.g., the "newness" of an apartment) features of a structure,

usually a building or an apartment. It also includes services and amenities available in the building, but primarily the neighborhood (e.g., access to shopping, the ease of transportation); and the upkeep and maintenance of the building and the neighborhood, primarily by the superintendent or management, but also by the residents.

- Safety and Crime - Security issues for both the respondent and her child in their apartment, building and neighborhood. This category includes the management's provision of security; general mentions of crimes; specific mentions of drug-related crime or activities; and violence to self and others (e.g., fights with neighbors, shootings in the neighborhood).
- Interpersonal - This category includes relationships and activities with family and friends both inside and outside of the respondent's apartment. It also encompasses relationships with neighbors in the building and the neighborhood, and relationships with the building staff.
- Affective - This category was used when respondents provided answers that included emotional responses such as comfort, "hominess," privacy, like or dislike, and ownership/possession (e.g. "It's mine").
- Other - The "other" category includes mentions of affordability or value, and other responses difficult to categorize in the other groups.

Because most respondents provided responses that could be coded into more than one category, the answers were coded using SPSS's multiple response option. Appendix L indicates that responses are reported as both a percentage of all the responses given (because of the multiple codes) and as a percentage of the women who provided such a response. "% of cases."

Initially, this author attempted to further break down the coding into “positive” and “negative” responses. After a careful review of all of the responses and the coding scheme, this approach was rejected because of the meta theme, the “...but...” clause. As will be explained in more detail in the next section, most responses conveyed respondents’ ambivalence towards their housing, and their awareness of its limitations (e.g., for management to provide safety outside the building). Coding such responses as either “negative” or “positive” would have been misleading. Coding them instead as “mixed” or “ambivalent” would not have been useful or informative, therefore the responses were instead analyzed for content and frequency of response.

Qualifying Housing Satisfaction: “...but there’s room for improvement...”

Despite the initial appearance of predominately positive ratings of the quality of (see Appendix J), and the satisfaction with (see Appendix K) the apartment, building, and housing, most respondents qualified, or modified their answers in the follow-up question, “Why did you give that rating?.” Many fewer respondents rated the quality of their neighborhood as good, 32%, or their satisfaction with their neighborhood as satisfied, 52%. Many respondents used a “...but...” clause to contrast some positive feature of one housing component with a negative feature. Frequently the comparisons were between positive features of the apartment, or the building, with the poor conditions of, or safety concerns within, the neighborhood.

Carol M.¹³ is a 28 year old Black woman. She is a single-parent of three children ages 3, 4, and 6 years. At the time of the interview, Carol had lived in her apartment for 29 months, and had been homeless for 18 months prior to rehousing. She resides in the large complex of 150 families, both formerly homeless and low-income, described earlier. She rated the quality of all of the components of her housing (i.e., apartment, building, neighborhood, and housing) as “good.” She reported that she was either “satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” with these same housing components. She considers her apartment to be her home and reported good relations with most of her neighbors and the building staff. However, her reasons for her quality and satisfaction ratings conveyed a sense of basic dissatisfaction. The major sources of

¹³ Respondents are identified using a pseudonym and their interview numbers.

her dissatisfaction were the lack of services in the neighborhood and her concerns about safety in the neighborhood. Her comparison of her building to the neighborhood is poignant:

It's good, but it could be better.... It could be better, you know, they could better the neighborhood. See, this is a nice place where we live at, right, but I feel they built it in a wrong area, the wrong neighborhood.'Cause to me, this is like a little castle in a jungle. As I say, it's like a mansion in a jungle, and it could be better. It's real nice but, it could be better. (R # 46)

Her solution to making the neighborhood better focuses on bringing social services into the community and renovating the abandoned buildings:

What's not good, they can better it. Try to get the money they need for the day care... What's broken they can fix it and make sure it don't break down again or whatever.... The abandoned buildings that are down, I would fix up. I would put centers for the kids to go play in the afternoon. You know, put a pool maybe, a little park that they can play, um, you know just fix them. 'Cause so many people are homeless, you know, and there's so many abandoned buildings that could be fixed up for the homeless, and you know, get the homeless off the street. Have counseling areas for kids that have problems, runaways, druggies and all of that.

Several other participants also expressed similar mixed feelings, although things were

“OK” they could be better -- oftentimes much better:

It's a roof over my head, and it's fairly decent. It's better than what I came from and what I had.

(Donna J., a 37 year old Black woman, single parent of 3 children. Rehoused 53 months in a complex of 36 units. R # 28)

Because there is always room for improvement. And for the better, I always want better.

(Lucy P., a 29 year old Hispanic, part of a two-parent household with 4 children. Rehoused 72 months in a complex of 36 units. R # 26)

I'm satisfied with my apartment...and the building but, I just hate the neighborhood.
(Genny C., a 21 year old Black woman, single parent of 2 children. Rehoused 30 months in the large 150 unit complex. R # 36)

I'm somewhat satisfied because I come here, and I got my own place now, and like I could have been living in a worser dump than this, you know.I don't call this the pits, you know, I call this more or less fair housing.

(Shelly L., a 35 year old Black woman. Two-parent household with 2 children. Rehoused for 32 months in the large 150 unit complex. R # 39)

I like the building. I like the setup. But the area and the neighborhood isn't all that great. So I can only be somewhat satisfied.

(Mimi H., a 30 year old Black woman. All 4 of her children are in foster care. Rehoused for 15 months in the large 150 unit complex. R # 40)

In response to their dissatisfaction with the neighborhood, but basic satisfaction with their apartments and/or buildings, some respondents suggested moving the building to another neighborhood:

If I could move to Manhattan and take this apartment with me, I would be so happy.And maybe the reason why I like this apartment so much is because it's my first. I like the (layout) too because a lot of these apartments in this building, the rooms are together but it's more private in here.

(Debbie J., a 32 year old Black women, single parent of 1 child. Rehoused 37 months in a scatter-site apartment [number of units unknown]. R # 25)

Although respondents' ambivalence about their housing focused primarily on dissatisfaction with the neighborhood, this sentiment pervaded many of the responses to the reasons for the housing satisfaction ratings. The ambivalence may be a function of the more reflective task of answering the "Why?" follow-up questions. When shown a rating guide some respondents may have picked the response they thought was expected or acceptable. However, the follow-up questions allowed them to describe their feelings without *all* of the confines imposed by the rating guides. The rating deflation as reflected by the "...but..." clause needs to be used as a filter to interpret respondents' reasons for their housing satisfaction.

Within this framework of respondents' concerns despite the primarily positive rating of housing satisfaction, the themes which emerged from the qualitative analysis of the reasons for these rating can be presented. Three dominant themes emerged: safety and crime; changeable aspects of the structure; and interpersonal relationships (see Appendix J). A more detailed analysis of these themes revealed that they were tied to a particular setting: safety and concerns about crime in the neighborhood (reported by 89% of the respondents), changeable structural aspects, specifically the maintenance of the apartment and the building, (reported by 75% of the women), and interpersonal relationships with family, friends, neighbors, and building staff (reported by 63% of the respondents). These themes were interwoven. For example, when women discussed maintenance aspects of their apartment, their responses also included comments regarding the maintenance of the building and grounds, and often their relationships with the super and/or other building staff. Similarly when the respondents discussed their concerns about safety, included were discussions about how neighbors, both in the building and the neighborhood, can aid or erode one's sense of safety. The role of the design of the building and the security provided by the management connects issues of safety in the neighborhood to interpersonal relationships with the building staff. Although the structure of the interview, and even this analysis attempted to separate, or make distinct, the physical and emotional boundaries between the apartment and the building and the neighborhood, the respondents' awareness that the areas can - and do- blend and intersect, nonetheless emerged.

Safety in the Neighborhood:

“You don’t hear of that many people getting killed or robbed.”

As discussed, respondents’ ambivalence regarding the quality of and satisfaction with their housing, and the awareness that things should be better -but could also be worse- is an overarching theme which permeates most of the interviews. The above quote, from Tamika S., 26 year old Black woman, who had been rehoused for 40 months in a scatter-site apartment building of approximately 80 units¹⁴, illustrates this theme as it pertains to issues of safety in the neighborhood. As noted, 89% of the respondents cited issues regarding safety and crime as the reason for their housing satisfaction (see Appendix L). When asked to rate their personal and children’s safety in the neighborhood on a 5-point rating scale ranging from “extremely concerned” to “not at all concerned” most of the women, 80%, were either “extremely” or “somewhat concerned” about their overall personal safety in their neighborhoods (see Appendix M). Even more respondents, 92%, expressed such concerns about their children’s overall safety in the neighborhood. In addition to rating their level of concern respondents also rated their safety, and their children’s safety in the neighborhood (see Appendix N).

Veronica F. is a 39 year old Black woman. She is the single-parent of four children, three of whom are minors, ages 7, 8 and 10. At the time of the interview she had been rehoused for 30 months in the large complex that houses both formerly

¹⁴ Respondent # 21

homeless and low-income families. Although she was satisfied with the quality of her apartment and building, she expressed dissatisfaction with the neighborhood, based mainly on her concerns for her safety and that of her children. She discussed her strategies for teaching her children to protect themselves. Her concerns for safety included an awareness of the difficulties of controlling possible dangers and her feelings that the housing management should be more concerned about the residents' safety issues:

Basically I just watch [my children] close as I can, tryin' to let go and tryin' to hold on too, and tellin' them, you know tell them listen... Tellin' them, "don't you see the news?" "Look at the news." It's very frightening, very frightening. R # 43

Veronica rated her personal safety in the neighborhood as poor, and her children's as very poor. She indicated that she ultimately is the person responsible for protecting her children:

I mean, since we're supposed to be like protected. But it's poor because nobody is really gonna look out for me and my children but me. ...It stops with me. [My children's safety is] very poor, if I'm not there you know tryin' to watch them and take care of them.If I'm not gonna go see about them, if I'm not gonna be out there and see what they doin', then forget it, 'cause nobody else is.

Veronica's dissatisfaction with the level of safety in her neighborhood also extended to more general concerns about her neighborhood. She did not spend time with anyone in the neighborhood, nor did she want to:

I don't know them... I don't want to spend time with anyone here. I'm afraid - I don't know who to trust. It just creates problems in your life.

Her concerns about her safety and general dissatisfaction with the neighborhood were voiced by other respondents:

There are drugs right across the street. When I take my kids to school around the corner, they's selling right across the street. (R # 36)¹⁵

This is the pit stop. Nobody cares. Everybody does what they want. A cop could be standing right there and they'd be selling drugs. You call cops and it would takes half-an-hour. You could be dead.... The neighborhood. It's like...the people that live in this neighborhood. It's like it's a certain class of people that live in this neighborhood. Like all the rejects were put here. If I knew that, I wouldn't have moved here. Because I did go to school and I know how to talk and I know how to try to be peaceful. But if I try to talk peace here, It's like, I'm a chicken, I'm scared. So all that does is make that person just want to hurt you even more. (Marie P., a 39 year old Hispanic, single parent of one child. Rehoused for 50 months in a scatter-site apartment within a building of approximately 20 units. R # 24)

Several researchers (Cook, 1988; Rent & Rent, 1978), found that safety concerns were the best predictor of housing satisfaction and that was supported by this research. As discussed earlier, the simultaneous regression of all the important rating scales (see Appendix H), indicated that safety concerns, both personal and for their children, in the building and in the neighborhood, were predictive of housing satisfaction. Moving from the larger, less controllable domain of the neighborhood, the next dominant theme for reasons of housing satisfaction was satisfaction with maintenance of the apartment and/or building.

¹⁵ If information about the respondent was already provided in an earlier vignette or quote, that information is not repeated. See Appendix O for a table of most of this basic identifying information.

Apartment And Building Maintenance: “I’ve seen worse.”

The second most frequently cited reason for housing satisfaction, mentioned by 75% of the respondents, was the maintenance of the apartment and/or the building (see Appendix L). Most respondents, 92%, were satisfied with their apartment, and 90% were satisfied with their buildings (see Appendix K). Yet, despite these overwhelmingly positive satisfaction ratings, the responses denote the women’s awareness of the problems and the limitations of their housing. Only 52% reported that they were satisfied with their neighborhoods.

Nancy G. is a 21 year old Black woman. She is the single-parent of 2 children, and she has been rehoused, in a scatter-site apartment, in a building of approximately 25 units, for 7 months. She rated her housing satisfaction as “neutral” because “There’s some things I like and some things I don’t like.” She indicates that although she tries to maintain her apartment, it is harder to do with the building, and she is unhappy with the neighborhood:

I try my best to keep [my apartment] up.... It’s like a whole different world in here....it’s just some place to escape to... I don’t like the neighborhood.

I think it would have been a very good building but it’s coming down... Sometimes its very noisy and sometimes the building is not as clean as it should be.
(R # 20)

Distinguishing between the quality of, or satisfaction with, the apartment versus the building and/or neighborhood was not uncommon for these respondents. As part of the modifying, or the deflating of the housing satisfaction rating, some women expressed an

expectation that things, usually the quality of the building, would get worse soon, as did

Nancy G. above, and others:

My apartment is good 'cause it still looks the same it did when I moved in, I mean it's still in good condition.

The building is good 'cause it's not filthy, it's not extremely filthy or infested - at least not to look at it. A couple of the trees and the bushes might have been a little destroyed but still it's not bad...that's what made it so beautiful when I moved here...Everything is just O.K.

(Jenny P., a 27 year old Black woman. Single mother of four children. Rehoused in the large complex for 28 months. R # 37).

They don't take care of things right away. They wait until they become disasters.... I'm satisfied I have a roof over my head. As for the quality -- it stinks!
(R # 24)

Not all the respondents gave positive ratings of housing satisfaction. Marie H. is a 23 year old Black woman, the single parent of two children, ages 6 years, and 7 months. She has lived in her very poorly renovated ground floor, scatter-site apartment for 16 months. The building is small, approximately 10 units. She is very dissatisfied with the upkeep of her building and apartment. In fact she is the only respondent who provided a rating of "very dissatisfied" with her housing:

I don't believe that it should take over a year and a half to get repairs done. The superintendent should be around more. I have to buy supplies to make my own repairs. He doesn't recycle, he stopped sweeping. Someone's shirt is on the ground in front of my door. They don't make an effort. The super pays homeless people \$1 or \$2 to clean up and they don't do a good job. There are needles from a (diabetic) neighbor and crack vials in the back of the building. Super does a rush job at cleaning. The gates are not locked... No one comes to the tenants' meetings...
(R # 01)

When asked what she would do to improve her housing she replied:

Change the owners. Choose one who is not trying to see the building "go to hell in a hand basket."

Illustrating how these three dominant themes are interwoven, respondents' satisfaction with the building staff, often only an on-site superintendent, is part of both their feelings about the maintenance of their apartment and/or building, and their interpersonal relationships within the building. Relationships with family, friends, neighbors - both in the building and the neighborhood - and the building staff, was the third dominant theme which emerged from the analysis of the reasons for housing satisfaction responses.

Interpersonal Relationships

The interpersonal relationships that respondents discussed as affecting their housing satisfaction focused on two primary subgroups: family and friends, and people in the building and/or neighborhood. Most women, 63%, reported such issues as reasons for their housing satisfaction (see Appendix L). A more detailed analysis of this sub-group of women revealed that 65% discussed relationships with family and friends and 73%, discussed relationships with people in the building and/or neighborhood. Many women discussed both, especially when friends were also neighbors. The findings for these two sub-analyses will be discussed separately.

In addition to the analyses of the reasons for housing satisfaction, other questions in the interview are used to support this analysis. Interview sections included as part of this analysis are: "Relationships with Building Tenants," "Relationships with Other People in the Neighborhood," and "Social Networks-Relationships with Family and Friends" which all examined the existence and extent of social relationships and networks. Respondents' relationships with people in the building and/or neighborhood will be discussed first. These relationships encompassed concerns about the borrowing and possible non-repayment of resources, the loss of privacy and feeling threatened.

Social Networks in the Building and Neighborhood:

“So the less I have to do with them, the less they knock on my door to borrow things.”

There were two major sub-themes voiced by the women who reported relationships with people in the building and/or neighborhood as having an impact on their housing satisfaction: first, concerns that forming relationships with neighbors would result in their borrowing resources (e.g., money, diapers) and/or a loss of privacy; and secondly, concerns over possible conflict with neighbors and/or building staff.

Borrowing Resources & Privacy Issues

To better understand how respondents interacted with the people in their building and neighborhood, the analysis of their responses to a series of questions about their relationships with people in the building and in the neighborhood is included. Respondents were asked if they spent time with people in the building and/or the neighborhood, and why. If they did spend any time, they were asked to report what activities they took part in (e.g., shopping, baby-sitting), how many people did they do these activities with, would they like to spend the “same,” “more,” or “less” time with them, and reasons for that answer. Although most respondents did report that they said “hello” to at least one neighbor, most women also expressed a desire to limit their interactions with neighbors in the building, and especially with people in the neighborhood. A desire to limit contact with neighbors because of concerns about neighbors borrowing items, and losing their privacy were the major themes expressed by women when asked about their relationships with neighbors in the

building, and in the neighborhood.

Eighty-two percent of the respondents reported that they spent time with people in their building (e.g., visiting each other). Almost 13% indicated that they only greeted them in passing, and 5% reported that they had no contact, not even minimal greetings, with their building neighbors. For similar interactions with people in the community the breakdown was 65% spent time, 5% only greeted in passing, and 30% had no contact. All of the women who indicated that they *only* greeted their neighbors, or avoided contact with them - both in the building or the neighborhood - gave as their primary reason the desire to maintain their privacy and limit their neighbors' borrowing items and/or resources from them (e.g., food, phone use, money). Concerns about being taken advantage of, by having a neighbor borrow frequently and/or without reciprocity, was expressed more often about neighbors in the building than in the community. These concerns about protecting privacy and the depletion of resources such as food, diapers, and phone use, were also frequently voiced by those women who did have contact with neighbors in the building, and people in the community.

Nancy G. was described earlier. She indicated that she no longer spends time with any of her building neighbors and recounts why:

I seem to kind of avoid the neighbors. I avoid too much relationships with the people here. At one time there was a lady that lived here, she came from the shelter. Because we were at the [office] for Section 8 housing...to sign a lease at the same time, she got pretty friendly. There was times she needed carfare and then the stories got even more sad. Pathetic. To the point where it was almost a problem. Or it could have been if I'd been naive enough to keep giving [money] to her. But I believe she had to be on drugs and I wasn't going to be used.

I just really don't want to know nobody around here. Neighbors can be a

pest to you. If you don't really get to know them -- or watch them so I could get to see where their mind is, or where they're going before you could become friends with them. They could be your worst enemies. (R # 20)

Susan B. is a 38 year old Black woman who has been rehoused for 7 months in an apartment in a scatter-site, 90 unit apartment building, which houses other formerly homeless families. She is the single-parent of a 15 year old son. She indicated her reasons for limiting her interactions with neighbors:

'Cause we spent time in New York in the shelter for one year and we found problems. ... ever since I got here, [the neighbors] always want something from you, they always want money, they always want to borrow something, and they don't want to replace it. And they will borrow anything! They ask me for catsup, salt, pepper, my money. They wait for you on payday. So, to avoid that, we don't speak to them, that's why we didn't join the tenant patrol. I don't want to know no extra people and I don't want my son to have any problems. Because I told him if they found out that he was working, they would wait for him, they would look for him, I would have to help him out.

I'm not interested in [spending time with neighbors] that's not me. I'm not interested in the neighbors. Now, before I was interested in being friendly, understanding your situation, understanding more about New York where to go, and they were very helpful, but they were also very helpful to my money! So, I'm not interested in knowing anyone.

It's easier if your friends are far away, then they don't come to your house to borrow. A lot of these people in New York, all they ever want is for you to do something for them or they want to borrow or borrow money. And, everybody I've met, especially see in the shelter everybody's poor. They want to borrow... A lot of people are on drugs. (R # 27)

Similar reasons for avoiding all but minimal contact with neighbors in the building were related by several other women.

Lisa T. is 23 year old Black woman. Her very energetic toddler, age 2, was entertaining us during the interview. Lisa has lived in her scatter-site apartment for 37 months. It is in a building of about 70 units, and houses several formerly

homeless families. Lisa knew several of these families because they had stayed in the same transitional shelter:

Just social, "hello, how you doing?" and "good day"! More than that starts trouble. When you start getting personal that's when problems start.... Because certain people are phony and I am a sucker for a sob story...I am not a good judge of character! (R # 29)

'Cause I'm not a people person. I like to stay to myself basically...I mean, they come here to knock on the door and they want to borrow this - and then they want to borrow that. And half the people in the building, most of the people that's in the building be all on welfare. I have one child - my child. Everybody else got kids - you have kids. So the less I have to do with them, the less they knock on my door to borrow things. (R #25)

Not all the respondents tried to limit their contact with neighbors. Two women indicated their reasons for why they spent time with neighbors in their buildings. Three other respondents also indicated that they spent time with neighbors. Only one respondent talked about spending time with people outside her building.

Amy B. is a 24 year old Black woman. She is the single-parent of two children. She lives in a scatter-site, renovated apartment, in a building of approximately 24 units, which houses some other formerly homeless families. She has lived in this apartment for 9 months. She does spend time with neighbors in her building and enjoys it. She describes what she does with a neighbor, and how it benefits her:

'Cause [me and the girl downstairs] are young mothers, we go shopping together, food shopping, clothes shopping. Sometimes I go over there and they come over here.I look up to her, she's about 30, she has a car, her house is very nice, she has two older kids. And I look up to her 'cause she young and has herself together. She works, she drives, she's like a big sister. Like a role model....

[I would like to spend] a little more time with some people. 'Cause I'm getting to know what they're about. See what I'm actually around and what surroundings is in this particular building....

I don't think its very important to get myself involved with a lot of people that live outside the building. 'Cause you never know what you might get into. (R # 18)

Marie H. was described earlier. Although, she was very unhappy with her housing she managed to express mostly good feelings about her building neighbors. She indicated her reasons for spending time with her neighbors:

Because we knew each other from the shelter and I wanted to lend my support and expertise to these younger women... to help them adjust. You know I moved in about 3 to 5 months before everyone else. (R # 1)

Barbara M. is a 30 year old Black woman, part of a two-parent household with three children. She has lived in the large complex site for 30 months and seems to enjoy the opportunities such a setting provides in promoting interactions with neighbors:

Most of the time we work together. We do playground monitor together. We do Teen Center. We just like to talk. We plan parties and things for these kids. It's a whole lot we just do together as a community. So we try to get as many of our neighbors involved as possible. We get tickets together. We take the kids on field trips. We attend meetings. We in each other's house eating, watching TV, we go to the movies together, to plays. It's whole lot that we do.

Well, I'm involved with everybody. I try to be involved with everybody, but there's only like, four that I'm really, really close with.

I want to spend the same amount of time I'm spending now 'cause I got to have time for my own family and my own kids and my husband. (R # 30)

Myrna R. is a 31 year old Hispanic woman. She is single-parent of two children, ages 18 months and 5 years. She has been rehoused for 12 months in a 16 unit, scatter-site apartment which was completely renovated. Several of the other families in the building are also formerly homeless:

Umm, I was going to school, so I was never home, and when I got home, I mean I was so exhausted I just, you know, I'm taking care of the kids, I'm cooking,

cleaning, looking forward to the next day, so I never really took time to really hang out with folks.

We always say hello to each other, but I'm never in and out of anyone else's house. I mean, a neighbor, on my floor, being that she has a daughter, she invited me over to a couple of her parties, like Halloween and her daughter's birthday, you know, like that, I'll spend like an hour or two. If she needs anything she'll come knocking on my door, like that. She's probably the only one that I really... no, we've never used each other's phones. We'll borrow movies for example, you know. Or, if she needs milk, or you know, just little things, you know, nothing,... You know, I don't trust anybody. (R # 23)

June W. is a 23 year old Black woman who has been rehoused for 54 months in a scatter-site apartment, in a building of 50 units. She is the single-parent of one child. She is one of the few respondents who explicitly stated that they spend time with people in the neighborhood. Because she has lived in this community for almost 5 years, she may have made friends since moving there:

I have two good friends up the block and down the block. We exchange favors, baby sit, shop, socialize and hang out.... [We spend time] 'cause we have a lot in common and I get along well with them. (R # 50)

Conflict with Others

The second sub-theme focused on respondents' concerns about potential conflict with neighbors and/or building staff. Relationships with other building neighbors was mentioned more often than interactions with neighbors in the community because most respondents did not attempt to socialize within the community. Often this was due to a concern for safety, busy schedules, or just a general lack of interest.

Maria P. a 39 year old Hispanic woman is a single parent of one child. She has lived in her scatter-site apartment for 50 months. Her building has approximately 20

units. Maria reported that she interacted with her building neighbors in the form of hallway conversations with other formerly homeless families, and helping the non-English speaking neighbors read notices, mail, etc. She maintained these relationships primarily with other residents on her floor, and these largely positive feelings do not extend to other neighbors in the building. She expressed strong negative feelings about both building neighbors and people in the community. Most of her concerns focused on threats to her safety:

Like I told you before, it's just the whole -- the lifestyle that you have to adapt to. I can't go downstairs because you're afraid of a flying bullet. Or you're afraid if you touch a child on the head because you turn too fast, that the parent's going to take it like, "you hit my child." And all the bad "b" words and all the "f" words. That's all there is. It's not like you say, "Listen, my child said this, come in and talk to me." There's no talk. There's no communicating.

It's all violence. I don't even wear jewelry. My daughter likes jewelry. I don't wear jewelry. 'Cause especially if you have jewelry on, that's what they want. They want to fight you so they could take off your jewelry. They don't really want to fight you, they just want to take off whatever you got....

If you complain to the landlord (that) certain people are doing this, the tenants would have some kind of reprimand or something to keep the control. If when you call the cops and they would come and assist you like they're supposed to, that they would do their job, I think there would be a little more respect.

It's like everybody has turned their back. Nobody cares. And when you don't care, a lot of bad things happen. Because you have to be concerned about somebody else besides yourself. So that you can make something better of the neighborhood. But if you don't care and if you say "Well, even though she's been a nice lady, the hell with it. I want the watch." Because there's no consequences. They rob you -there's no consequences. Nobody is going to go to jail, nothing is going to be done. (R # 24)

Although admittedly atypical of the responses, a few women recognized the role of their housing in the larger community and welcomed being involved with their neighborhood.

Ellen O. is a 35 year old Black woman. She has lived in the large complex for just

over 2 years, and she and her partner have three children in their household. She indicated a real interest in becoming involved with the surrounding community on both a personal level and through the involvement of her building complex:

Because to me the quality of the building is still here after three years. Everybody figured it wouldn't look this good by now...because it is in [neighborhood name]. You understand what I'm saying? By being in this neighborhood it's going to be -- it's called a little mini-project. But they figured it wasn't going to last this long. But you got people here that really care. This is where you and your kids going to live. You have to do something. And you look at it as like changing the community of [neighborhood]. Because who would be fool enough to build a building like this in [neighborhood]? And you know the community wants to see that if they can do it and they're O.K. why can't we do it? So we trying to get the outside projects and stuff like that. People be looking like "What do y'all have in here? What can y'all do for me in here?" We try to help them...

...the kids on the outside be coming in here to see what the recreation department be having. Like "When you goin' to start a basketball team?" Or "When they going to start a football team? I want to join!" So the outside kids could have something to do. We just opened the gym at [public school] from 3:00-6:00. And that's for the outside kids too. It's not just for kids in [the large complex]. We try to get the community to get involved with us. There's still a lot of work to be done in this part of the neighborhood. We want to build a park across the street. Not just for us, for everybody instead of walking three or four blocks to go to another park. They got this big empty lot there. Let's do something with it. So that's why I'm not neither [satisfied nor dissatisfied] because it can be done. They just want to give you the run around. But if all of us get together, it can be done. (R # 31)

Other than relations with neighbors, interactions with the building staff, usually regarding issues of maintenance and/or safety were most often cited by the respondents who identified interpersonal relationships as a source of housing satisfaction.

Because the security's here.....You know, and I don't really get into no fights or anything with people in here. You know, I go in and I go out, and when I feel like I want to sit on a bench with my girlfriend you know we don't argue or fight with other neighbors or people, so...

(Shelly L., a 35 year old Black woman. Part of a two-parent household with two children. Rehoused 32 months in the large complex. R # 39)

I think the management could do more, if they came around more often maybe.It's clean. It's pretty much quiet. There's really not too much noise like in other places. And basically the people in general are nice. I don't have any complaints, really. I'm happy with it compared to what I had.

(Eileen A., a 41 year old Hispanic woman. Part of a two-parent household with three children. Rehoused in a complex of 36 units for 54 months. R # 48)

I mean, this building is like fairly new, and the two (repair) problems I had, they got taken care of right away, so, there's no urgency or something really terrible.... I've never had any complaints as far as heat or hot water. Being the apartment's brand new, and me being the first tenant, I'm satisfied with that, so. It's kept clean, the garbage gets picked up regularly, they have the recycling and they reinforce that. The laundry room stays clean, never dirty, there's never any garbage, they have no smoking signs out on the building.... Mainly, let's see, I feel safe here....

And you know, like when we talked about with the tenants, the management you know not communicating with us. You know, I would hate to see such a good building, and then the people fall apart over lack of communications among the management. Then they (management) just like, "Oh to hell with it!", and just let the building, and it just falls apart, because it's an excellent building, you know, and the people that live in it, aren't...they're not bad. But then when they don't see a strong part as far as you know the management, you know, they don't care, then why should I care? (R # 23)

The interpersonal relationships that are important in these women's lives are not limited to their interactions with their neighbors in their buildings. They include family and friends with whom they have contact in a variety of ways. These types of social relationships will be discussed next.

Social Connections With Friends And Family:

“It depends on who I’m getting help from.”

The second subgroup of interpersonal relationships which was discussed as a source of housing satisfaction was that of social networks with family and friends. To supplement respondents’ answers to that question (see Appendix L), responses from the “Social Networks” section of the interview are integrated. Respondents were asked a series of questions about their relationships with family and friends. The social connections of these respondents that emerged from the analysis of those responses were as follows. All of the respondents were able to name at least one person with whom they had regular, usually daily, contact. This person(s) was usually a friend or a close family member. Contact with members of the social network was usually maintained by daily phone conversations, and often, daily visits (for neighbors). Most contacts involved some type of socializing, and often included the respondents’ children (e.g., going to the playground to hang out). Most respondents had people in their network who lived nearby, so seeing them was not usually a problem.

As another way of understanding the extent and the nature of these women’s social networks, several questions focused on whether people had stayed with the respondent since she had been rehoused, and if she could stay with others now. A third of the women had someone stay with them since they had been rehoused. Most often it was a parent or sibling who had come for a short visit of up to two weeks. About half, 56%, of the respondents had stayed with someone before they had become homeless. Very few women had stayed with

anyone since they were rehoused. However, almost all of the women reported that they could stay with someone in an emergency for unlimited periods of time (e.g., “as long as I want”). Respondents were asked how difficult it was to get help when they needed it. Most, 72%, reported that was either “somewhat” or “very easy” to get help.

When many of the women discussed their social networks, they expressed an awareness that they could go to someone for help if needed, but also a reluctance to depend upon this help because of many of the concerns regarding reciprocity, and fears of being taken advantage of discussed earlier:

Maria P.’s description of why she has not stayed with anyone since being rehoused captures many of the respondents’ feelings about the obligations of social ties:

No, I never bothered my relatives. I always...my relatives basically say that you have to take care of yourself. That’s the way I was raised up. You don’t bother them, the family for nothing. So basically I took care of myself. I mainly rely on my friends for whatever.

I stayed with my friends. Yeah, different friends like if I go to spend the night. Like if I’m going out and then I just stay there in their house. Just like not to come home late.

I could stay with my friend Ruthy. She wants me to move with her. She got so many boyfriends. That’s the part I don’t like. She don’t really care [how long I would stay]. I just don’t like the parties -- she’s a party person. [I could also stay with] Daisy and with Hal. If I told Hal right now “I’m homeless.” He’ll say “Well, you’re homeless because you want to be homeless but, you could stay anywhere here.”

He doesn’t care but, I don’t like to impose on people either. ‘Cause their living arrangement might not be big enough for them to be comfortable, let alone me be comfortable. So I’m kind of independent. I don’t like to depend on anyone. I could stay with Hal until I’m on my feet. Same with Daisy. I wouldn’t stay in my dad’s house because he’d probably have me go to church....

....Well, it would be somewhat difficult to [get help]. Because I would be inconveniencing them too at the same time. I wouldn’t want to do it. But if I didn’t have a choice, I think I would. There wouldn’t be a problem with that. But I like living on my own. I don’t like living with people. I like living ...I have my own place and I do as I please. You go to people’s houses and.... I realize though, when you become homeless it’s O.K., it’s good when you have a friend and they might

tolerate but, you could see inside that they don't feel comfortable because you're really taking their privacy away too. So I don't take advantage of things. Because sometimes you impose on somebody and they're not in a position to help you. You could wreck their whole life too. And you could also lose a friend because they might feel like they're being taken advantage of also. So I wouldn't do that, unless I had no choice. But I'd seek all other alternatives before I would do that. Because that's the way I am. (R # 24)

As discussed earlier in the review of the research on the social networks of homeless people, most of the research has studied the connections of homeless, single men. Even when homeless families are included in the research (Shinn, Knickman & Weitzman, 1991), the findings are inconclusive. However, the findings from the present research support the view that not all homeless people have "worn out" their welcome. These women maintain frequent social connections to numerous family members and friends, who usually live within the same borough. Their social networks involve the exchange of a variety of resources and opportunities for social connections.

SUMMARY & DISCUSSION

Summary

This research was undertaken to discover the components of housing satisfaction for a group of formerly homeless families. The findings indicate the following for this group of respondents:

- *The length of time rehoused was not statistically significantly related to housing satisfaction.*

Housing tenure was chosen as a primary variable because it seemed to be an important factor in Schwartz and Devance-Manzini's (1993) study of families who reentered the shelter system. Reexamining the research presented in the other studies that investigated the impact of housing tenure on housing satisfaction (Berry & Weitzman, 1993; Rent & Rent, 1978), revealed that housing tenure had no impact on housing satisfaction. It is likely that it was the deteriorating housing conditions that Schwartz and Devance-Manzini's respondents faced - which occurred over almost two years - that led to their return to the shelter, not simply the passage of time. Because many of the respondents in this present research reported "good" quality ratings for their apartments and buildings, deteriorating housing was not as important a factor for them *now*. It can be speculated that if apartment and building maintenance is not maintained in the future, these respondents' housing satisfaction would be eroded by the worsening housing conditions. This was reflected by their qualifying "...but..." statements.

■ *There were no statistically significant distinctions among the ratings of quality of the housing components on housing satisfaction.*

The slightly greater impact of neighborhood, versus apartment and building quality, on housing satisfaction reflects respondents' balancing their ability to control the poor conditions in deteriorating, low-income neighborhoods with the more controllable, usually good conditions within their apartments. Because the neighborhood may pose more threats to the safety of themselves and their children, its quality may present a more immediate concern for respondents because of the many activities which must take place outside the household (e.g., laundry, shopping, going to school or work).

■ An analysis of the reasons provided for the housing satisfaction rating revealed an overarching meta-theme, and three dominant sub-themes as follows:

- *The meta-theme, the "...but..." clause used by most of the respondents deflated the predominately positive ratings of housing satisfaction. This served as a framework for the interpretation of the ratings, and the reasons for the ratings.*

Respondents' ambivalence towards their housing, expressed through their use of the "...but..." clause, filters seemingly positive ratings of housing satisfaction. As illustrated by the vignettes and quotes in the "Findings" sections, the "...but..." clause most frequently contrasted good features of a woman's apartment, or building, with the impoverished conditions of her neighborhood. The clause necessitates a reevaluation of the ratings. Without the dampening effect of the "but" clause, the ratings of the quality of, and satisfaction with, the apartment, building, and housing are overwhelmingly positive, when

the two highest categories are combined. However, this is much less so when the satisfaction, and particularly the quality ratings of the neighborhood are evaluated. Although most of the ratings are positive, the explanations given deflate the ratings because they modify the positive aspects.

- *The dominant sub-themes were safety concerns about neighborhood crime, concerns about the maintenance of the apartment and the building, and interpersonal relationships with friends and family, with neighbors and staff in the building, and people in the neighborhood.*

Discussion

Connections Between Safety Concerns, Social Networks and Social Organization

The first and third most cited reasons for housing satisfaction were concerns about safety in the neighborhood and interpersonal relationships with neighbors, building staff, friends and family. These reasons are closely linked and those connections can be placed in the context of residents' perceptions of the level of "social disorganization" (Sampson & Groves, 1989) or "social organization" (Sampson, 1991; Wilson, 1996) in their communities. Sampson and Groves posited that:

Low economic status, ethnic heterogeneity, residential mobility and family disruption lead to community social disorganization, which in turn increases in

crime and delinquency rates. A community's level of social organization is measured in terms of local friendship networks, control of street-corner teenage peer groups, and prevalence of organization participation. (p. 774)

Wilson (1996) identified three major dimensions of a neighborhood's social organization: (1) the prevalence, strength and interdependence of social networks; (2) the extent of collective supervision that the residents exercise and the degree of personal responsibility they assume in addressing neighborhood problems; and (3) the rate of resident participation in voluntary and formal organizations. Wilson categorized voluntary associations as street associations and parent-teacher organizations. Formal organizations were identified as churches and political party groups.

Within this context of social dis/organization respondents' reactions to their neighborhoods, especially the crime, and their decisions regarding forming social connections to their neighbors are better understood. These are vulnerable families who recently experienced homelessness and now have been rehoused in low-income, impoverished communities. As indicated by the two safety ratings, most respondents were very concerned with their personal safety, and that of their children, in the neighborhood. Although everyone is concerned with safety, it is understandable why it would be particularly important for women living in such housing circumstances. These women are the mothers (or grandmothers) of young children, and even when their apartment and building were secure, their ability to ensure their children's safety and their personal safety was limited once they left the more protective environment of their immediate housing. The very process of how New York City locates sites to be used for housing formerly homeless families guarantees that the housing will be placed in the poorest neighborhoods. These are

the neighborhoods where it is more likely that housing will be abandoned by landlords (*in rem*) because of the low profit such housing can generate (as rental housing) or the value of the housing (as private housing). These are the neighborhoods where it is less expensive for the City to build or renovate housing for people with low-incomes.

Social dis/organization theories would suggest that residents' concerns about their safety would lead them to feel little control over their housing, and much less so over the neighborhood conditions. This perception, in turn, may influence their willingness to form social bonds with neighbors and become involved in any community activities which could create positive changes in their communities. In addition, their recent homelessness and their experiences in the transitional shelters may make them reluctant to form new networks in their new communities.

In addition to the social dis/organization research, Stack's (1975) and Belle's (1982) research on social networks provides additional information within which to understand the respondents' attitudes towards social connections in the present research. Unlike Stack's and Belle's studies, and much of the social network research, this study did not attempt to collect information for a network analysis. Its goal was to collect basic information about respondents' social networks. One of the sub-themes revealed by the analysis of the social network questions is that respondents often avoided becoming involved with their building neighbors because they feared that such interactions would result in their being depleted of resources such as money, food, diapers, etc. The caution that respondents expressed about getting "too" involved with neighbors in their building indicates their awareness that social networks do not necessarily guarantee support. Belle (1982) describes the distinction:

The social relationships of low-income mothers do not automatically constitute a social *support* system for them. Instead, the cost of social ties must be weighed against their benefits to gain a complete picture of their importance for low-income women (p. 134).

Given the limited resources most of these women possessed, their decisions regarding whether to include building neighbors - both whom and under what circumstances - is understandable. Respondents indicated that they often felt the need to limit the intrusions. It may be risky to lend a neighbor a diaper because you may not get it back. For the short term it may be a better decision not to share, but in the long-term it can cause problems because you have not established the social connections necessary to ensure that others will share with you. Reciprocity - crucial for social networks to function "well" - assumes a satiable need, but when the vast, constant, and perhaps insatiable needs of your neighbors are considered in the context of low and rapidly dwindling resources (e.g., time-limited welfare, food stamp cuts, declining housing subsidies) you may decide not to share.

While respondents were cautious about forming bonds with neighbors, the women in this research were not isolated from social networks. Although they may choose to limit their contacts with people in the building and neighborhood for the reasons discussed, most also interacted with neighbors on a regular basis. In addition, all of the respondents were connected to family and friends outside of their immediate housing. Most expressed an ability to both offer and receive hospitality from people in their social networks.

The Relevance of Asking About "Housing Satisfaction"

This research generated many questions about the construct of housing satisfaction and its relevance to people living in circumstances similar to those of the respondents. Although some of the questions will be posed, many of the answers can only be addressed by future research in this area. The high satisfaction ratings of the building and the apartment versus the neighborhood seem, on the surface, inconsistent with the finding that 60% of the respondents wanted to move at some undefined time in the future. On one hand, given the mobility of Americans in general (Rossi, 1980), this may not be a startling finding. On the other hand, it does raise the question of what kind of information was captured by the ratings. The "...but..." clause, as explained earlier, highlights some reasons to be cautious about what information was captured by the rating scales. What are the limitations of this construct and does it ignore the oppression of these women's lives? Does it attempt to minimize the subtle demand characteristics caused by having the interviewers in a respondent's home? For women in such impoverished conditions, is "satisfaction" *just* staying stably housed? The desire to move implies a general sense of dissatisfaction, acknowledging that the current housing is meeting short-term but not long-term needs for more space, privacy, etc. Many of the women raised issues related to their children when they discussed their satisfaction with their housing. Is housing satisfaction linked to self-perceptions of being a good parent and being able to provide housing for your children?

Whether the respondents had ever lived independently or not, they are aware of other people's housing conditions. The women in this research grew up in households, they

lived in shelters for homeless families, they have visited and continue to visit neighbors, family, and friends, living in a range of housing types and conditions. They can make comparisons between their housing and the housing of other people, most likely in similar social, economic, and environmental (e.g., neighborhood) circumstances. The respondents' assessment of their housing satisfaction and quality take all this information into account. On a daily basis they experience the housing options limited by their poverty, gender, and race, as discussed in the review of the literature.

Respondents are probably aware of the “war on welfare.” On multiple levels, and from various sources, women such as these respondents, low-income, Black or Hispanic, under-educated, urban women are constantly conveyed the message that they are not *entitled* to “good” housing. For example, New York City’s family shelter system is designed to divert people from entering the shelter, and for those who do enter, disincentives to remain and wait to be placed in permanent housing, such as the minimum stay requirements, all serve to convey a lack of entitlement to good housing. Their initial positive rating of housing satisfaction may capture their reluctance to complain about their housing. The responses elicited when picking a category on a rating guide may be guided by comparisons with former housing, including their shelter accommodations, and may reflect an attempt to balance the comparatively good condition of their housing with the paucity of resources in the community, and deteriorating neighborhood conditions.

Does the methodology matter? If group interviews had been done, would more dissatisfaction and/or anger have been expressed? Perhaps the individual interview captures more of the despair while the group dynamics may reveal more anger or frustration. In a

group interview the respondents may feel supported by the expressions of the other women. Knowing that your neighbors are angry too could help justify your expression. Such sharing and connecting among the group of respondents may help facilitate social networks. Could such emotional expressions be channeled into social actions? This author must admit that though such methodology sounds useful, it raised other questions. Would I feel comfortable with the expression of anger as an interviewer? How might the expression of such feelings influence the rest of the interview? In summation, researchers must explore new ways to ask about housing satisfaction for such populations. The notion of housing satisfaction for such groups may be much more complicated than structured interviews can capture.

Future Research and Implications of the Research

Future Research

Based on the results of this research and the dramatically changing nature of income and housing subsidies, some issues warrant future study. Recommendations for future research include two longitudinal studies, one a small project, and another larger one that would require the efforts of numerous agencies and research groups:

- A study of a larger cohort of rehoused, formerly homeless women over five to seven years to determine how the changing conditions of their housing impact on their housing satisfaction. This larger sample would include the 40 women used for this study, the other

10 women who are part of Dr. Rivlin's research, and a sample of women from a broader spectrum of types of housing and housing conditions.

- A study of the impact of welfare reform and decreasing low-income housing subsidies on people with low-incomes. This would be a huge project involving the collection and compilation of both quantitative and qualitative data on factors such as housing stability, use of shelters, impacts on health (e.g., infant birth weight, stress related illness), the use of social services such as foster care and shelters for domestic violence victims.

Although the focus of this research is on the components of housing satisfaction, the findings illustrate the complexity of -- yet also the limitations of -- such a construct in understanding and explaining the experiences of homelessness and rehousing. Researchers in this field must move beyond the current parameters of studying housing satisfaction to explore theoretical bases and methodologies that may better capture what housing satisfaction means for such people. For housing satisfaction to be useful to policy changes it must be embedded in the context of poverty, racism, sexism, and the resulting power differentials that women, such as my 40 respondents, deal with their entire lives.

Implications of the Research

There are several areas that can be changed to improve the quality of the housing for formerly homeless families. Based on the findings of this present research, much of the effort would have to focus on improving neighborhood conditions. Such an approach would

include ensuring the safety of *all* members of a community in their apartments, their buildings and very importantly, their neighborhoods. This effort would also require greatly increasing the resources (e.g., laundry facilities, grocery and other shopping, more street lighting, better fire and police response) available in the community. Research which focused on the special needs of rehoused formerly homeless families (Greenblatt, 1995; Knickman, Weitzman, Shinn & Marcus, 1989; Weitzman & Berry, 1994) stressed the need for available community-based services to increase the likelihood that such families would remain stably housed. Such strategies would make it unnecessary for families to make a decision to seek better neighborhood conditions elsewhere. While such a decision would benefit the individual it would further harm the community. Families with no intentions of “putting down” roots would be less likely to get involved with their neighbors, tenants’ associations and local civic groups. As illustrated by the social dis/organization research (Sampson, 1991; Sampson & Groves, 1989; Wilson, 1996) the experiences of such families while they reside in the community and their hoped-for, if not actual eventual exodus, has negative repercussions on attempts to organize a cohesive sense of community. The literature on how communities can be improved focuses primarily on strategies such as community organizing and the role of residents and government in developing and supporting such strategies (Dreier, 1993; Saegert & Winkel, 1996; Sampson, 1991). Although there have been many promising success stories there are limitations to what communities can do - especially in the light of declining government support on the local, state and federal level. The continued success of community empowerment models in this nonsupportive environment will have to be assessed. On the level of the apartment and/or

the building, such families' opportunities for housing satisfaction can be addressed by providing adequate building staff and services to ensure that apartment, and building repairs are done in a timely and efficient manner. This is support by this research's findings that problems with maintenance was the second most cited reason given for housing satisfaction ratings.

However, what should take priority over this approach are methods of preventing families from becoming homeless in the *first place*. Accomplishing this goal would necessitate increasing the supply of good, low-income housing, through building new housing. Much of the housing that appears to be abandoned in low-income neighborhoods is actually already slated for renovation by the City's Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD).

Although these are the recommendations of this author, they are not my expectations. Consistent with the fifteen year trend in the government's withdrawal from providing services to low-income people, recent changes in housing and income subsidies provided to people such as the respondents of this study, are not beneficial to their survival - far less their attempting to attain goals such as "housing satisfaction." On the local level, the number of apartments the City produced to house homeless people (this may include homeless individuals as well as families) dropped 39% from its 1995 count of 1,997 units, to a 1996 count of 1,219 units. To truly appreciate the inadequacy of this housing production, consider that in 1996 there were approximately 336,000 families on the waiting list for NYCHA's public housing and this list was closed several years ago; and there are approximately 5,600 families in the City's family shelter system (New York Times,

September 22, 1996). The governments at the federal (HUD), state and city levels have almost entirely abandoned their responsibility for providing housing for people with low-incomes. De Parle's October, 1996 article on the federal government's current policies on low-income housing illustrates the magnitude of the problem:

[In] this year's housing appropriations bill...the Federal Government has essentially conceded defeat in its decades-long drive to make housing affordable to low-income Americans.... two decades of rising rents and falling wages have created record numbers of people, *including working people*, who can't afford to pay the rent.... The bill that [was signed] drops the number....of additional families that can expect rent subsidies from the Government this year to *zero*....And there is no hope that it will rise again. (p. 52)

This trend is only accelerating and it is not known what could cause its reversal. In addition to the abandonment of the creation and maintenance of a low-income housing market, sources of income, in the form of welfare, have also been severely reduced through the recent welfare reform act. At this time, New York State has not detailed their policies under the new Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) Act (which replaces Aid to Families with Dependent Children [AFDC]), but the State and the City have cut the number of recipients of AFDC and Home Relief (for adults without the custodial care of children) for the past two years and now have the mandate to accelerate this trend. In the coming months, New York State will probably pass legislation to limit the length of time recipients can collect TANF and demand enrollment in school or job training.

When the government's abandonment of providing low-income housing is combined with the end of welfare (AFDC), it is clear that the opportunities for women, such as the respondents in this present research, to remain stably rehoused are seriously threatened. In approximately five years these women's major source of income, their AFDC/TANF grants

will end, and the housing subsidies, either through Section 8 vouchers, or other means, will very likely be discontinued. Some housing advocates cling to the hope that in his second term, President Clinton will repeal, or modify many of the harsher provisions of TANF because he no longer has to worry about re-election. This is unlikely for several reasons including the popularity of welfare "reform" and the continued dominance of the Republican Congress. Economic analysts assume that only a recession would cause the loosening of welfare reform mandates. What is the future for people with low-incomes and numerous barriers to opportunity? The arena of welfare and housing subsidies is changing so radically and quickly that it impossible to predict a likely scenario for the next several years. What is our role as researchers? We must document their experiences and advocate for change.

"So we do not lose heart... Because we look not to things that are seen but things that are unseen." II Corinthians 4:16, 18

APPENDIX A - NYC's Permanent Housing Programs for Homeless Families

NYC'S PERMANENT HOUSING PROGRAMS		
PROGRAM/ AGENCY	ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA	
	DESCRIPTION	MINIMUM SHELTER STAY
HPD <i>in-rem</i> / NYC Dept. Of Housing Preservation (HPD)	Vacant apartments in NYC owned or managed buildings.	9 months
SECTION 8/ 2 programs: HPD and New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA)	Section 8 is a federal subsidy grant. It is available to all low-income families via a process that can take as long as 2 years. Rental assistance is provided by the allocation of "vouchers" (HPD and NYCHA) not limited to 30% of income; or "certificates" (NYCHA) a maximum of 30% of income. Both are "household-based" so the family can move with them.	3 months
SECTION 8 - Emergency Assistance Rehousing Program (EARP)/ NYC's Dept. of Homeless Services, NYCHA & HPD	Families must be on public assistance or SSI. Landlord receives a one-time subsidy depending on the family size. Usually a maximum of 3 bedrooms. Applicants can be certified in 2 months. Tenants are given a 32 month Section 8 lease, auto renew if rent-stabilized.	12 weeks
Special Initiative Program (SIP)/ HPD	HPD owned buildings which have been gut-renovated and are now managed by private and community-based groups. SIP buildings are now 10-30% homeless (down from 100%). Requires orientation & home visit.	9 months
NYCHA	NYCHA's goal is to house 1,420 families in NYCHA developments. Approximately 1% of the dwelling units in each development are allocated for homeless families.	9 months

Housing Environments Research Group
 Center for Human Environments/ Department of Environmental Psychology
 The Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York

33 West 42nd Street New York, New York 10036
 Phone: (212) 642-2566 FAX (212) 642-1986

APPENDIX B - Study Information Letter

Winter 1994

REHOUSING EXPERIENCES STUDY – INFORMATION LETTER

Leanne Rivlin, a psychology professor, and Mary Valmont and MaryAnn S. Allacci, graduate students at the City University of New York's Graduate Center, are talking to residents about their rehousing experiences. The questions will cover your housing experiences, both in your present apartment, and earlier housing. We would be very grateful for your help in this research.

We are conducting an independent research project and we are not affiliated with _____. However, _____ has permitted us to distribute this recruitment flyer.

If you are able to be a part of this study, you will be interviewed at a time and place convenient for you. The interview will take about 90 minutes. **YOU WILL BE PAID \$20 AT THE END OF THE INTERVIEW.** *Interviews will be done in English.* We will resume interviewing by January 1995. Interviewing should continue through early February 1995.

We are looking for the following types of families to interview:

- Formerly "homeless" families who have stayed in a **FAMILY shelter before moving into their current apartment.** This includes families who moved *directly* from a shelter into their current apartment, or families who have stayed with friends or family for 3 months or less before moving into their current apartment.
- Families with children under the age of 18 living in the household.

IF THIS APPLIES TO YOU, and you are willing to be contacted to arrange an interview, please complete and return the enclosed "sign-up form" in the self addressed, stamped envelope that was included in this mailing. PLEASE RETURN THE SIGN-UP FORM AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

We will call you within two weeks of receiving your sign-up form to discuss the project in more detail and to arrange a date and time for the interview.

If you participate in our study, your individual answers will be kept private. Your name will not be used in anything we write. What you tell us will not be shared with anyone, except as part of a general, group story.

If you decide not to, or are unable to participate in our study, thank you for your time.

If you agree to allow us to contact you for an interview, *you can still change your mind when we contact you.* You will be contacted by Renee Davila, a research associate, MaryAnn, or Mary. We will identify ourselves when we call. **PLEASE KEEP THIS STUDY INFORMATION LETTER.**

We are happy to answer any questions you have, either now or in the future. If you have questions about this study you can call Ms. Valmont or Ms. Allacci at (212) 642-2566.

APPENDIX D - Phone Screener

REHOUSING EXPERIENCES OF FORMERLY HOMELESS FAMILIES

Phone Screener 12/15/94 version

Potential Interviewee (PI): _____

Phone # (____) _____ - _____
OR alternate # (____) _____ - _____

Contact agency/person: _____

Calls before actual screening of PI should ONLY be logged in the "Phone Log."

SUCCESSFUL CONTACT DATE/ CALLER INITIALS: _____

[INSTRUCTIONS ARE IN CAPS & WITHIN BRACKETS]

DO NOT COMPLETE THE BOX BELOW UNTIL YOU HAVE GONE THROUGH THIS
SCREENER.]

INTERVIEW SCHEDULED FOR:	
Day & Date: _____	Time: _____
[IF CHILDREN WERE SCHEDULED TO BE INTERVIEWED, ASK IF THEY WILL BE HOME AT THIS TIME - NOTE ANSWER ON PG 3]	
Location: ___ apt ___ Other: _____	
Address: _____	
Borough: _____	Apt #: _____ Fl: _____ Zip: _____
TRAVEL DIRECTIONS: (What subway? What stop? How many blocks from the subway?)	

CROSS STREETS:	

REMEMBER TO : (1) XEROX MAP SECTION & (2) TRANSFER INFO TO PG 1 OF INTERVIEW Go back to the "Closing" section on page 4"	

REMEMBER: We are interviewing women ONLY for this study.

Introduction: [READ BEFORE CALLING. HAVE INTERVIEWERS' SCHEDULES HANDY.]

We will get access to Potential Interviewees by 3 primary methods:

(1) They have returned a "sign-up form."

"Hi, my name is (first & last name). I am calling from the City University about a study of people's rehousing experiences. Ms. (first & last name) returned a form to us indicating that she was interested in being interviewed for the study. Is Ms. _____ home?"

(2) They receive a study information letter indicating that THEY should call us and leave some information.

a. You actually take their call.

"Hi, my name is (first & last name). I am calling from the City University about a study of people's rehousing experiences. I need to get a form to get some information from you. Please hold on for a moment." [GET PHONE SCREENER] "... as the study information letter you received/saw indicates, we are asking people about their rehousing experiences. We are paying \$20 at the end of the interview... [GO TO ♣]

- OR -

b. They leave the information on HERG's voice mail and WE call THEM back.

"Hi, my name is (first & last name). I am calling from the City University about a study of people's rehousing experiences. You left us a message that you may be interested in being interviewed. We are paying \$20 at the end of the interview... [GO TO ♣]

(3) An agency gives us their name and phone # and WE call THEM.

"Hi, my name is (first & last name). I am calling from the City University about a study of people's rehousing experiences. (Agency name/person) gave us your name and phone # as someone who may be interested in being interviewed..."

[IF MS. _____ IS NOT HOME]:

"...Do you know when she will be home? When: _____ (time & date). O.K., I will call back then. Thank you." [NOTE CONTACT ON PHONE CONTACT LOG]

[WHEN YOU HAVE MS. _____ ON THE PHONE]:

"...Hi, my name is _____. I am calling from the City University. Recently you indicated your possible interest in being contacted by us to be interviewed for a study we are doing on people's rehousing experiences. We are paying \$20 at the end of the interview. I am calling to see if you want to arrange an interview." [GO TO ♣]

♣ "Are you interested in being interviewed?" ___ Yes ___ No [END PHONE CALL]

If "YES":

"...Ok, before we can set up the interview time, I have to do two things. First I will give you a little more information about this project, then I have to ask you a few questions to see if your background fits the type of families we are interviewing for this project. We can only interview certain types of families for this study, so I need to get some information from you first before I know if we can arrange an interview with you, o.k... This will take about 10 minutes to go through, o.k.?"

First, let me tell you a little bit more about the study. The study is exploring the rehousing experiences of people to try to understand the issues and problems they face trying to establish a home. We are interested in the role played by your contacts with family members, friends and service agencies in the neighborhood, as well as any training programs or orientations to the area you may have experienced. The questions will cover the history of places where you have lived, how you obtained your present housing and your moving-in experiences. Though the study is an over-time, two-year, view of your rehousing

experiences, *I am arranging only the FIRST interview now.* You can decide when we interview you, if you want to continue in the longer study. As I mentioned, you will be paid \$20 at the end of the interview. This is just a way of thanking you for taking the time to talk to us about your housing experiences.

In order for us to analyze the information you give us, it is necessary to tape your interview and then get the interview typed up. Taping and transcribing your interview allows us to make sure that we don't miss anything that you have to say. The tape will be destroyed when the study has been completed, and it will not be given to anyone not directly connected to the study. Also, you have the right to review the tape if you want.

Is it O.K. for us to tape your interview? Yes No [GO TO ♣]

♣ "...Well I'm sorry but RIGHT NOW we can only interview people who will allow us to tape their interview. We need to type up the interviews in order to do the data analysis. IF, in the future, we can interview people like you, who don't want their interview taped, we will call you back. Thank you for taking the time to speak to me..." [END THE PHONE CALL.]

[IF THE PERSON **OFFERS** TO CHANGE HER MIND. AND LET US TAPE THE INTERVIEW. PROCEED WITH THE SCREENER.]

"...we respect your right not to want your interview taped. Are you SURE that you NOW don't mind having it taped?..." [IF SHE STILL WANTS TO BE INTERVIEWED, PROCEED.]

Screener: "...As I told you, there are a few quick questions I need to ask you....

1. When did you move into your current apartment? ____ / ____ / ____ (m/d/y)
2. What is your race or ethnicity? _____
3. Have you **ever** stayed in a **FAMILY** shelter (assessment center, Tier II, hotel)? Yes No [GO TO ✪]
4. Were you staying in a **FAMILY** shelter **right before** you moved into your present apartment?
 Yes [SKIP TO Q 6] No

If "NO":

5. When was the LAST time you **left** a FAMILY shelter. about what month & year? _____
 [REVIEW ✪]

✪ [IF (a) PERSON HAS **NEVER** STAYED IN A FAMILY SHELTER or (b) IT HAS BEEN MORE THAN 3 MONTHS SINCE THE PERSON **LAST LEFT** A FAMILY SHELTER - END THE PHONE CALL]

"... Well I'm sorry but we are only interviewing people who stayed in a family shelter up to 3 months before moving into their current apartment. Since you were last in a shelter ____ months before moving in, (**OR** "Since you never stayed in a family shelter) we can't interview you. Thank you very much for taking the time to speak to me..." [END THE PHONE CALL]

6. When did you FIRST become homeless? _____ (m/yr)
 Doesn't consider herself to have been homeless.
7. Are you the person who holds the lease to YOUR apartment?
 Yes No, Specify: _____

8. Do you feel comfortable having the interview conducted in English?

Yes No [END THE PHONE CALL] "...Well then, I'm sorry but since we only have English speaking interviewers at this time we can not interview you. However we may contact you when we have hired _____ speaking interviewers. Thank you for your time..." [ALSO NOTE IF YOU HAVE DIFFICULTY UNDERSTANDING THE PERSON'S ENGLISH OR VICE VERSA. MAKE DECISION WHETHER TO CONTINUE.]

9. Does your household have one or two parents currently living there?

1 parent HH [GO TO Q 10]
 2 parent HH [END THE PHONE CALL] "Well... then, I'm sorry but we are only interviewing single parent households for this study. Thank you for taking the time to speak to me..."

CHILDREN - POTENTIAL INTERVIEWS:

10. How many children UNDER THE AGE OF 18 live in your household? _____

No children under the age of 18 [END PHONE CALL] "...I'm sorry but we are only interviewing families with children under the age of 18 living in the household. Since this is not the case for you, we can not interview you. Thank you for your time..."

11. Are any of your children over the age of six? Yes

No [GO TO

If "YES": "...The reason I asked is because we are interested in talking to children also. The children's interview will only take 10-15 minutes. We would ask questions about their schooling and adjustments to their current neighborhood..."

12. Would you be willing to allow him/her (any of them) to be interviewed after we interview you, IF they will be home at that time. We can interview up to 2 children. Of course, you can always change your mind when we come interview you. Yes No [SKIP TO Q 13]

If "YES": [NOTE: CHILDREN MAY NOT BE HOME DURING INTERVIEW TIME]

"...o.k., we will plan to interview _____ [child's name]_____ after we interview you... How old is _____ (child)_____? We will bring a small gift for him/her..."

Child's name

Age

Children Younger than 6:

"...ALL or SOME of your children are younger than 6. Is that correct? Please tell me his/her (their) name(s) and age(s)..." [MAKE NOTE ON PRE-INTERVIEW CHECKLIST TO BRING GIFTS FOR NON-INTERVIEWEE CHILDREN]

Child's name

Age

WILL INTERVIEW CHILD(REN)? YES: # OF KIDS: _____ NO

Ratings of Housing Quality:

"...I have just a few more questions about the quality of your current housing. By "quality" I mean the condition of your housing such as the heat or hot water in your apartment, or the cleanliness of your building, or the street lighting in your neighborhood..."

◆ 13. Using the definition of quality I just gave you, how would you rate the QUALITY of your APARTMENT on a scale of either 'excellent,' 'very good,' or 'good,' or 'fair,' or 'poor,' 'very poor,' or 'horrible'? APARTMENT _____

14. Using the same rating, what about the BUILDING? How would you rate it? _____

15. Using the same rating, how would you rate your NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

16. How would you rate the OVERALL QUALITY of your housing, that is combining the ratings of the quality of your apartment, your building, and your neighborhood? _____

Eligibility:

[IF THE PERSON HAS NOT BEEN ELIMINATED YET. THEY **SHOULD** BE ELIGIBLE]

Arrange Interview Date, Time & Place:

"O.k. now that we have gone through all those questions, we can finally set up a time and place for us to come interview you..."

First, as I've mentioned, you will be paid \$20 at the end of the interview. How do you want the \$20 in cash or. a blank money order? [THESE ARE THE **ONLY** CHOICES]

Cash Money order [NOTE ON PRE-INTERVIEW CHECK LIST]

Now I would like to set up a time and place, convenient to you, when two members of our research team can interview you. The interview will take about 60 to 75 minutes to complete. I would like to arrange a time within the next few days (or weeks). Is there any time soon that you will be available to be interviewed?

What about ___(day & date)___ at ___(time)___ ?.... [COMPLETE BOX ON PG 1]

Where do you want to be interviewed? We usually interview people in their home. [TRY TO HAVE INTERVIEW IN THEIR APT.]

home other, Specify: _____

O.K., I'll need your address and the easiest way to get to your home... [COMPLETE BOX ON PAGE 1]

Closing:

"...Let me see, you are scheduled to be interviewed on ___(CHECK INFO ON PAGE 1)____. Is that right? Please make a note of our visit. If something should come up and you can't make the interview, **please** call me at this number and leave a message at least 2 HOURS before the interview. Otherwise we will send two people out and they won't be able to meet with you.

DO YOU HAVE A PIECE OF PAPER HANDY TO WRITE DOWN THE NUMBER? THIS INFORMATION IS ALSO ON THE LETTER OR FLYER, IF YOU RECEIVED ONE. THE NUMBER IS (212) 642-2566. [Have the person repeat the # to you.]

YOU CAN CALL AND LEAVE A MESSAGE AT ANY TIME. WE HAVE VOICE MAIL.

Because everyone leads such busy lives, and we want to make sure we interview you, we will send you a reminder note in a few days. In addition to this note, we will also call you the day before the interview, and the morning of the interview, to remind you, o.k.?

O.k., thanks a lot, see you on ____ (interview date) __ at __ (time) __. Let me just check your address again...

[CHECK ADDRESS & NOTE CONTACT ON PHONE CONTACT LOG]

Reminder Letter:

TIME TO SEND REMINDER LETTER (~7-3 DAYS FROM 43RD ST POST OFFICE, not from 3M)? YES NO

[WHEN POSSIBLE, SEND LETTER 7 DAYS BEFORE THE INTERVIEW]

LETTER SENT? Date: _____ Initials: _____

Caller's Comments:

Housing Environments Research Group
 Center for Human Environments/ Department of Environmental Psychology
 The Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York

33 West 42nd Street New York, New York 10036
 Phone: (212) 642-2566 FAX (212) 642-1986

APPENDIX E - Adult Consent Form

Winter 1994

Rehousing Experiences Study

Adult Consent Form

Leanne Rivlin, who teaches at the City University of New York, and Mary Valmont and MaryAnn S. Allacci, who are graduate students working with her, are talking to residents about their housing experiences since moving into their current apartment. We would be very grateful for your help in this research. We consider your experiences to be useful to people who plan and manage housing.

We have no connection with any agency or organization, other than CUNY. If you agree to talk to us anything you say will be kept private. Your name will never be used in anything we write. What you tell us will not be told to anyone except as part of a general, group story.

This interview will take about 90 minutes. If you agree, after the first interview you will be contacted each month, for two years, usually by telephone, to answer some follow-up questions. These phone contacts will take approximately 10-15 minutes. If you agree, one or more of your children may be interviewed today, as well. His or her interview will take 10-15 minutes. The interview will be done in English. The questions will examine your housing experiences, both in your current residence and earlier ones. The questions examine what it is like to live here and in other housing.

You can refuse to answer questions during this interview and you are free to stop participating in the study at any time in the future. We are asking your permission to tape this interview so that we do not miss anything that you say. If you agree to be taped, you can review your tape at any time. If you agree to be part of this study it will not affect your housing in any way. If you choose not to participate, it will not affect your housing, either. You will be paid \$20 at the end of the interview.

We are happy to answer any questions you may have, either now or in the future. If you have questions about the project you can call Professor Leanne Rivlin at (212) 642-2563. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a participant in this study, you can call the Office of Sponsored Research, City University of New York at (212) 642-2059.

I have been told about the research and I agree:

(1) to be interviewed _____ Initial

(2) for my interview to be taped _____ Initial

Print Name: _____

Signature of participant: _____ Date: _____

Signature of interviewer: _____ Date: _____

Signature of interviewer: _____ Date: _____

Copy of consent form to participant: _____

APPENDIX F - Interview & Rating Guides

NOTE: The January 1995 version, a 85 page interview, was reformatted so that only the questions appear here. The interview is followed by the three rating guides used for satisfaction, quality, and safety concerns.

Jan/6/95 - FINAL version

ID # ___ ___

Rehousing Experiences of Formerly Homeless People

Housing Environments Research Group (HERG)
Graduate School and University Center, C.U.N.Y.

Initial Contact Interview – Formerly Homeless Families**[COPY THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION FROM THE PHONE SCREENER]:**

INTERVIEWEE: _____

Address: _____ Boro _____ Apt # _____ Fl _____

PHONE #: (_____) _____ - _____

SCHEDULED FOR: DAY & DATE- _____ TIME- _____

Will children also be interviewed? ___ No ___ YES – HOW MANY? _____

Interview Attempts: Date _____ Outcome _____

1: _____

2: _____

For Office Use ONLY:

Contact agency/person: _____ [Phone Screener]

Type of Housing/Program: _____ [See Q 17, p 7]

of apts in bldg: ___ [Q 129, p 30] Source: ___ contact agency **OR** ___ estimate of interviewer

Date moved in: ___ / ___ / ___ (m/d/y) [Q 14, p 7] # months rehoused: _____

Best day(s)/time(s) for follow-up(s): _____ [See Q 397, p 80]

● 1st follow-up interview should be approx.: ___ / ___ / ___ (m/d/y)

● # of adults in the household: ___ [Q 316, p 68] ● # of children in the household: ___ [Q 316]

● Was interviewed taped? ___ Yes ___ No ● Child(ren) interviewed? ___ Y ___ N

INTRODUCTION [*Note: Interviewer instructions are usually IN CAPS, within brackets*]

"Hi, my name is _____, and this is _____. We recently called you to arrange an interview about your rehousing experiences. As we explained to you over the phone, we are researchers at the City University Graduate Center. We are here to interview Ms. _____." [SHOW CUNY ID CARD?]

[ONCE YOU ARE IN THE APARTMENT]

"...We are interviewing people who used to be homeless, but who are now rehoused. This information will help us understand the experience of being rehoused. This information may also be useful to agencies helping people find housing. The interview should take **AT LEAST 90 minutes** to complete. **WE KNOW IT IS A LONG INTERVIEW AND WE APPRECIATE YOUR WILLINGNESS TO SIT THROUGH IT!** Nothing you tell us will be revealed to the superintendent, managers, or owners of this building.

We need you to sign this consent form [GIVE THE CONSENT FORM]. Let me read the consent form with you [READ FROM YOUR COPY OF THE CONSENT FORM]. Do you have any questions? [ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS -- SIGN CONSENT FORMS. GIVE COPY OF FORM TO INTERVIEWEE]

As we begin the interview, I just want to stress again that you can refuse to answer any question, and you if you agreed to have this interview taped, you can stop the tape at any time..."

[IF THERE IS A TV OR RADIO ON, ASK FOR IT TO BE TURNED OFF, OR TURNED DOWN VERY LOW. OTHERWISE IT WILL MAKE THE TRANSCRIPTIONS VERY DIFFICULT.]

"O.K., I just have to fill out some information on this page as we get started... [IF TAPED, READ THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION OUT LOUD SO THAT IT IS RECORDED]

1. This is interview # _____ 2. Date: _____/_____/_____ (m/d/y)
3. Time: started: _____ 4. ended: _____ [FILL IN AT END] TOTAL TIME: _____ MINS

[PLAY BACK THE TAPE TO CHECK IF IT IS WORKING - check level of background noise]

Interviewers: 5. _____ - interviewer
6. _____ - note taker

7. Consent form signed? Yes No 8. Interview taped? Yes No
9. Just to check, what is the spelling of your name?

Interviewee: _____

10. Just to check, are you the person who was relocated from a shelter into this apartment?
 01 Yes [SKIP TO Q 12] 02 No

11. If "NO": Who is that person? [SEE INSTRUCTIONS BELOW]

◆12. Are you the leaseholder? 01 Yes [SKIP TO Q 14] 02 No

13. If "NO": Who is the leaseholder? _____

[IF THE POTENTIAL INTERVIEWEE IS NOT THE PERSON RELOCATED FROM THE SHELTER, FIND OUT WHO IS THE RELOCATED PERSON.

ASK IF THAT PERSON IS A WOMAN. IF "YES" ASK WHEN THAT PERSON WILL BE HOME & ARRANGE TO CALL HER (OR HAVE HER CALL US) TO REARRANGE A NEW INTERVIEW DATE & TIME. **IF "NO" TELL THEM WE ARE ONLY INTERVIEWING WOMEN FOR THIS STUDY. LEAVE.]**

Miscellaneous Notes to the Interviewers:

- Please remember to write **NEATLY**. The transcribers and the coders will have to be able to read your handwriting.
- Write "NA" and slashes through questions or sections that are NOT applicable.
- A "◆" indicates this question is a "SKIP TO" question.

◆ CURRENT RESIDENTIAL INFORMATION

MOVING IN EXPERIENCES

● Familiarity with Area (Qs 14 - 24)

◆14. When did you move into this apartment? _____ / _____ / _____ (m/d/y)

15. How many bedrooms are in this apartment?

16. How did you get this apartment? Did anyone help you get it?

___ 01 Agency, Which one? ___ 03 Self
___ 02 Family/friend ___ 04 Other

Explain: _____

17. What type of housing is this? [PROBE: Is it a Section 8 building? Do you have a Section 8 voucher? Is it NYCHA? "HPD"? "SIP"? Is it _____?] ___ Doesn't know

18. Did you look at THIS apartment before deciding to take it? ___ 01 Yes ___ 02 No

19. How many OTHER apartments did you look at before taking this one?

___ 01 No others, this was the only apartment ___ 02 Looked at _____ apartments

20. What made you decide to take THIS apartment?

21. Do you feel you had any choice in selecting THIS apartment? ___ 01 Yes ___ 02 No

22. Could you please explain why? [FOR EITHER RESPONSE]

23. Did you know anything about THIS NEIGHBORHOOD before moving here?

___ 01 Yes ___ 02 No [SKIP TO Q 25]

24. If "YES": How did you know this neighborhood BEFORE?

___ 01 Knew someone who lived here [PAST] Who? _____

___ 02 Had visited here before

___ 03 Had lived here before

___ 04 Knows someone who lives here NOW Who? _____

___ 05 Knew (generally, or heard of)

___ 06 Other: _____

• **Transitional/Adjustment Aid(s) & Needs (Qs 25 - 37)**

Help Moving In:

◆ 25. Did you get ANY help MOVING INTO this apartment, INCLUDING help from agencies? 01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 28]

26. If "YES": What type of help? [READ LIST & CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

- 01 Housing specialist at the shelter
 02 "Living skills" training in the shelter
 03 Lend-a-Hand or Project Domicile [CIRCLE WHICH ONE]
 04 Orientation to this neighborhood by: _____
 05 Post-move case management by: _____
 06 Family &/or friends
 07 Other: _____

27. What type of help was it? [IDENTIFY THE SOURCE OF THE HELP (i.e., "Concourse House," "my sister helped me move")]

On-site Social Services:

◆ 28. Are there any SOCIAL SERVICES, or/& medical services, located IN YOUR APARTMENT BUILDING or within the apartment complex? I mean services such as on-site day care, counseling, job training...

01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 33] 03 Don't Know [SKIP TO Q 33]

29. If "YES": What type?

30. Have you ever used any of these services? 01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 32]

31. If "YES": Which one(s)? [SKIP TO Q 33 AFTER COMPLETING THIS QUESTION]

◆ 32. If "NO": Please explain why you have NOT used any of the services.

Help Wanted/Needed:

◆ 33. Was there some type of help that you would have liked to receive WHILE MOVING, but didn't? By help I mean getting information about or help with getting the phone or electricity turned on... 01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 35]

34. If "YES": What type of help could you have used?

◆ 35. Are there things you still need or want for your APARTMENT?

01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 37]

36. If "YES": What are they?

INDEPENDENT LIVING HISTORY (Qs 37 - 45)

Leaseholder:

◆ 37. Were you EVER the leaseholder of an apartment **BEFORE** THIS ONE?

01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 43]
 03 **NOT CURRENTLY THE LEASE HOLDER, BUT WAS BEFORE** [ASK Q 38]

38. How many times BEFORE have you been the leaseholder?

01 Once 02 More than once [GET INFO FROM THE 2 MOST RECENT TIMES]

"O.K., let's start with the LAST place you lived in where you were the leaseholder?..."

39. How long did you live in that (LAST) apartment where you were a leaseholder?

From about when _____ (m/y) to about when _____ (m/y)

40. Why did you leave that apartment?

[IF MORE THAN ONCE, continue..., IF only ONCE, SKIP TO Q 46]

"...What about the place you lived before that as a leaseholder?..."

41. How long did you live in that apartment?

From about when _____ (m/y) to about when _____ (m/y)

42. Why did you leave that apartment?

Never a Leaseholder:

◆ 43. Even if you were NEVER the leaseholder, did you ever manage [run/take care] of a household? By this I mean were you the person responsible for the day-to-day running of the household, did you pay the bills, buy the groceries... etc? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No [SKIP TO Q 46]

If "YES": Please explain:

44. With whom were living? [PROBES: "parents," "partner," "husband," "with my children"?

45. When did you live there?

From about when _____ (m/y) to about when _____ (m/y)

ASSESSMENT OF APARTMENT, BUILDING AND NEIGHBORHOOD

INTRODUCTION:

"Now I'm going to ask you a series of questions about the 3 major parts of your housing: your apartment, your building and your neighborhood..."

The next section will cover various aspects of those 3 areas. Because this is a MAJOR section of this questionnaire, I want to explain to you how the questions are set up.

The questions will move from your housing that is physically closer to you, your APARTMENT, to the next level, your BUILDING, to the physical area furthest away, the NEIGHBORHOOD... [YOU MAY WANT TO GESTURE WITH YOUR HANDS, INDICATING INCREASING LARGER CIRCLES???

...within each sub-section, there are a series of questions about the QUALITY of features in that setting. For example the hot water in your apartment, or the street lighting in your neighborhood. EACH section also has questions about CHANGES IN THE QUALITY and the OVERALL QUALITY. EACH section also has questions about your SATISFACTION with each of the three major parts of your housing: your apartment, your building and your neighborhood...

...you will notice after the first section, "apartment related questions," that the questions for the other 2 sections, BUILDING and NEIGHBORHOOD seem to be "the same." Though the questions may seem as though "we already asked that" we did NOT for that section. The questions for most sections are kept "the same" on purpose... Before we get started with questions about your APARTMENT, do you have any questions?

● **APARTMENT RELATED QUESTIONS**

Apartment Quality: (Qs 47 - 58)

"The first set of questions concern your rating the qualities of different features of your apartment. I am going to read a list of several features of your APARTMENT, "heat" for example.

FIRST I want you to tell me about that feature in your apartment, THEN I will ask you to rate the QUALITY of that feature in your APARTMENT, using the words 'very good,' 'good,' 'fair,' 'poor' or 'very poor.' **By QUALITY I mean the condition of that feature in your apartment.** Using this definition, please answer the next series of questions. To help you remember the categories, I have a chart with these choices on them. [HAND THE RESPONDENT THE "QUALITY RATINGS" CHART] Do you have any questions?....

[INTERVIEWER: FOR EACH FEATURE ASK:

(1) "Tell me about the ____ in your apartment." WRITE THE RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

[IF THE INTERVIEWEE ONLY WANTS TO GIVE A RATING, GO ON TO THE NEXT QUESTION!!]

(2) "O.K. which word would you use to describe the QUALITY of the _____ in your APARTMENT? Very good, good, fair, poor, or very poor? CIRCLE THEIR CHOICE]

◆ 46. HEAT	very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
47. HOT WATER	very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
48. ELECTRICITY	very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
49. PLUMBING	very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
50. WINDOWS/AIR FLOW	very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
51. PEST CONTROL	very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
52. STORAGE SPACE	very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
53. SECURITY/SAFETY	very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
54. PRIVACY	very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
55. MAINTENANCE	very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
56. OVERALL APPEARANCE...	very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
57. NUMERIC AVERAGE OF APT QUALITY = _____	

Damage/Repairs to Apartment: (Qs 58 - 69)

CURRENT Damage/Repair

58. Are there things in your apartment that need to be repaired NOW?

[PROBE: Such as ceiling leaks?] ____ 01 Yes ____ 02 No [SKIP TO Q 62]

59. If "YES": What needs to be repaired?

60. When did this/these problem(s) start, about what month and year?

61. Have you reported the damage to the superintendent or the landlord?

◆ 62. How do you report damage or needed repairs in your apartment?

◆ 63. If ANY of Q 61 = "NOT REPORTED": Why haven't you reported the damage?

[OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q 64]

Apartment Satisfaction: (Qs 81 - 83)

"...You just answered several questions about the quality of your apartment. Those quality questions dealt MORE WITH PHYSICAL ASPECTS of your housing, such as heat.

What I would like for you to rate for me NOW is your level of SATISFACTION with your apartment. By SATISFACTION I mean... do you feel good about living here, does it fulfill your needs, whatever they may be...

Using a **DIFFERENT** 5 point scale of "very satisfied," somewhat satisfied," "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied," somewhat dissatisfied," or "very dissatisfied" please rate your satisfaction with your APARTMENT. Any questions? To help you, I have a chart with the choices on it. [HAND THE RESPONDENT THE "SATISFACTION RATINGS" CHART]

◆ 81. How would you rate your satisfaction with your apartment?

very satisfied----somewhat satisfied----neutral----somewhat dissatisfied----very dissatisfied

82 SATISFACTION RATING OF APARTMENT = _____

83. Please explain why you gave that rating.

84. Are there any other comments you want to make about your APARTMENT?

01 Yes 02 No

● **BUILDING RELATED QUESTIONS**

Building Quality: (Qs 85 - 101)

"This next set of questions concern your rating the qualities of different features of your BUILDING. I am going to read a list of several features of your BUILDING, maintenance for example. FIRST I want you to tell me about that feature in your building, Then I will ask you to rate the QUALITY of that feature in your building, using the words 'very good,' 'good,' 'fair,' 'poor' or 'very poor.' **By QUALITY I mean the condition of that feature in your BUILDING.**

To help you remember the categories, we will use the chart again. [HAND THE RESPONDENT THE "QUALITY RATINGS" CHART] Do you have any questions?....

[INTERVIEWER: FOR EACH FEATURE ASK:

(1) "Tell me about the ____ in your building." [WRITE THE RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.]

(2) "O.K. which word would you use to describe the QUALITY of the ____ in your BUILDING? Very good, good, fair, poor, or very poor? CIRCLE THEIR CHOICE]

85. PEST CONTROL	very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
86. SECURITY/SAFETY	very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
87. MAINTENANCE	very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
88. OVERALL APPEARANCE OF...	very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor

These next questions concern the people who are in charge of this building.

89. Is there a superintendent? 01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 92]

90. Does s/he live in the building? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No

Using the same 5 point scale of "very good," to "very poor," [GIVE CHART] please rate your:

91. RELATIONS WITH THE SUPER... very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor

92. Is there a management office? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No [SKIP TO Q 96]

93. Is it in this building OR complex? __ 01 Yes __ 02

Using the same 5 point scale of "very good," to "very poor," please rate your:

94. RELATIONS WITH MANAGEMENT OFFICE

very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor

95. [NOTE IF THE SUPER & THE LANDLORD ARE THE SAME PERSON: __ YES __ NO]

96. Is there a landlord? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No [SKIP TO Q 99]

97. Does s/he live in the building? __ 01 Yes __ 02

Using the same 5 point scale of "very good," to "very poor," please rate your:

98. RELATIONS WITH THE LANDLORD

very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor

99. Are there laundry facilities in the building? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No [SKIP TO Q 101]

100. If "YES": Please use the same ratings to rate them.

___ Building's laundry is NOT USED

BUILDING LAUNDRY

very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor

◆ 101. If Q 99 = "NO" or Q 100 = "NOT USED": How do you deal with the laundry?

Safety Issues in Building: (Qs 102 - 118)

"I'm going to ask you some questions about safety, both your personal safety and your child(ren)'s, IN THIS BUILDING.

Personal Safety Let's start with your personal safety first...

102. How concerned are you about your PERSONAL safety IN THIS BUILDING? Would you say you are [SHOW RESPONDENT THE "SAFETY RATINGS" CHART & CIRCLE CHOICE]

extremely -----somewhat ----- neutral ----- somewhat ----- not at all
concerned concerned UNconcerned concerned

[IF Q 102 = "NOT AT ALL CONCERNED," SKIP TO Q 108]

How concerned are you about the following possible threats to your personal safety, IN THIS BUILDING, from... [USE ABOVE RATING SCALE]

103. Personal attack IN THIS BUILDING?

104. Drug activity IN THIS BUILDING?

105. Guns or gun fire IN THIS BUILDING?

106. Other? If "other," please explain: _____

107. What do you do to keep YOURSELF safe IN THE BUILDING?

Child(ren)'s Safety Concerns "Let's now talk about your child(ren)'s safety..."

◆ 108. How concerned are you about the safety of your CHILD(REN) in the BUILDING? Would you say you are [READ & CIRCLE CHOICE]

extremely -----somewhat ----- neutral ----- somewhat ----- not at all
concerned concerned UNconcerned concerned

[IF Q 108 = "NOT AT ALL CONCERNED," SKIP TO Q 115]

How concerned are you about the following possible threats to your CHILD(REN)'s safety IN THIS BUILDING from... [USE ABOVE RATING SCALE]

109. Personal attack IN THIS BUILDING?

110. Drug activity IN THIS BUILDING?

111. Guns or gun fire IN THIS BUILDING?

112. Play or play areas IN THIS BUILDING? [i.e., playing in the hall way]

113. Other? If "other," please explain: _____

114. What do you do to keep your CHILD(REN) safe in this BUILDING?

"...Using the same 5 point scale as before, 'very good' to 'very poor,' [SHOW "QUALITY RATINGS" CHART AGAIN]

◆ 115. How would you rate your PERSONAL OVERALL security or safety in this BUILDING?

Interviewee's OVERALL SECURITY/SAFETY very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor

116. Please explain why you gave that rating.

117. How would you rate your CHILD(REN)'s OVERALL security or safety in this BUILDING?

Child(ren)'s OVERALL SECURITY/SAFETY very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor

118. Please explain why you gave that rating.

119. NUMERIC AVERAGE OF BUILDING QUALITY = _____

Building Rules: (Qs 120 - 123)

120. Are there any rules for LIVING in this building? [PROBE: For example, are children allowed to play in the hall....?] ___ 01 Yes ___ 02 No/Not Known [SKIP TO Q 124]

If "YES":

121. What are the rules for the building? [ASK FOR 1 AT A TIME]

122. How did you find out about THAT rule? [PROBE] (i.e., "received orientation manual")

123. How do you feel about THAT rule? [PROBE] (i.e., "I like it" "I think it is too harsh")

Building Satisfaction: (Qs 136 - 137)

"...You just answered several questions about the quality of your BUILDING and relationships with the building staff. The quality questions focused on physical aspects of the building, such as the laundry facilities...

What I would like for you to rate for me now is your level of SATISFACTION with your BUILDING. By SATISFACTION I mean... do you feel good about living here... does it fulfill your needs... Using a **DIFFERENT** 5 point scale of "very satisfied," somewhat satisfied," "neutral," somewhat dissatisfied," or "very dissatisfied" please rate your satisfaction with your BUILDING. Do you understand, any questions? To help you, I have a chart with the choices on it. [HAND THE RESPONDENT THE "SATISFACTION RATING" CHART]

136. How would you rate your satisfaction with your BUILDING?

very satisfied----somewhat satisfied----neutral----somewhat dissatisfied----very dissatisfied
SATISFACTION RATING OF BUILDING = _____

137. Please explain why you gave that rating.

138. Are there any other comments you want to make about your BUILDING?

01 Yes 02 No

● **NEIGHBORHOOD RELATED QUESTIONS**

Neighborhood Quality: (Qs 139 - 153)

"This next set of questions concerns your rating the qualities of different features of your NEIGHBORHOOD. The "neighborhood" is however YOU define it.

I am going to read a list of several features of your NEIGHBORHOOD. Some features ask about **CHOICE**, such as grocery shopping, other features are about your **ACCESS**, for example public transportation. **FIRST** I want you to tell me about that feature of your neighborhood, **THEN** I will ask you to rate the **QUALITY** of that feature of your NEIGHBORHOOD using the words which **BEST** it, either 'very good,' 'good,' 'fair,' 'poor' or 'very poor.' **By QUALITY I mean the condition of that feature in your NEIGHBORHOOD.**

To help you remember the categories we'll use the chart again. [HAND THE RESPONDENT THE "QUALITY RATINGS" CHART]

Do you have any questions?....

[INTERVIEWER: FOR EACH FEATURE ASK:

(1) "Tell me about the _____ in your neighborhood." WRITE THE RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

(2) "O.K. which word would you use to describe the **QUALITY** of the _____ in your NEIGHBORHOOD? Very good, good, fair, poor, or very poor? **CIRCLE THEIR CHOICE**]

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| ◆ 139. CHOICE OF GROCERY SHOPPING | very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor |
| 140. CHOICE OF OTHER SHOPPING | very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor |
| 141. ACCESS TO PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION | very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor |

155. Personal attack IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?
 156. Drug activity IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?
 157. Guns or gun fire IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?
 158. Other? If "Other," please explain: _____

159. What do you do to keep YOURSELF safe IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

Child(ren)'s Safety Concerns "Let's now talk about your child(ren)'s safety..."

◆ 160. How concerned are you about the safety of your CHILD(REN) IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD? Would you say you are [READ & CIRCLE CHOICE]

extremely -----somewhat ----- neutral ----- somewhat ----- not at all
 concerned concerned UNconcerned concerned

[IF Q 160 = "NOT AT ALL CONCERNED," SKIP TO Q 167]

How concerned are you about the following possible threats to your CHILD(REN)'s safety, IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD, from... [USE ABOVE RATING SCALE]

161. Personal attack, IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?
 162. Drug activity IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?
 163. Guns or gun fire IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?
 164. Play or play areas such as playgrounds and parks IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?
 165. Other? If "Other," please explain: _____

166. What do you do to keep your CHILD(REN) safe IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

◆ "...Using the same 5 point scale as before, 'very good' to 'very poor,' [SHOW "QUALITY RATINGS" CHART AGAIN]

167. How would you rate your PERSONAL OVERALL security or safety in this neighborhood?
Interviewee's OVERALL SECURITY/SAFETY very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
 168. Please explain why you gave that rating.

169. How would you rate your CHILD(REN)'s OVERALL security or safety in this neighborhood?

Child(ren)'s OVERALL SECURITY/SAFETY very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
 170. Please explain why you gave that rating.

171. NUMERIC AVERAGE OF NEIGHBORHOOD QUALITY = _____

Changes in Neighborhood Quality: (Qs 172 - 173)

172. Has the OVERALL quality of your NEIGHBORHOOD changed since you FIRST moved in?
 ___ 01 YES ___ 02 NO, has not changed [SKIP TO Q 174]

173. If "YES": Please tell me about that change, and about when did that change begin...

Overall Quality: (Qs 174 - 175)

◆ 174. How would you rate the OVERALL quality of your NEIGHBORHOOD NOW, using the ratings of "very good" to "very poor"? By "overall" I mean combining the various aspects of your neighborhood... [ALLOW MULTIPLE RESPONSES - IF SO, EXPLAIN FOR EACH]

Neighborhood -- OVERALL QUALITY very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
175. Please explain why you gave that rating (OR those ratings)?

Other Neighborhood Issues: (Qs 176 - 178)

176. OTHER than the safety issues we just discussed, are there OTHER PROBLEMS with your neighborhood? ___ 01 Yes ___ 02 No [SKIP TO Q 178]

177. What are they?

◆ 178. GENERALLY, as you think about your neighborhood, are there things about the neighborhood that you LIKE?

Relationships with Other People in the Neighborhood: (Qs 179 - 184)

"...Now I'm going to ask you some questions about your relationships with other people who live in THIS neighborhood.."

179. Do you spend time with ANY people who live in THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

___ 01 Yes ___ 02 No

180. Can you please explain why? [FOR EITHER ANSWER]
[FOR Q 179 = "NO," NOW SKIP TO Q 183]

181. What kinds of activities do you do with them? Do you exchange favors, use their phone in an emergency, baby sit, borrow items, eat, shop?, socialize?...

182. About how MANY of the people living in this neighborhood do you do these activities with (i.e., "only one," "just the people on my block)? [TRY TO GET A NUMBER ESTIMATE]

◆ 183. Would you like to spend the same amount of time, OR more OR less time with people living in your neighborhood?

___ 01 More ___ 02 Less ___ 03 Same Amount of Time

184. Please explain why you would want to spend (same amount OR more OR less) time with people living in your neighborhood.

Comfort in Neighborhood

185. Do you feel comfortable in THIS neighborhood/community? ___ 01 Yes ___ 02 No

186. Please explain why? [FOR EITHER RESPONSE]

Previous Neighborhood Ties

187. What neighborhood [BORO & NEIGHBORHOOD NAME], IF ANY, do you feel like you have the MOST ties to? ___ Does NOT feel ties to any neighborhood [SKIP TO Q 189]

188. Why?

Neighborhood Satisfaction: (Qs 189 - 190)

"...You just answered several questions about the quality of your NEIGHBORHOOD. Those quality questions dealt more with the physical aspects of your neighborhood, such as access to shopping.

What I would like for you to rate for me now is your level of SATISFACTION with your NEIGHBORHOOD. By SATISFACTION I meando you feel happy living here... does it fulfill your needs...

Using a **DIFFERENT** 5 point scale of "very satisfied," somewhat satisfied," "neutral," somewhat dissatisfied," or "very dissatisfied" please rate your satisfaction with your NEIGHBORHOOD. Do you understand, any questions? [HAND THE RESPONDENT THE "SATISFACTION RATINGS" CHART]

◆ 189. How would you rate your satisfaction with your NEIGHBORHOOD?

very satisfied----somewhat satisfied----neutral----somewhat dissatisfied----very dissatisfied

189. SATISFACTION RATING OF NEIGHBORHOOD = _____

190. Please explain why you gave that rating.

191. Are there any other comments you want to make about your NEIGHBORHOOD?

___ 01 Yes ___ 02 No [SKIP TO Q 192]

OVERALL RESIDENTIAL QUALITY & SATISFACTION RATING: (Qs 192 - 199)

"...This next series of questions are about the OVERALL quality of your HOUSING and your OVERALL satisfaction with it...

Once again by "OVERALL" I mean your GENERAL feelings about your housing....

First I'm going to ask you about quality, which refers to the conditions of things, and by HOUSING I mean you are **COMBINING** your feelings about your apartment AND the building AND the neighborhood... Any questions?...

Overall Quality:Change in Quality:

◆ 192. Has the OVERALL QUALITY of your HOUSING changed since you FIRST moved in?
___ 01 YES ___ 02 NO, has not changed [SKIP TO Q 194]

193. If "YES": Please tell me about that change, and about when did that change begin...

Overall Ratings

◆ 194. How would you rate the OVERALL quality of your HOUSING, using the ratings of "very good" to "very poor"? [HAND RESPONDENT THE "QUALITY" CHART. CIRCLE CHOICE].

Housing QUALITY -- OVERALL RATING very good -- good -- fair -- poor -- very poor
195. Please explain why you gave that rating?

Overall Satisfaction:

"...O.k., next I'm going to ask you about your OVERALL satisfaction, which means... do you feel good about living here... does it meet your needs? and by HOUSING I mean you are COMBINING your feelings about your apartment AND the building AND the neighborhood... Any questions?..."

Change in Satisfaction

196. Has your OVERALL SATISFACTION with your HOUSING changed since you FIRST moved in? 01 YES 02 NO, has not changed [SKIP TO Q 198]

197. If "YES": What happened that caused your OVERALL SATISFACTION to change? Please tell me about that change. About when did that change begin?...

Overall Rating

◆ 198. If you had to rate your OVERALL SATISFACTION with your HOUSING, that means your apartment, AND the building, AND the neighborhood/community, how would you rate it using either 'very satisfied,' ..."very dissatisfied." [HAND RESPONDENT THE "SATISFACTION CHART AND READ CHOICES. CIRCLE CHOICE]

very satisfied----somewhat satisfied----neutral----somewhat dissatisfied----very dissatisfied

Housing SATISFACTION -- OVERALL RATING _____

199. Please explain why you gave that rating?

200. If you could change ONE thing to IMPROVE your SATISFACTION with your overall housing, that means a change to your apartment, OR building, OR neighborhood, what would that change be?

PERCEIVED HOUSING ALTERNATIVES (Qs 201 - 213)

Intentions to Move/Stay:

201. Would you like to stay in your apartment or move? __ 01 Stay __ 02 Move [CAN CHECK BOTH - PROBE]
202. Why do you want to (stay &/OR move)?
203. Are you planning to move? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No [SKIP TO Q 205]
204. If "YES": When are you planning to move? _____ (approx. month/year, or event)
- ◆ 205. If you had the opportunity to choose an apartment again, would you choose THIS apartment again? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No
206. Please explain why? [FOR EITHER RESPONSE]

Housing Aspirations:

"...These next questions concern your IDEAL housing... If you could live in ANY type of housing, located ANYWHERE, what would it be?..."

207. Where would it be located? [NEIGHBORHOOD, BOROUGH, STATE, COUNTRY]
208. What would it look like? What type of housing would it be? Would it be an apartment building, or a single family detached or _____?
209. Who else would be living there?
210. Would you own or rent this place? __ 01 Own __ 02 Rent
211. Why would you want to own (OR rent) this place?
212. Now that you've described this place, how does your CURRENT apartment compare with the PLACE YOU JUST DESCRIBED? Would you say your CURRENT APARTMENT is... [READ CHOICES] __ 01 Better __ 02 the Same __ 03 Worse
213. Why?

◆ SOCIAL NETWORKS

RELATIONSHIPS WITH FAMILY & FRIENDS

● Networks (Qs 214 - 247)

"...Can you please tell me the people with whom you have the MOST contact. They can be friends and/or family members... they can live in New York or elsewhere... By "CONTACT" I mean what types of activities do you do with them? Do you phone them, do you visit, shop, loan money...."

214. Can you name anyone? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No [SKIP TO Q 249]
215. If "YES": Can you give me the names of these people? [LAST NAMES ARE NOT NEEDED. THERE ARE SPACES FOR UP TO 15 PEOPLE]
216. Total number of contacts: _____

"...O.K., now from the people you just named, I want you to select the 5 people, family and/or friends, with whom you have the MOST contact.

217. Which 5 people?

[ON THE FOLLOWING CHARTS, READ ONLY THE QUESTION, NOT THE CATEGORIES OR PROBES, THAT'S FOR YOU!]

O.K.? Let's start with the first person... that is..." [FILL IN CHARTS ON NEXT PAGES]

Social Network Person # 1 (Qs 218 - 223)

218. WHO? "Who is the person?"
 219. FREQUENCY OF CONTACT? "How often do you have contact with him/her?"
 220. CONTACT HOW? "How do you have contact with him/her?"
 221. LOCATION? "Where does s/he live?"
 222. EASE OF TRAVEL? "How easy, or hard, is it for you to travel to see him/her? Does the travel affect how often you see him/her? If so, how?"
 223. TYPES OF ACTIVITIES/SUPPORT "What types of things do you do with him/her?"

Social Network Person # 2 (Qs 224 - 229)

224. WHO? "Who is the person?"
 225. FREQUENCY OF CONTACT? "How often do you have contact with him/her?"
 226. CONTACT HOW? "How do you have contact with him/her?"
 227. LOCATION? "Where does s/he live?"
 228. EASE OF TRAVEL? "How easy, or hard, is it for you to travel to see him/her? Does the travel affect how often you see him/her? If so, how?"
 229. TYPES OF ACTIVITIES/SUPPORT "What types of things do you do with him/her?"

Social Network Person # 3 (Qs 230 - 235)

230. WHO? "Who is the person?"
 231. FREQUENCY OF CONTACT? "How often do you have contact with him/her?"
 232. CONTACT HOW? "How do you have contact with him/her?"
 233. LOCATION? "Where does s/he live?"
 234. EASE OF TRAVEL? "How easy, or hard, is it for you to travel to see him/her? Does the travel affect how often you see him/her? If so, how?"
 235. TYPES OF ACTIVITIES/SUPPORT "What types of things do you do with him/her?"

Social Network Person # 4 (Qs 236 - 241)

236. WHO? "Who is the person?"
 237. FREQUENCY OF CONTACT? "How often do you have contact with him/her?"
 238. CONTACT HOW? "How do you have contact with him/her?"
 239. LOCATION? "Where does s/he live?"
 240. EASE OF TRAVEL? "How easy, or hard, is it for you to travel to see him/her? Does the travel affect how often you see him/her? If so, how?"
 241. TYPES OF ACTIVITIES/SUPPORT "What types of things do you do with him/her?"

Social Network Person # 5 (Qs 242 - 247)

242. WHO? "Who is the person?"

243. FREQUENCY OF CONTACT? "How often do you have contact with him/her?"

244. CONTACT HOW? "How do you have contact with him/her?"

245. LOCATION? "Where does s/he live?"

246. EASE OF TRAVEL? "How easy, or hard, is it for you to travel to see him/her? Does the travel affect how often you see him/her? If so, how?"

247. TYPES OF ACTIVITIES/SUPPORT "What types of things do you do with him/her?"

● **Networks in New York Area (Qs 248 - 256)**

Family:

248. [QUICKLY REVIEW THE PEOPLE JUST NAMED. ARE ANY OF THEM **FAMILY** WHO LIVE IN NEW YORK? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No

IF "YES": [SKIP TO Q 252]

IF "NO" : ASK Q 249, THE NEXT QUESTION]

◆ 249. If "NO": Do you have any **FAMILY** IN THE NEW YORK AREA?

__ 01 Yes __ 02 No [SKIP TO Q 252]

250. If "YES": Have you been in contact with ANY of them WITHIN THE PAST (1) YEAR?

__ 01 Yes [SKIP TO Q 252] __ 02 No

◆ 251. If "NO": Is there a reason why you haven't been in contact with **FAMILY** IN THE NEW YORK AREA WITHIN THE PAST (1) YEAR?

__ Interviewee didn't answer/ didn't have a reason

Friends:

◆ 252. [QUICKLY REVIEW THE PEOPLE JUST NAMED. ARE ANY OF THEM **FRIENDS** WHO LIVE IN NEW YORK? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No

IF "YES": [SKIP TO Q 257]

IF "NO" : ASK Q 253, THE NEXT QUESTION]

253. If "NO": Do you have any **FRIENDS** IN THE NEW YORK AREA?

__ 01 Yes __ 02 No [SKIP TO Q 256]

254. If "YES": Have you been in contact with ANY of them WITHIN THE PAST (1) YEAR?

__ 01 Yes [SKIP TO Q 257] __ 02 No

◆ 255. If "NO": Is there a reason why you haven't been in contact with **FRIENDS** in the New York area WITHIN THE PAST YEAR?◆ 256. If Q 253 = "NO": Is there a reason why don't you have any **FRIENDS** in the New York area? For example, is it because you just moved to New York?

● **Other Social Networks Issues: (Qs 257 - 270)**

"Some of these issues may have already come up, but we need to ask everyone the same questions..."

Stays with Interviewee

257. You JUST TALKED ABOUT several family members and or friends that you have contact with. SINCE YOU MOVED IN, have any of THEM **&/OR** ANYBODY ELSE stayed with you in THIS apartment for 2 weeks, or more, at a time?

01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 262]

If "YES":

258. Who stayed with you?

259. Why were they staying with you?

260. How many times have they stayed with you since you moved in?

261. How long did they stay with you? [INDICATE DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS]

Interviewee's Stays with Others

262. Did you stay with any of these friends or relatives BEFORE you moved into THIS apartment? 01 Yes 02 No

263. Have you stayed with any friends or relatives SINCE you moved into THIS apartment?

01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 267]

264. With whom did you stay?

265. Why did you need to stay with her/him?

266. How long did you stay with him/her? When did you stay with him/her, about what month and year?

Stay NOW -

◆ 267. Could you stay with ANY family or/& friends NOW if you HAD TO? [i.e., an emergency]

01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 270]

268. If "YES": Please tell me with whom could you stay.

269. How long do you think s/he (they) would let you stay? [INDICATE DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS...]

◆ 270. GENERALLY, how easy, or difficult, is it for you to get help when you need it? Is it [READ CHOICES & CIRCLE RESPONSE]...

very difficult ---- somewhat difficult ----- neither ----- somewhat easy ---- very easy
easy NOR difficult

SOCIAL/POLITICAL PARTICIPATION (Qs 271 - 279)

271. Are you active in any organizations or activities, such as church groups or tenant associations? 01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 273]

272. What organization(s) or activities? For each one, please indicate your role in the organization (i.e., treasurer, member) and how long have you been active in each one? [INDICATE WEEKS, MONTHS, YEARS]

● **Tenants' Association (Qs 273 - 276)**

◆ 273. Is there a tenants' association in your building?

01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 277] 03 Don't know [SKIP TO Q 277]

274. If "YES": What do you think of the tenants' association?

275. If "YES": Do you participate in your building's tenants' association?

01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 277]

276. In what ways do you participate? (PROBE: attend meeting, member of the tenants patrol)

● **Voting (Qs 277 - 279)**

◆ 277. Are you registered to vote? 01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 280]

278. Are you registered to vote in the district in which you NOW live? 01 Yes 02 No

279. When was the last time you voted? _____ (year) Never voted

RESIDENTIAL HISTORY**MOST RECENT STAY PRIOR TO MOVING INTO CURRENT APARTMENT (Qs 280 - 285)**

"...The next few questions are about where you stayed JUST before you moved into THIS apartment...."

◆ 280. Where were you staying JUST BEFORE you moved into this apartment? (Type of residence) [WRITE ANSWER ONLY]

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 01 own apartment | <input type="checkbox"/> 07 institution |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 02 parent's home | <input type="checkbox"/> 08 street/public place |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 03 other relative's home | <input type="checkbox"/> 09 SRO/furnished room |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 04 friend's home | <input type="checkbox"/> 10 foster care |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 05 FAMILY SHELTER | <input type="checkbox"/> 11 other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 06 single's SHELTER | <input type="checkbox"/> 99 No answer |

281. For about how long had you been staying there? About when did you move in, and when did you leave? From when _____ (m/y) to when _____ (m/y)

282. Who else was living with you? [WRITE ANSWER ONLY]

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 01 alone | <input type="checkbox"/> 07 w. friends |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 02 w. spouse/boyfriend | <input type="checkbox"/> 08 w. roommates |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 03 w. spouse & children | <input type="checkbox"/> 09 w. other institution residents |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 04 w. children only | <input type="checkbox"/> 10 w. other : _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 05 w. parent(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> 99 No answer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 06 w. other relatives | |

283. How does your CURRENT APARTMENT compare to the place you stayed RIGHT BEFORE you moved in here?

Is your CURRENT apartment 'much better,' or 'somewhat better,' 'the same,' 'somewhat worse,' or 'much worse' than the last place you stayed?" [READ CHOICES - CIRCLE ONE]

Much	Somewhat	Same	Somewhat	Much
Better-----	Better-----	-----	Worse-----	Worse
01	02	03	04	05

284. Why?

285. Why did you leave that place? 01 to move into CURRENT apartment 02 Other:

"..The next set of questions are about your last SHELTER stay. You may have already answered the first two questions IF the last place that you stayed was a shelter..."

LAST SHELTER STAY (Qs 286 - 289)

286. What shelter, by shelter I mean transitional apartments and hotels rooms, were you staying in RIGHT BEFORE you moved into THIS apartment? [NAME OF FACILITY & BOROUGH &/OR NEIGHBORHOOD] So even if you stayed with family or friends for a few months after leaving the shelter, BEFORE moving here, it's o.k...[IF LAST STAY WAS A SHELTER, REPEAT INFO FROM QUES 280 & 281 FOR THE NEXT 2 QUESTIONS TO MAKE SURE YOU ARE CORRECT.]

Shelter: _____

287. For about how long had you been staying there?

From when _____ (m/y) to when _____ (m/y)

288. How did you feel about staying there? What was it like? [MAY = Q 284]

[IF LAST STAY WAS A SHELTER, SKIP TO Q 290]

289. How does your CURRENT APARTMENT compare to this SHELTER STAY?

Is your CURRENT apartment 'much better,' or 'somewhat better,' 'the same,' 'somewhat worse,' or 'much worse' than that SHELTER STAY?" [CIRCLE ONE]

Much	Somewhat		Somewhat	Much
Better-----	Better-----	Same-----	Worse-----	Worse
01	02	03	04	05

◆ 290. Was that the FIRST time you ever stayed in a shelter for homeless people?

___ 01 Yes [SKIP TO Q 294] ___ 02 No

291. If "NO": About how many times, other than your LAST stay at _____, have you stayed in a shelter, welfare hotel, or other place for homeless people? About _____ times

292. In what types of places for homeless people have you stayed? [PROBE: hotels, shelter...]

MOBILITY (Qs 293¹⁶ - 294)

293. ABOUT how many DIFFERENT places did you live in up until the age of 18?

___ Only 1 place ___ More than 1 place, SPECIFY: _____

294. ABOUT how many DIFFERENT places did you live in after the age of 18, UP UNTIL

NOW? ___ Only 1 place ___ More than 1 place, SPECIFY: _____

HOMELESSNESS HISTORY (Qs 295 - 300)

"You may have already answered some of the following questions, but I need to make sure I get the information about when you FIRST became "*homeless*"..."

[IF RESPONDENT INDICATES THAT SHE DOES NOT CONSIDER HERSELF TO BE "HOMELESS" ASK HER WHAT WORD OR PHASE OR EVENT SHE WOULD USE TO DESCRIBE WHEN SHE FIRST LOST HER HOUSING. SUBSTITUTE HER TERM UP TO Q 302. NOTE HER COMMENTS.]

● First Homeless

295. When did you FIRST become "homeless"? _____ (m/yr)

296. For about how long were you homeless? _____ [INDICATE DAYS, MTHS, YRS]

¹⁶ From question 293 on, the numbering is different, by minus one, from the January 1995 version. Question 293 was deleted in that version.

297. What happened at THAT TIME that caused you to become homeless? [WRITE ANSWER ONLY] *LL = landlord

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 01 eviction by LL*, non-pay | <input type="checkbox"/> xx problems w. spouse |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 02 eviction by LL, other | <input type="checkbox"/> xx domestic violence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 03 eviction by primary tenant | <input type="checkbox"/> xx poor/unsafe building |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 04 primary tenant lost apt | <input type="checkbox"/> xx fire/disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 05 couldn't pay rent-no eviction | <input type="checkbox"/> xx crime in building |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 06 couldn't pay utilities | <input type="checkbox"/> xx crime in neighborhood |
| <input type="checkbox"/> xx overcrowded: doubled up | <input type="checkbox"/> xx unemployed |
| <input type="checkbox"/> xx difficulties w. others | <input type="checkbox"/> xx new arrival in NYC |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> xx other, Specify: _____ |

298. Where had you been living when you FIRST became homeless? [WRITE ANSWER ONLY]

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 01 own apartment | <input type="checkbox"/> 07 institution |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 02 parent's home | <input type="checkbox"/> 08 street/public place |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 03 other relative's home | <input type="checkbox"/> 09 SRO/furnished room |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 04 friend's home | <input type="checkbox"/> 10 foster care |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 05 family shelter | <input type="checkbox"/> 11 other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 06 single's shelter | <input type="checkbox"/> 99 No answer |

299. How long did you stay there? [APPROXIMATE]

From about when _____ (m/yr) to about when _____ (m/y)

300. Who else was living with you? [WRITE ANSWER ONLY]

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 01 alone | <input type="checkbox"/> 06 w. friends |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 02 w. spouse/boyfriend | <input type="checkbox"/> 07 w. roommates |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 03 w. spouse & children | <input type="checkbox"/> 08 w. other institution residents |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 04 w. children only | <input type="checkbox"/> 99 NO ANSWER |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 05 w. parent(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> 09 w. other : _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 06 w. other relatives | |

FEELINGS ABOUT HOMELESSNESS (Qs 301 - 304)

"...Some people who have used the shelter system have considered themselves to be homeless, others have not...."

◆ 301. Do you consider yourself to have EVER been homeless?

- 01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 303]

302. If "YES": When did you FIRST consider yourself to be homeless and why?

◆ 303. If "NO": Why is it that you DON'T consider yourself to have EVER been homeless?

◆ 304. What does being homeless mean to you? [REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THEY CONSIDER THEMSELVES TO HAVE EVER BEEN HOMELESS]

MOST IMPORTANT PLACE (Qs 305 - 309)

305. What place or places, if any, seem MOST IMPORTANT in your life? What place(s) means a lot to you? You can have both good and bad feelings about this place.

01 A place or places 02 No place(s) [SKIP TO Q 309]

306. What place(s) is it? [e.g., "Mom's home"]

307. Where is it located? [e.g., city, state, borough]

308. Why is it important? [e.g., "I was born and raised there"]

◆ 309. If "NO PLACE": Why do you think you DON'T have a place that is important to you?

◆ HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION

"O.K., now I'm going to ask you some general questions about yourself, and the other members of your household..."

DEMOGRAPHICS (Qs 310 - 313)

◆ 310. What is your birth date? _____ / _____ / _____ (m/d/y) AGE = _____

311. Where were you born? _____ [BORO, CITY, STATE...]

312. If NOT born in NYC: How long have you lived in New York City? _____
[INDICATE DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS & YEARS]

313. What is your race and/or ethnicity? [WRITE ANSWER ONLY]

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 01 Blk-African Amer/Non-Hispanic | <input type="checkbox"/> 04 Asian/Pacific |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 02 Hispanic | <input type="checkbox"/> 05 Native American |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 03 White/Non-Hispanic | <input type="checkbox"/> 06 Other/Unknown |

HOUSEHOLD & FAMILY COMPOSITION

● Household Members (Qs 314 - 318)

"I need some information on the people who are LIVING WITH YOU IN THIS APARTMENT.... For each person I'll need to know their first name, their age, and their relationship to you. Let's start with the youngest member of your household.."

314. What is his or her name?

315. How old is s/he?

316. What is their relationship to you?

317. Do you have a partner, or spouse, or boy/girlfriend, whom YOU consider to be PART of your household? 01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 319]

318. If "YES": Could you please give me the same information on him/her?

● **Family members NOT in Household (Qs 319 - 323)**

319. Are there other people who SHOULD be living with you, **OR** who MAY BE living with you in the future, but who are NOT in your household NOW?

01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 324]

If "YES": Please provide the same information as before about family members NOT in your household. Let's start with the youngest member..."

320. What is his or her FIRST name?

321. How old is s/he?

322. What is his/her relationship to you?

323. Why is s/he not with you?

CHILDREN INFORMATION (Qs 324 - 348)

● **Children's Schooling**

"...Next I will ask you some questions about the day-care and school-aged children **IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD**, including your experiences enrolling them in school..."

◆ 324. First, which children, if any, are in day-care? I need their first name and their age.

NA, no children in day care [ASK Q 326, SKIP Q 327]

Day-Care: _____

325. Which children, if any, are in school? I need their first name and their age.

NA, no children in school [ASK Q 327, SKIP Q 326]

School: _____

326. What have been your experiences ENROLLING your children into DAY CARE?

Day-Care: _____

327. What have been your experiences ENROLLING your children into SCHOOL?

School: _____

328. What is it like getting your children to day-care &/or school on a daily basis?

● **Children Enrolled in School**

[IF THERE ARE CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SCHOOL, ASK THE NEXT SERIES OF QUESTIONS -- IF NOT, SKIP TO Q 340]

"...I need the following information for each child: their FIRST name, age, the name of their PRESENT school, the grade/program they are in, and the date they enrolled in THIS school..."

[COMPLETE THE CHART BELOW]

[ASK FOR EACH CHILD]:

329. What is her/his first name and age?

330. About their **present** school, I need the name of it, the grade/program they are in, and the date they enrolled in THIS school...

331. When did each child stop going to his/her **last** school?

332. How many other schools has each child gone to starting with kindergarten?

● **Satisfaction with School(s) & Day Care**

333. How satisfied, or dissatisfied, are you with the school(s) AND/OR day care your child(ren) attends NOW **and** may have attended in the PAST?

● **Children NOT Enrolled in School (FOR ANY PERIOD, PAST OR PRESENT)**

334. Were there ANY periods of time when ANY of the SCHOOL AGED children in your household were not been enrolled in school? (EITHER now or before?)

01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 340]

335. If "YES": I need their first names, ages and the period they were NOT enrolled. I also need to know why weren't/aren't they enrolled in school.

[ASK FOR EACH CHILD]:

336. What is her/his first name?

337. Age?

338. When weren't/(aren't) they enrolled in school? From about what month and year to what month and year?

339. Why weren't/(aren't) they enrolled in school?

● **Children in Foster Care**

[NOTE THAT SOME OF THIS INFORMATION MAY HAVE ALREADY BEEN PROVIDED IN THE SECTION, "FAMILY MEMBERS NOT IN HOUSEHOLD," Q 319 - 323, SO REVIEW IT FIRST]

◆ 340. Are any of your children in foster care NOW? 01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 346]

If "YES": Please provide their first name, their age, the date they LAST entered foster care, and what type of foster care they are in...

341. What is his/her name?

342. How old is s/he?

343. What date did s/he LAST enter foster care?

344. What type of foster care is it, is it family ("kinship") or non-family?

345. Why is s/he in foster care?

General Children's Questions: (Qs 346 - 347)

346. GENERALLY, how satisfied are you with how your children are adjusting to living in this APARTMENT? Would you say you are... [READ CHOICES & CIRCLE RESPONSE]

very satisfied-----somewhat satisfied-----neither satisfied-----somewhat dissatisfied-----very
 NOR dissatisfied
 dissatisfied

347. GENERALLY, how satisfied are you with how your children are adjusting to living in this NEIGHBORHOOD? Would you say you are... [READ CHOICES & CIRCLE RESPONSE]

very satisfied-----somewhat satisfied-----neither satisfied-----somewhat dissatisfied-----very
 NOR dissatisfied
 dissatisfied

STRESSFUL LIFE EVENTS (Qs 348 - 364)

"...You may have experienced some stressful events as a child, or recently as an adult. The next few questions are about such events and whether you personally have experienced them... If you don't want to answer any of the questions just tell me..."

• Childhood Events

Did you experience any of the following **BEFORE** the age of 18? [READ LIST]

- ◆ 348. Lived in foster care? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No __ Didn't answer (DA)
 349. Lived in a group home/institution? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No __ DA
 350. Run away from home? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No __ DA
 351. Lived in the street/public place? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No __ DA
 352. Were physically or sexually abused? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No __ DA
 353. Grew up in a single-parent household? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No __ DA
 354. Parents separated or divorced? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No __ DA
 355. A parent/guardian died? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No __ DA
 356. Other person close to you died? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No __ DA
 357. Were victim of a crime? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No __ DA

• "Recent" Events (since age 18)

Did you experience any of the following **SINCE** the age of 18? [READ LIST]

358. Lived in the street/public place? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No __ DA
 359. Been physically or sexually abused? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No __ DA
 360. Separated or divorced from partner/spouse? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No __ DA
 361. Person close to you died? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No __ DA
 362. Victim of a crime? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No __ DA
 363. Asked to leave your parents' home? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No __ DA
 364. Have YOUR children been abused (physically/sexually)? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No __ DA

INCOME, EDUCATION, MEDICAL & EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION● **Income (Qs 365 - 375)**365. What are your **CURRENT** sources of income? [READ CHOICES, CHECK OFF]

- 01 AFDC ("welfare," "public assistance")
 02 SSI/SSD (disability)
 03 Veteran's benefits
 04 Unemployment benefits
 05 Child support/Alimony
 06 **FULL-TIME JOB**
 07 **PART-TIME JOB**
 08 **Financial** support from family
 09 **Financial** support from friends
 10 **Financial** support from boy/(girl)friend/partner/husband
 11 Other: _____
 99 No answer

366. About how much is your **MONTHLY** income? This includes cash payments from welfare **BUT NOT** the dollar value of food stamps.

- 01 Under \$500
 02 Between \$501 to \$750
 03 Between \$751 to \$1000
 04 Between \$1,001 to \$1,250
 05 Over \$1,250
 99 No answer

367. What is your monthly **RENT**? _____
 Not Sure 99 No answer DOES THIS INCLUDE GAS? Y N**CODING – INTERVIEWERS DO NOT COMPLETE!**

368. % OF MONTHLY INCOME THAT GOES TOWARDS RENT = _____ %

369. How is your rent paid? [READ CHOICES, CHECK OFF]

- 01 Self
 02 Direct vendor, by public assistance office
 03 Other: [SPECIFY] _____
 99 No answer

370. Does your "shelter allowance," ["welfare," "public assistance"] payment cover your **ENTIRE** rent? 01 Yes [SKIP TO Q 372] 02 No 99 No answer

371. If "NO": How do you pay the difference? [e.g., "Section 8 pays balance"]

◆ 372. Are you **NOW** having any problems meeting your living expenses?

- 01 Yes 02 No

373. Please explain why you (do / do NOT) have problems...

374. Do you EXPECT to have any problems meeting your living expenses IN THE FUTURE?
 01 Yes 02 No

375. Please explain why you (do / do NOT) expect...

● **Education (Q 376)**

376. What is the highest level of school you COMPLETED? [INCLUDING "GED"]

● **Medical (Q 377)**

377. Are there any HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS with medical conditions you consider to be SERIOUS? Please give me their name(s), the condition(s), when the illness started, and the type of treatment(s), if any. NA, no medical problems

Other Medical info: _____

● **Employment/Training (Qs 378 - 391)**

Employment

[SEE Q 365 ABOVE, RESPONSES 06 OR 07, TO CHECK IF SOMEONE IS CURRENTLY EMPLOYED. IF "YES," ASK THE NEXT SERIES OF QUESTIONS, IF "NO," SKIP TO Q 381]

◆ 378. You said that one of your sources of income is from a full- or part-time job. Who is employed? [CAN CHECK BOTH - ASK Q 379 &/OR Q 380 DEPENDING ON RESPONSE]
 01 Interviewee 02 Other: _____

379. What do you do? Is it a full- or a part-time job?

380. If Q 378 = "OTHER": What do they do? Is it a full- or a part-time job?

IF INTERVIEWEE DID NOT INDICATE THAT SHE IS CURRENTLY EMPLOYED, OR Q 365. CHOICES 06 OR 07 ARE NOT CHECKED:

◆ 381. Have you EVER worked in a part- or full-time job?
 01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 385]

382. If "YES": What were you doing IN YOUR LAST JOB?

383. Was it part- or full-time? _____

384. When did you begin and end your LAST job? [APPROXIMATE M/YR TO M/YR]

Training Programs or School

◆ 385. Are YOU in a training program or school? 01 Yes 02 No [SKIP TO Q 387]

386. If "YES": Specify _____

Training Program/School _____

Full/Part-time _____

◆ If NOT employed or NOT in a training program OR school, would you like:

387. a job? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No

If "YES": What type: _____

388. to be in a training program? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No

If "YES": What type: _____

389. to be enrolled in school/GED? __ 01 Yes __ 02 No

If "YES": What type: _____

390. Are you receiving any help to get into a job or training program/school?

__ 01 Yes __ 02 No

391. If "YES": What type? _____

● **Future Plans: (Qs 392 - 393)**

392. What do you see yourself doing in the next (1) year? [PROBE: Where do you plan to be living? With whom would be living? Would you be working?]

393. What do you see yourself doing in the next **5 years**? [PROBE: Where do you plan to be living? With whom would be living? Would you be working?]

NOTE: The final questions assessed the respondent's willingness to participate in the monthly follow-up interviews and asked for their feedback on the interview. They are not included here.

INTERVIEWER or NOTE TAKER'S COMMENTS ABOUT THE INTERVIEW, THE RESPONDENT, THE HOUSING... ETC... [WRITE YOUR COMMENTS UP THE SAME DAY OF THE INTERVIEW]

DO NOT CITE, OR COPY QUESTIONS, WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF THE AUTHORS

Authors: Valmont, M. E., Rivlin, L. G., & Allacci, M. S.

Housing Environments Research Group (HERG)

The Center for Human Environments

The Graduate School and University Center, The City University of New York

(212) 642-2566

REHOUSING EXPERIENCES STUDY

**Apartment, Building, Neighborhood & Overall
QUALITY Ratings**



APPENDIX G - Length of Time Rehoused and Housing Satisfaction Rating Percentages

Length of Time Rehoused and Housing Satisfaction Rating Percentages			
SATISFACTION RATINGS	ALL RESPONDENTS N=40	REHOUSED 24 MONTHS OR LESS n=15	REHOUSED 25 MONTHS OR MORE n=25
Very satisfied	30.0%	46.7%	20.0%
Somewhat satisfied	47.5	33.3	56.0
Neutral	10.0	6.7	12.0
Somewhat dissatisfied	10.0	6.7	12.0
Very dissatisfied	2.5	6.7	0.0
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Statistical Results			
STATISTIC	ALL RESPONDENTS	REHOUSED AS \leq 24 MONTHS, OR \geq 25 MONTHS	
χ^2 -df -value	88 111.44152*	4 5.43626	
Pearson's R -value	.11532	.10869	

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

$M = 26.6$ months; $Mdn = 30.0$; $SD = 15.03$; Range = 5-55 months

APPENDIX H - Summary of Simultaneous Regressions for Rating Scales

Summary of Simultaneous Regressions for Rating Scales and Length of Time Rehoused			
ALL RESPONDENTS			
N=40			
(as 40 data points)			
Adjusted $R^2 = .76147$			
Standard Error = .49939			
Analysis of Variance:			
	<i>df</i>	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	16	35.03908	2.18994
Residual	23	5.73592	0.24939
F = 8.78127		Signif F = .0000	

APPENDIX I - Summary of Simultaneous Regression Analysis for Quality Ratings

Summary of Simultaneous Regression Analysis for Quality Ratings			
ALL RESPONDENTS			
N=40			
Question # - Variable	<i>b</i>	SE <i>b</i>	β
14b- Length of time rehoused	.007644	.009397	.112366
73- Apartment Quality	.297449	.173574	.312392
126- Building Quality	.250683	.178311	.256758
174- Neighborhood Quality	.327629	.135234	.320316

Adjusted $R^2 = .31895$

Standard Error = .84383

Analysis of Variance:

	<i>df</i>	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	4	15.85348	3.96337
Residual	35	24.92152	0.71204

F = 5.56619

Signif F = .0014

**APPENDIX J - Percentages of Quality Ratings for the Apartment, Building,
Neighborhood & Housing**

Percentages of Quality Ratings for the Apartment, Building, Neighborhood and Housing				
ALL RESPONDENTS N=40				
RATING	APARTMENT	BUILDING	NEIGHBORHOOD	HOUSING
Very good	42.5%	40.0%	5.0%	25.0%
Good	30.0	40.0	27.5	40.0
Fair	17.5	12.5	40.0	27.5
Poor	7.5	2.5	20.0	7.5
Very poor	2.5	5.0	7.5	0.0
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**APPENDIX K - Percentages of Satisfaction Ratings for the Apartment, Building,
Neighborhood & Housing**

Percentages of Satisfaction Ratings for the Apartment, Building, Neighborhood and Housing				
ALL RESPONDENTS N=40				
RATING	APARTMENT	BUILDING	NEIGHBORHOOD	HOUSING
Very satisfied	45.0%	52.5%	20.0%	30.0%
Somewhat satisfied	47.5	37.5	32.5	47.5
Neutral	5.0	2.5	15.0	10.0
Somewhat dissatisfied	0.0	2.5	22.5	10.0
Very dissatisfied	2.5	5.0	10.0	2.5
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

APPENDIX L - Reasons for Housing Satisfaction Rating - Multiple Response Percentages

Reasons for Housing Satisfaction Rating - Multiple Response Percentages		
THEME	ALL RESPONDENTS N = 40	
	% of responses	% of cases
Structural/ Unchangeable	6.2%	43%
Structural/ Changeable	21.1	75
Safety & Crime	53.8	89
Interpersonal Relationships	11.9	63
Affective	3.8	32
Other	1.2	8
Total	100.0%	---

APPENDIX M - Neighborhood Safety - Percentages of Safety Concern Ratings

Neighborhood Safety - Percentages of Safety Concern Ratings						
ALL RESPONDENTS N=40						
CONCERN	FOCUS	SAFETY CONCERN RATINGS				
		Extremely Concerned	Somewhat Concerned	Neutral	Somewhat Unconcerned	Not at all Concerned
Overall concern (n=40)	Self	45.0	35.0	5.0	10.0	5.0
	Child	62.5	30.0	2.5	2.5	2.5
Personal attack	Self (n=38) ¹⁷	44.7	39.5	2.6	2.6	10.5
	Child(n=39) ¹⁸	48.7	41.0	2.6	0.0	7.7
Drug activity	Self	63.2	21.1	7.9	2.6	5.3
	Child	66.7	23.1	2.6	0.0	7.7
Guns or gun fire	Self	73.7	21.1	0.0	0.0	5.3
	Child	66.7	28.2	0.0	2.6	2.6
Play or play areas	Self	Not asked				
	Child	51.3	23.1	5.1	0.0	20.5
Other concern	Self (n=10) ¹⁹	40.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	30.0
	Child (n=8) ²⁰	50.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	37.5

¹⁷ The 2 respondents who answered "Not at all concerned" to the previous question were not asked this series of follow-up questions therefore, the "valid percent" based on n=38, is provided.

¹⁸ The 1 respondent who answered "Not at all concerned" to the previous question was not asked this series of follow-up questions therefore, the "valid percent" based on n=39, is provided.

¹⁹ Only 10 of the 38 respondents indicated that they had "other" concern(s).

²⁰ The respondents who answered "Not at all concerned" to the previous question was not asked this series of follow-up questions therefore, the "valid percent" based on n=8, is provided.

**APPENDIX N - Neighborhood Safety - Percentages of Ratings of Safety
Personal and Children's**

Neighborhood Safety - Percentages of Ratings of Safety - Personal and Children's		
ALL RESPONDENTS N=40		
RATING	PERSONAL	CHILDREN
Very good	15.0%	12.5%
Good	35.0	40.0
Fair	30.0	22.5
Poor	17.5	20.0
Very poor	2.5	5.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0

APPENDIX O - Basic Respondent Information

Basic Respondent Information Used for Vignettes and Quotes						
ID#	Pseudonym	Age	Race	Housing Type	# of kids	Total HH size
01	Marie H.	23	Black	Scatter-site	2	3
04	Sandra S.	24	Black	Complex	2	4
07	Jane M.	24	Black	Complex	2	3
14	Sherri A.	23	Black	Scatter-site	2	3
15	Tammy M.	21	Black	Scatter-site	1	2
16	Vera M..	20	Black	Scatter-site	1	4
17	Joan G.	22	Black	Scatter-site	1	2
18	Amy B.	24	Black	Scatter-site	2	3
19	Ann W.	DK	Black	Scatter-site	5	6
20	Nancy G.	21	Black	Scatter-site	2	3
21	Tamika S.	26	Black	Scatter-site	4	6
22	Sharon S.	57	Black	Scatter-site	1	4
23	Myrna R.	31	Hispanic	Scatter-site	2	3
24	Maria P.	39	Hispanic	Scatter-site	1	2
25	Debbie J.	32	Black	Scatter-site	1	4
26	Lucy P.	29	Hispanic	Complex	4	5
27	Susan B.	38	Black	Scatter-site	1	2
28	Donna J.	37	Black	Complex	3	4
29	Lisa T.	23	Black	Scatter-site	1	2
30	Barbara S.	30	Black	Complex	3	4
31	Ellen O.	35	Black	Complex	3	5
32	Dana A.	37	Black	Complex	2	4

Basic Respondent Information Used for Vignettes and Quotes						
ID#	Pseudonym	Age	Race	Housing Type	# of kids	Total HH size
33	Brenda M.	33	Black	Complex	5	7
34	Janice F.	39	Black	Complex	2	4
35	Charlotte T.	27	Black	Complex	2	3
36	Genny C.	21	Black	Complex	2	3
37	Jenny P.	27	Black	Complex	4	6
38	Dawn D.	27	Hispanic	Complex	2	3
39	Shelly L.	35	Black	Complex	2	4
40	Mimi H.	30	Black	Complex	0	1
41	Betty D.	32	Black	Complex	5	6
42	Anne S.	34	Hispanic	Complex	4	8
43	Veronica F.	39	Black	Complex	3	4
44	Elaine D.	35	Black	Complex	3	5
45	Sharron M.	26	Black	Complex	4	5
46	Carol M.	28	Black	Complex	3	4
47	Charlene D.	32	Black	Complex	1	2
48	Eileen A.	41	Hispanic	Complex	3	5
49	Val M.	37	Black	Scatter-site	2	3
50	June W.	23	Black	Scatter-site	1	2

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apgar, Jr., W. C. (1989). Recent trends in housing quality and affordability: A reassessment. In S. Rosenberry & C. Hartman (Eds.), *Housing issues of the 1990s* (pp. 37-62). New York: Praeger.

Austerberry, H., & Watson, S. (1983). *Women on the margins: A study of single women's housing problems*. London: Housing Research Group, the City University.

Bahr, H. M., & Garrett, G. R. (1976). *Women alone: The disaffiliation of urban females*. Lexington, MA: Heath, Lexington Books.

Belle, D. (1982). *Lives in Stress: Women and depression*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Berger, S. D. (1970). *The social consequences of residential segregation of the urban American Negro*. New York: Metropolitan Applied Research Center.

Berry, C. A., & Weitzman, B. C. (1993). Factors affecting housing comfort among formerly homeless families: Housing quality or individual vulnerabilities? *The Community Psychologist*, 26(1), Spring, 27-29.

Birch, E. L. (1985a). Planning for the unsheltered woman. In E. Birch (Ed.), *The unsheltered woman: Women and housing in the 80's* (pp. 121-126). New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.

Birch, E. L. (1985b). The unsheltered woman: Definition and needs. In E. Birch (Ed.), *The unsheltered woman: Women and housing in the 80's* (pp. 21-45). New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.

Charles, A. (1995). *Ethnic groups: The fear of crime and community involvement in the black community*. Unpublished master's thesis, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, The City University of New York.

Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, Inc. (1992). *On their own-at what cost?: A look at families who leave shelters*. New York: Author.

Clay, P. L. (1992). The (un)housed city: Racial patterns of segregation, housing quality and affordability. In G. C. Galster & E. W. Hill (Eds.), *The metropolis in black & white: Place, power and polarization* (pp. 93-107). New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.

Cook, C. C. (1988). Components of neighborhood satisfaction: Responses from urban and suburban single-parent women. *Environment and Behavior*, 20(2), 115-149.

Cook, C. C. (1989). The role of expectations in the "intention to move" among single-parent families. *Environment and Behavior*, 21(5), 554-576.

Cooper, C. (1974). The house as symbol of the self. In J. Lang, C. Burnette, W. Moleski & D. Vauchon (Eds.), *Designing for human behavior* (pp. 130-146). Stroudsburg, PA: Dowden, Hutchinson & Ross.

Crosby, F. J., Pufall, A., Snyder, R. C., O'Connell, M., & Whalen, P. (1989). The denial of personal disadvantage among you, me, and all the other ostriches. In M. Crawford & M. Gentry (Eds.), *Gender and thought: Psychological perspectives* (pp. 79-99). New York: Springer-Verlag.

DeParle, J. (1996, October 20). The year that housing died. *The New York Times Magazine*, pp. 52-57, 68, 94, 105.

Despres, C. (1989). *The meaning of home: Literature review and directions for future research and theoretical development*. Paper presented at The Meaning and Use of the Home and Neighborhood, International Housing Symposium, Sweden.

Dinkins, D. (1992). *The way home: A new direction in social policy*. New York: New York City Commission on the Homeless.

Dovey, K. (1985). Home and homelessness. In I. Altman & C. M. Werner (Eds.), *Home environments. Human behavior and environments: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 33-64). New York: Plenum Press.

Dreier, P. (1993). *Community empowerment strategies: The experience of community-based problem-solving in America's urban neighborhood, recommendations for federal policy*. Orange, NJ: National Housing Institute.

Fairchild, H. H. & Tucker, M. B. (1982). Black residential mobility: Trends and characteristics. *Journal of Social Issues*, 38(3), 51-74.

Francescato, G., Weidemann, S., Anderson, J.R., & Chenoweth, R. (1979). *Residents' satisfaction in HUD-assisted housing: Design and management factors*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Fried, M. (1972). Grieving for a lost home. In R. Gutman (Ed.), *People and buildings* (pp. 229-248). New York: Basic Books, Inc. (Originally published in 1963)

Fried, M., & Gleicher, P. (1976). Some sources of residential satisfaction in an urban slum. In H. M. Proshansky, W. Ittelson, H. & L. G. Rivlin (Eds.), *Environmental psychology: People and their physical settings (2nd ed.)* (pp. 550-612). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Galster, G. C. (1991). Housing discrimination and urban poverty of African-Americans. *Journal of Housing Research*, 2 (2), 87-120.

Geiger, S. M. (1995). African-American single mothers: Public perceptions and public policies. K. M. Vaz (Ed.), *Black women in America*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Guzman, M. (1989). *Families in transition: Adjustment of homeless families to permanent housing*. Bronx, NY: Banana Kelly Community Improvement Association.

Greenblatt, S. B. (1995). *Families in transition: Making the move to permanent housing, lessons from the NYC intensive case management initiative*. Paper accepted by the National Association of Family-Based Services for the 8th Annual Empowering Families Conference.

Harris, C. M. (1976). The measurement of quality in housing and its relationship to housing satisfaction. *Housing Educators Journal*, 3, 7-13.

Hayward, D. G. (1975). Home as an environmental and psychological concept. *Landscape*, 20(1), 2-9.

Interagency Council on the Homeless. (1994). *Priority: Home! The Federal plan to break the cycle of homelessness*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Knickman, J. & Weitzman, B. (1989). *Forecasting Models to Target Families at High Risk of Homelessness*. Volume 3. New York University, Health Research Program, Urban Research Center, Graduate School of Public Administration.

Knickman, J., Weitzman, B., Shinn, M., & Marcus, E. H. (1989). *A Study of Homeless Families in New York City: Characteristics and Comparisons with Other Public Assistance Families*. Volume 2. New York University, Health Research Program, Urban Research Center, Graduate School of Public Administration.

Lazere, E. B., Leonard, P. A., Dolbeare, C. N., & Zigas, B. (1991). *A place to call home: The low income housing crisis continues*. Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities and Low Income Housing Information Service.

Loo, C. (1986). Neighborhood satisfaction and safety: A study of a low-income ethnic area. *Environment and Behavior*, 18(1), 109-131.

Mann, E. S. (1985). Female-headed families in New York City. In E. Birch (Ed.), *The unsheltered woman: Women and housing in the 80's* (pp. 47-51). New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.

Massey, D. S. & Denton, N. A. (1993). *American apartheid: Segregation and the makings of the underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mc Callister, L., & Fischer, C. S. (1978). A procedure for surveying personal networks. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 7(2), 131-148.

Mc Chesney, K. Y. (1990). Family homelessness: A systemic problem. *Journal of Social Issues*, 46(4), 191-205.

Michelson, W. (1977). *Environmental choice, human behavior, and residential satisfaction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Milardo, R. M. (1988). Families and social networks: An overview of theory and methodology. In R. Milardo (Ed.), *Families and social networks* (pp. 13-47). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Miller, D. C. (1991). *Handbook of research design and social measurement*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Mitchell, J. C. (1987). The components of strong ties among homeless women. *Social Networks*, 9, 37-47.

New York City's Human Resources Administration, Bureau of Management Information Systems. (1988). *Survey of women in the singles' shelters*. Unpublished report.

Nunez, R. D. (1994). *Hopes and promises: The future of homeless children in America*. New York: Homes for the Homeless.

Passero, J. M., Zax, M., & Zozus, Jr., R. T. (1991). Social network utilization as related to family history among the homeless. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 19(1), 70-78.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.) Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Peterson, R. B. (1987). Gender issues in the home and urban environment. In E. H. Zube & G. T. Moore (Eds.), *Advances in environment, behavior and design*. (pp. 187-218). New York: Plenum Press.

Rainwater, L. (1967). Fear and the house-as-haven in the lower class. In J. Bellush & M. Hausknecht (Eds.), *Urban renewal: People, politics, and planning*, (pp. 437-450). New York: Doubleday.

Rent, G. S., & Rent, C. S. (1978). Low-income housing: Factors related to residential satisfaction. *Environment and Behavior*, 10(4), 459-488.

Rivlin, L. G. (1996, July). Evolving conceptions of home for formerly homeless families. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Association for People-Environment Studies (IAPS), Stockholm, Sweden.

Rivlin, L. G., Valmont, M. E., & Foster, A. *The meanings of home and implications for homelessness*. Unpublished manuscript.

Rossi, P. H. (1980). *Why families move*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications Ltd. (Originally published in 1955)

Saegert, S. (1985). The role of housing in the experience of dwelling. In I. Altman & C. M. Werner (Eds.), *Home environments. Human behavior and environment: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 287-309). New York: Plenum Press.

Saegert, S. (1996). Issues for low-income housing policy and management: Results of surveys and case studies in Brooklyn *in rem* housing. Paper prepared for the New York City Task Force on City-Owned Property.

Saegert, S., Thompson, J. P., Gottlieb, N. M., Scott-Melnyk, S., & Johnson, K. (1994). *Social networks of public housing residents: Social deficit or social capital?* The City University of New York, Housing Environments Research Group, The Graduate School and University Center.

Saegert, S. & Winkel, G. (1996). Paths to community empowerment: Organizing at home. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 24(4), 517-550.

Sampson, R. J. (1991). Linking the micro- and macro-level dimensions of community social organization. *Social Forces*, 70(1), 43-64.

Sampson, R. J. & Groves, W. B. (1989). Community structure and crime: Testing social-disorganization theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(4), 774-802.

Schroeder, L. D., Sjoquist, D. L. & Stephan, P.E. (1986). *Understanding regression analysis: An introductory guide*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Schwartz, D. C., & Devance-Manzini, D. (1993). *Preventing recidivism among previously homeless families in New York City: Data bases and program designs for four major homelessness prevention efforts*. New Brunswick, NJ: American Affordable Housing Institute.

Shinn, M. & Gillespie, C. (1994). The roles of housing and poverty in the origins of homelessness. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 37(4), 505-521

Shinn, M., Knickman, J. R., & Weitzman, B. C. (1991). Social relationships and vulnerability to becoming homeless among poor families. *American Psychologist*, 46(11), 1180-1187.

Sixsmith, J. A. (1986). The meaning of home: An exploratory study in environmental experience. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 6, 281-298.

Stack, C. B. (1974). *All our kin: Strategies for survival in a black community*. NY: Harper.

Stone, M. E. (1993). *Shelter poverty: New ideas on housing affordability*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Tognoli, J. (1987). Residential environments. In D. Stokols & I. Altman (Eds.), *Handbook of environmental psychology (Vol. 1)* (pp. 655-690). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Valmont, M. E. (1993). *A bridge back home: Place attachments of homeless people*. The City University of New York, Housing Environments Research Group, The Graduate School and University Center.

Watson, S., & Austerberry, H. (1986). *Housing and homelessness: A feminist perspective*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Weicher, J. C. (1989). Housing quality: Measurement and progress. In S. Rosenberry & C. Hartman (Eds.), *Housing issues of the 1990s* (pp. 9-32). New York: Praeger.

Weidemann, S., & Anderson, J. R. (1985). A conceptual framework for residential satisfaction. In I. Altman & C. M. Werner (Eds.), *Home environments. Human behavior and environment: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 153-182). New York: Plenum Press.

Weitzman, B. C. & Berry, C. (1994). *Formerly homeless families and the transition to permanent housing: High-risk families and the role of intensive case management services*. New York: The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation.

Weitzman, B. C., Knickman, J.R., & Shinn, M. (1990). Pathways to homelessness among New York City Families. *Journal of Social Issues*, 46(4), pp. 125-140.

White, M., Kasl, S. V., Zahner, G. E., & Will, J. C. (1987). Perceived crime in the neighborhood and mental health of women and children. *Environment and Behavior*, 19(5), 588-613.

Wilson, W. J. (1996). *When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor*.
New York: Alfred A. Knopf.